In the Matter Of:

CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

January 25, 2019



1	PUBLIC HEARING
2	CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
11	FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2019
12	10:13 A.M.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	REPORTED BY: ALICIA SANTANA, CSR 12824



1	APPEARANCES:	
2		STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
3		OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SUITE 11000 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94102
5		
6		STACEY D. SCHESSER SUPERVISING DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
7		
8		TICA DOMOTING KIM
9		LISA BOYOUNG KIM DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
LO		
L1		DEVIN MAUNEY
L2		DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
L3		
L4		DANIEL BERTONI
L5		STAFF SERVICES ANALYST
L6		
L7		JENNIFER KING
L8		EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



1 JANUARY 25, 2019, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 2 +++++ 3 4 Hi, everyone. Welcome on behalf MS. KIM: 5 of the California Department of Justice and Attorney 6 General Xavier Becerra. Welcome to the fourth public 7 forum on the California Consumer Privacy Act. We are at 8 the beginning of our process on CCPA, so these forums 9 are part of informal process or informal period where we 10 want to hear from you. 11 AUDIENCE: We can't hear you. 12 MS. KIM: I will hold this. 13 So we're at the beginning of CCPA, so 14 these -- these forums are part of the informal period in 15 which we want to hear from you. 16 There will be future opportunities for the 17 members of the public to comment on the regulations 18 after they are adopted, and that will be during the 19 formal rulemaking period. But today our goal here is to 20 listen. We are not able to answer questions or respond 21 to any of your comments. 22 Before we start, I wanted to introduce for 23 you those who are up here on the table, beginning with 24 myself. My name is Lisa Kim. I'm a deputy attorney 25 general in the privacy unit at the DOJ.



MS. SCHESSER: Good morning. 1 I'm Stacev 2 Schesser, the supervisor of the privacy unit. 3 MR. MAUNEY: I'm -- I'm Devin Mauney, deputy 4 attorney general in the consumer law section. 5 MR. BERTONI: And I'm Dan Bertoni, an 6 analyst in the attorney general's executive office. 7 So I want to direct your attention MS. KIM: 8 to the PowerPoint presentation behind me so that we can 9 go over a few process points for today's forum. 10 Each speaker will be given approximately 11 five member -- five minutes to speak. A member of the 12 staff is keeping time. We may not have a ton of 13 speakers, but we do ask that you be respectful of other 14 people and their opportunity to speak. 15 We have a court reporter here to my left. 16 She will be transcribing comments, so please speak 17 slowly and clearly. As with the transcripts for all of 18 our preceding forums, once they are available, they will 19 be posted on our CCPA website, as well as these 20 PowerPoint slides are also available on our website. 21 The front row is reserved for speakers. 22 When you come up to the microphone to my left, it is 23 requested, but not required, that you identify yourself 24 when you're offering public comment. It would also be

helpful, if you have a business card, to provide that to



25

the court reporter. I believe she would appreciate
that.

We welcome written comments by email or mail, and so the email address is above as well as our mailing address.

Also, bathrooms are available and they are to the right of this room.

And if I can ask, are there any media present, if you could raise your hand.

Okay. The next slide. If you'd like to stay informed about this process, we have a website, www.oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa. All right.

So CCPA Section 1798.185 of the Civil Code identifies specific rulemaking responsibility of the attorney general. The areas are summarized here in Numbers 1 through 7. Please keep these in mind when providing your comments today.

Number 1, should there be any additional categories of personal information; 2, should the definition of unique identifiers be updated; 3, what exception should be established by the state or federal law; 4, how should a consumer submit a request to opt out of the sale of personal information and how should a business comply with the consumer's request; 5, what type of uniform opt-out logo or button should be



developed to inform consumers about the right to opt out; 6, what type of notices and information should businesses be required to provide, including those related to financial incentive offers; 7, how can a consumer or their agent submit a request for information to a business and how can a business reasonably verify these requests.

At this time, we welcome comments from the public, so any speakers, please come down to the front row. Thank you.

MS. SCHESSER: I'm sorry, could you go back one slide, please. One more.

MS. KIM: Sorry about that.

To cover Slide 3, the rulemaking process is governed by the California Administrative Procedures

Act. During this process, the proposed regulations and supporting documents will be reviewed by various state agencies, including the Department of Finance and the Office of Administrative Law. Right now these public forums are part of the initial preliminary activities.

This is the public's opportunity to the address what the regulations should say -- should address and say.

We strongly encourage the public to provide oral and written comments, including any proposed regulatory language. Once this informal period ends,



- 1 there will be additional opportunities for the public to 2 comment on the regulations after proposed rules are 3 published by the Office of Administrative Law. We 4 anticipate starting the formal rulemaking process -- or 5 the formal review process, which is initiated by the five regulatory rulemaking -- or notice of regulatory 6 7 action in the fall of 2019. 8 The public hearings that take place during 9 the formal rulemaking process will be live webcasted and
- videotaped. All oral and written comments received
 during those public hearing will be available through
 our CCPA web page.
 - So this is the website to stay informed through the process. Again, it's oag.ca.gov/privacy/CCPA. You can also sign up for our mailing list, if you have not already done so.
 - Next slide. There we go, our seven points, areas to keep in mind.
 - So thank you. If you would like to speak today, we welcome you to the front row and you guys can take turns speaking.
 - (Discussion off the record.)
- MS. LI: Good morning. My name is Lily Li.
 I am a data privacy attorney based in Orange County. I
 just had some questions, ideally get some clarification



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 on the law. 2 The first question is --3 MS. KIM: Could you speak closer into the 4 mic. 5 There is just a few MS. LI: Sure. 6 questions, some clarifications that we would like on the 7 law. One of them is that, right now the law says that 8 companies need to require -- provide information for 12 9 months prior to the date of ever trust; however, the enforcement activity is not going to occur until after 10 11 the regulations are passed. 12 And so at this point, do companies need to 13 start the recordkeeping requirements this year or will 14 the recordkeeping requirements begin next year? Another point of clarification and kind of 15 16 unclear is, after a consumer submits a request, what 17 type of records will a company need to keep so that 18 later on if there is litigation, if there is attorney 19 general action, they can show that they complied with 20 the rule? 21 And then another point of clarification is 22 the uniform opt out "Do not sell my information" will 23 the government require this to be an automatic process 24 or will this be something where there can be some



back-and-forth with the consumer?

25

So just those points of clarification. 1 2 THE COURT: What's your name? 3 MS. LI: Lily Li. 4 MS. KIM: Could you repeat the last comment. 5 MS. LI: Oh, sure. For the uniform opt out 6 "Do not sell my information," is the expectation going 7 to be that this is an automatic process or will there be 8 some room for back-and-forth with the consumer and, you 9 know, the length of time that back-and-forth process can 10 occur? 11 Thank you. 12 MS. KIM: Thank you. 13 MR. BERTONI: Anyone? 14 I'm going to stand here and just MS. KIM: 15 let you know if it's too quiet. 16 My name is JP Colio. I'm here MR. COLIO: 17 because I got an alert from Consumer Reports. 18 In recent years, I've been notified by eight 19 or ten different large institutions ranging from UCLA to 20 Home Depot to Equifax that the protection of my personal 21 and financial data has been compromised. These 22 institutions need powerful incentives to make the 23 security of our personal information a high priority. 24 Control of personal and financial information of the 25 public, gathering, cataloging and selling that data.



The data -- my data and the data of millions
of others has made Mark Zuckerberg and other folks
billionaires. I have nothing against billionaires, but
I urge you to keep the interest of the public rather
than Silicon Valley companies and oligarchs in mind when
you craft these rules.

legislation, I would like to see California join the E.U. in clawing back privacy rights of the public. Please ensure us meaningful choices, simple and transparent, to opt out of the sale to third parties of our information. Thank you.

In the absence of meaningful federal

MS. HENRY: Hello. My name is Dr. Maxine Henry. I'm a Compliance NGRC expert.

My concern is around three specific areas. The first area is concerning a reduction in the amount of revenue for companies that will be in the scope for CCPA. Currently the law states it's \$25 million. However, in compliance, I see a lot of companies that have revenue amounts much smaller than that that are transferring personal information across their systems and as well as interacting with their customers. So that is something that needs to be looked at and considered.

And then the other avenue associated with



that would be related to any of third party vendors that companies work with, are they going to be in scope even if they are under the \$25 million amount?

And the last area is under the protection for HIPAA data, is that still going to be part of the law? Would there be a restriction? So that's something also that comes up a lot when you do consulting, and a lot of companies may have HIPAA data, they may not necessarily be medical companies, but they will have information on their patients or clients.

The last area of concern is around a certification process for CCPA. To me, if you're going to put a law in effect, if you're going to have companies that are going to be compliant, they need to have a certification path. And I'm hoping that the attorney general will look at that as well as give the compliance experts and specialists some guidance on how to set that up.

MS. BALBER: Hi. My name is Carmen Balber. I'm the executive director of Consumer Watchdog.

And as a consumer just said, an overwhelming majorities of consumers in American are concerned about the use of their data and the collection of their data by companies online. 85 percent of Americans consistently say that they want control over the data



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 that companies are collecting about them. And the 2 California Consumer Privacy Act is finally giving 3 Californians the strongest privacy protection in the 4 nation to do just that, control the data that's 5 collected about them, prevent its sale, to review it and take it with them if they choose to, and to hold 6 7 companies accountable when lapses in security cause data 8 breaches.

So we are here to, at the beginning of this process, urge you to make sure that that the implementation of that law and those protections are as protective for consumers as possible. I'm sure we'll have many more comments as the process goes on, but I think we heard a list of the few data breaches.

The most recent was announced on Wednesday, that 24 million records of tens of thousands of consumers mortgage and loan data, which included bank account statements and Social Security numbers, every piece of information an identity thief would need to impersonate some was just announced, the latest data breach.

So if we need any more examples why this law is so desperately needed and why consumers need the protections to be as strong as possible, we only have to look back two days to Wednesday.



On the specific regulations, we have a couple comments now. Starting in a little reverse order, the financial incentives that companies are allowed to offer to consumers in order to entice them to allow them to sell their data, the nondiscrimination rules that you rate, I think may be some of the most important that you write.

There are models for many of these other things, but this is unique to California's law. And the law is very clear. You will forgive me if I quote because everyone here doesn't have it in front of them, that it creates "the right of Californians to equal service and price," even if they -- even if they exercise their privacy rights, so even when they chose to opt out, the law says there cannot be a denial of goods or services for any consumer who opts out. And the law says that any financial incentive that a company dreams up to try to convince consumers to, in fact, allow the sale or sharing of their data "cannot be unjust, unreasonable, coercive or usurious."

The law, in essence, allows company to offer financial incentives to consumers for the sale or sharing of their data only if those incentives are related to the value of consumers' data. And so that means that any incentives that companies do choose to



provide consumers cannot set up a situation where mid income and low income consumers are forced to sell their data, are forced to give up their privacy in order to use a website or service. That means that any difference in price, any disparate level of service has to be connected to the value of the consumers' data.

We would suggest that the only way you can do that with any reasonable degree of certainty, either for the AG's Office or for the public, is to require companies perhaps quarterly, but certainly at least once a year, to submit to the Attorney General's Office the revenue they receive from the sale of consumers' data and then show how they use that data to figure out a per consumer price.

For example, if a blog chooses to charge a subscription -- well, let me reverse it.

If a blog chooses to offer a free subscription to their blog to a consumer in exchange for the sale and sharing of their data, they need to be able to prove to the AG and disclose to the consumer at the point of choosing to opt out the value and how that value is directly related to the revenue that the company is receiving from that consumer's data. We think that is really important to ensure that the kind of discrimination the law explicitly prohibits doesn't

occur.

On the uniform opt-out button, the law is, of course, very explicit that it needs to say "Do not sell my personal information." And that is to ensure that consumers have a clear and obvious choice about what their -- what they are giving up. We would again urge you to be very explicit about what consumers are agreeing to.

However, we think it's very important that we not get stuck in a situation wherein today where a consumer who chooses to, for example, manage their privacy preferences at Google can get glossed over and clicks buttons and explanations, a rabbit hole of information before the consumer gets to the point where they can say please opt me out.

And so the -- the button, we believe, once a consumer clicks on the I would like to express my preference to opt out, they should be able to on the very next page make the final decision to opt out of the seller -- sale or sharing of data.

Of course, that page needs to explain what consumers are opting out of, but we do not believe companies should be allowed to bury that opt out -- final opt-out choice under multiple pages and multiple clicks.



Just on an operational front, we think that that button should appear on the home page and on interior pages of a website because anyone who uses a search engine knows that they don't usually go to the home page of a website or frequency start somewhere else, and that should be in a font that is larger than the primary or the typical font of the website page so consumers cannot miss that they have the option to opt out of the sale or use of their data.

I guess the last piece -- and we will, of course, have more comments once we see regulations. But the last piece we would just want to put out there is that the law is actually very clear about the types of information that are considered personal information.

And that includes any information that can in any way be tied to a particular consumer or a particular household.

So that means not only information that a company has said Carmen Balber has done X, Y, Z. But also an IP address and all of the information that they imported off that so there is no justification for limiting the information that a company collects about a consumer that they should be required to disclose to that consumer. I think the law is very clear on that.

What we've heard in some of the other forums that companies are seeking to limit the amount of



information that might be considered personal information that companies would have to disclose and stop selling and also perhaps the suggestion that somehow the IP address isn't an appropriate unique identifier. And there can be no question that the IP address can be connected to a consumer or a household and is critical personal information when we're talking about data collection online.

I will leave it with that.

MS. SAVISS: Hi. My name is Alyssa Saviss, litigation attorney.

I would urge the Department of Justice to provide more clarity on the applicability of the act, specifically in regards to what constitutes a business. The act currently defines a business as an entity doing business in California that meets one of three thresholds. Now, the act has not provided transparency or a definition in regards to what it means to do business in California.

In addition to that, I would urge the Department of Justice to clarify on the threshold of the \$25 million revenue and whether that revenue is limited to the source of revenue in California or nationally or internationally. Thank you.

MS. HOWARD: Good morning. Can you hear me?



My name is Melanie Howard. I'm a partner in the
Los Angeles office of Loeb & Loeb where I chair the
brand protection group and practice in our privacy,
security and data innovations group.

At Loeb & Loeb, we represent companies that interact with California consumers across many industries and who care very much about respecting the privacy rights of their customers as well as other California consumers. We greatly appreciate the time you have taken out of your busy schedules to hold these open sessions and to listen to the feedback that we have on the California Consumer Privacy Act.

My comments today are intended to suggest ways in which the Attorney General's regulations could clarify the CCPA, thus helping California companies and others who provide their services to California consumers, services which are intended to benefit those consumers, fully respect such consumers' privacy rights in running their business. We understand that the attorney general has the authority to adopt additional regulations that are necessary to further the purposes of this California Consumer Privacy Act.

My first comment relates to the development of a logo, which we would suggest as opposed to just a button, that would allow companies to place on their



home page instead of the express language "Do not sell my information."

You're likely familiar with the AdChoices icon that was developed several years ago to provide consumers the ability to opt out of interest based advertising. A similar type of logo in place of the language "Do not sell my information" could be used on the home page as a hyperlink to an opt out page or a specific page that addresses the privacy rights of California consumers such as we've already seen with laws such as "Shine the light."

In many cases, companies are not truly selling a consumer customer's information, but are merely sharing it with a third party. The word "selling" has a negative connotation in those situations and may not accurately describe the different types of sharing that would fall into the category of selling as defined under the CCPA. We think that a privacy logo would more effectively communicate the intent to allow a customer's control over how a company is sharing their data.

My second comment involves the verification process for consumer requests. We would ask that you consider a written regulation that provides verification processes based on the quantity and quality of data held



1 by the company that is being contacted.

For example, a company with whom a California consumer has a customer relationship may have provided the company with their name, address, email, phone number and other points of data. When a company has a profile of this nature, authentication becomes easier. And many companies, including the financial services industry, likely have such authentication processes already in place. An established set of best practices and written guidelines would be helpful in this regard.

By contrast, another company may only have a unique identifier of a California consumer, such as a device identifier, which may not relate back to a specific individual. Verifying this California consumer without collecting additional personal information, which is typically considered to be anti-privacy is not ideal. It would be very useful if the regulation could be provided an outline verification process that would not require the collection of additional data simply to verify the consumer. The only information that the company had at the outset was extremely limited and possibly already used online to aggregate in the identified forum.

My third comment involves a proposal to



consider a notice template in the regulations that could provide a safe harbor. Our clients strive to create notices and privacy policies that are easily understood by consumers and presented in a very transparent and conspicuous manner. We think it would helpful if companies could take advantage of a safe harbor if we use the notice template that could be outlined in a regulation.

We note that the CCPA provide express exemptions for companies who are complying with the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act as well as HIPAA, and it also includes a general catchall regarding compliance with other states or federal regulations and laws. We note that it does not specifically reference the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act. In light of the specific rate for children under the age of 16, which differs from the previously recognized age of 13 under COPPA, it would be helpful for the regulations to expressly address the interaction between the CCPA and COPPA.

We would also propose a regulation to explain what the reference to household is intended to capture. As you are likely aware, the reference in the statute expands the definition of an individual's personal information to reach data about other individuals and may do so in ways that were not



anticipated by the drafters of the legislation, so further clarification on that point would be helpful in implementing appropriate practices to comply with the intent of the statute.

And finally, with regards to the exemption for Gramm-Leach-Bliley, we think that there could be a number of industries, including the financial services industry, who are engaged in businesses that involve the transfer of personal information in connection with an ongoing service or business. Examples might include the sale of a loan portfolio, the sale of delinquent accounts, situations in which personal information is being transferred together with another business line.

It's not the peeling out of personal data and the sale of data itself as an asset; however, a strict reading of the statute might bring these types of activities within the definition of sale. We would encourage the attorney general to look at the exemption to sale that deals with the transfer of all or part of a business and consider that these types of activities should really be subsumed within the transfer of a part of the business.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

MR. GRIMALDI: Good morning. And thank you for the opportunity to adopt the comments here today. I



commend the attorney general for holding these important sessions. My name is Dave Grimaldi. I'm executive vice president of the Interactive Advertising Firm. We were founded in 1996 and we represent over 650 media and technology companies that are responsible for selling, delivering and optimizing digital advertising or marketing campaigns.

We've long championed transparency and choice and the existing privacy regulatory framework.

Based in part on this concept, I've enabled tremendous growth and innovation in the modern economy while protecting consumer privacy and giving consumers meaningful options for what data about them will be used. iab's member companies offer content and services that Americans love and that are accustomed to accessing with little difficulty and at little to no expense.

Digital advertising enables that access.

Consumer data is integral to the value exchange that exists behind the free ad-supported online ecosystem and the responsible safeguarding of that data is a role that online publishers and ad tech companies take very seriously. However, the CCPA has vividly illustrated how consumer trust of that duty has eroded and Californians are looking for increased transparency into how their online data is used and how it is



protected.

The lead-up to the enactment of CCPA and the momentum behind it demonstrate how curiosity changed into frustration which then turned into action. The sentiment also took root in Europe and led to that passage of the General Data Protection Regulation, GGPR. And it's also gaining traction in Congress where members of the House and Senate have release privacy-centric bills and there are many more to come.

We absolutely agree with the spirit of CCPA and its guiding principles of transparency, control and accountability. Our cross-industry development of the Digital Advertising Alliance, or DAA, was created precisely to address those core conceptions over a decade ago and has gained widespread acclaim from government and public interest groups alike.

While the CCPA seeks to enshrine these concepts to increase consumer rights around the use of online data, the bill's language could result in unintended consequence that could run counter to its mission of smart and pragmatic privacy protection. The need to clarify definitions and consider their impact on businesses large and small is critical to promulgating a law that preserves the responsibilities of data and online value exchange between the company and the

consumer.

iab looks forward to providing more detailed written comments to the attorney general, but today I just want to highlight a few issues which we believe could use extra guidance and clarification to businesses and the media and marketing industries who are actively involved in working to comply with CCPA. I will submit these comments -- I brought extra copies of them, but will be submitting a much longer filing. I have these for you today if you'd like them.

First, it's important that CCPA's nondiscrimination provisions do not prevent publishers from charging a reasonable fee as an alternative to using an ad-supported business model. There is a concern the CCPA nondiscrimination proviso will prevent publishers from charging a reasonable fee to access their content for those consumers who would like to opt out.

Publishers, especially small ones, rely on third party advertising providers to generate revenue to support their online service and to provide desired content. It's critical that we avoid requiring websites to grant everyone access to their digital sites, even visitors who had opted out, without allowing some paid alternative. Doing so would limit the ability of

businesses to pursue their historic business model and
would likely result in lost voices across the digital
medium.

We ask the attorney general to permit a business to charge a reasonable fee as an alternative to using an ad-supported business model.

Second, it's important that CCPA provide flexibility for small businesses where consumer requests are cost prohibitive. Small- and medium-size businesses and self-employed individuals rely upon consumer data to improve products and services and to find new customers and business partners.

Compared with larger companies, smaller businesses face significant expenses in complying with consumer requests, and CCPA already recognizes that a business may charge a reasonable fee or will refuse to act on a consumer request when consumer requests are manifestly unfounded or excessive. We ask the attorney general to interpret excessive, to include requests that are unreasonably costly relative to the size of the business.

And finally today, it's important that CCPA provide the needed flexibility for businesses to verify consumer requests. In many scenarios in the digital advertising industry, businesses have limited ability to



verify the legitimacy of consumer requests under the CCPA. This difficulty in determining which requests are legitimate and which are fraudulent puts consumers and their data at risk from unauthorized requests.

We ask that the attorney general recognize that verifying consumer requests may take many forms and should refrain from enforcement actions when companies make commercially reasonable efforts to verify a consumer. We also ask that the attorney general distinguish between parties that hold that is purely synonymous and have no means of connecting it to an actual person.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today and speak to you. As I mentioned, we'll be filing longer comments, but I will leave a few here for you. Thank you.

MS. TAKATSUKI: Hi. I'm Yuli Takatsuki.

I'm here today for the privacy attorney at Field Fisher.

I just have one question regarding the right to data access and portability and would like some clarification on the portability provision. In the act, it says that requests which are filed electronically shall be provided in a portable and to the extent technically feasible in a readily usable format.

I would just like some clarification on the



meaning of "technically feasible." So, you know, to 1 2 what extent does an organization have to make efforts to 3 make the information available in a readily usable 4 format? For example, is there technology that already 5 exists within the company or do they have to go to some engineering effort, if it is possible from an 6 7 engineering perspective, to create it in that format? 8 Secondly, just to seek some clarification on the scope of that right. So what information does it 9 Is it just information that has provided by the 10 11 consumer that needs to be provided in a portable format? 12 Or does it need to cover all data that is held by the 13 organization? So anything from analytics to marketing 14 data, you know, service usage data, all of that stuff. 15 And so some clarification on that would be, yeah, very 16 much welcome. Thank you. 17 MS. SHARP: Good morning, you guys. 18 Linda Sharp from ZL Technologies. We're a software

company out of the Silicon Valley area.

One of the things we struggle with on a regular basis is working with clients on managing content. So as we look whether it's GDPR, CCPA, the Brazilian regulations or regulations coming out of China and Japan and all over the place unfortunately makes it very difficult for large organizations to actually



19

20

21

22

23

24

25

manage their data and provide -- actually meet these regulations and requirements.

So some of the things to try to keep in mind as you're looking at changes or notes you might be making to the CCPA is understanding how content moves within an organization and how they store that data with third party providers.

So, for example, under GDPR, it talks about controllers versus processors, although thew definition of processor is extremely broad. So that individual, that company may actually be hosting content and actually not processing that content. So making sure we actually have the ability from a technology standpoint to meet the requirements you are setting under CCPA.

One of the other areas I wanted to talk about a little bit is we really focus very heavily on information that is gained over a website or an internet access. So a consumer logs in, puts in their personal information or their URL address is being tracked when, in fact, that information may be gathered through the company in multiple different way.

For example, maybe that same individual happened to attend a trade show. So how are we supposed to triangulate that that same logon from a person in California or Europe coming in to a California company



versus maybe they attended a trade show, how are we supposed to keep track of all of those data points for those specific individuals?

So those are some of the technology issues that we're facing.

In addition to that, under CCPA and also adds on the issue around former employees and existing employees and management of their content. So I ask that you just take a look and think about all the different places within your business day where you store information. It could be sitting in file share SharePoint sites, email systems, SAP systems, accounting record, all across the board within the organization. It's very difficult to actually try to find all the disparate locations of this information.

So as attorneys, we're creating these regulations and setting these policies in place and imposing tremendous fines when, in fact, the technology is not there to meet the obligations that we've defined.

My last statement would be that, as a country, I think it's very important, and I'm excited for California, we're on the cutting edge, as we always are, but there is also, as the gentleman before me stated, federal regulations that we're looking at today that, as a country, maybe we should mirror what they've



done under -- in Europe and actually move as a country approach as a opposed to a state-by-state approach.

With that, thank you so much for your time today.

MR. LACHMAN: Hello. Good to see you all again. This is a much better drive, I imagine, for you than going to Riverside. I was there yesterday. My name is Andrew Lachman. I am the owner of Lachman Law. We are a law firm that focuses on technology and data privacy.

By way of my own background, I cofounded realtor.com's privacy committee when I was -- worked for them back in the early 2000s; sat on Viacom's privacy committee when I worked for Paramount Pictures. Then went to work on Capitol Hill and I worked one of the four computer science majors, Congressman Ted Lieu, was his legislative director and cofounded the congressional tech staff association.

So I got into it because -- into the public service aspect of the because I felt there was a shortage of people who really understood how the technology worked as much as the policy impacts that were there today.

And most of the clients that I serve make well under 25 million a year. They're startups.



Frankly, none of them have really asked me to advocate for them today. This is just based on my own experience.

Some things have been brought up, and I just wanted to add to some of them in some general comments.

First of all, with respect to IP addresses,
I think there is only one country in the world, in
Europe that says an IP address by itself is considered
identifiable information, that's the Netherlands. Most
European countries have said that an IP address by
itself, if combined with other personal data, would be
considered personal data.

As an example, there's two different kinds of IP addresses. There are static ones and there are dynamic ones. Most the ones that we all have in our phone or at home DSL, you don't have your own IP address. You probably share it with several hundreds, if not thousands of people, who would use the same IP address. Even if you have one in your own domain, your -- you may rotate IP addresses. So, therefore, making sure that the regulations reflect the actual way technology works is going to be very important.

Secondly, I think some further discussion in the regulations may be necessary about what kind -- what constitutes sale of information. As I mentioned, a lot



of client companies, including my clients, none of my clients actually sell information that they collect directly from data sources -- from the data subjects. And so -- but many of them are required to share that information in order to provide their service, and I think that to make that a part of CCPA would go well beyond what is normally used in this industry.

To go back to the notice, I think the logo idea is a great idea. Again, none of my clients sell information, but they all now have -- many of them will have to have this comment that will create some confusion. I do think though that some of the guidance that has come out of the WP 29 group may be particularly helpful in coming up with these regulations.

As an example, the consumer watchdog folks brought up some very good points about making sure that the privacy policy and the opt-out rights are easily available. WP 29 group says they should be within two clicks of the home page. That would be a very good suggestion.

I'm going to bring up one last thing today, and I just want to give this as an example of how the situation could be abused. A lawyer a while back wrote an example letter of what they said was a nightmare GDPR request. It can be found on LinkedIn, and I'm just



5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to read a small part of it, just an example of how
the situation if not -- regulation are not put together
reasonably can get out of control.

It says here I would like to -- "I need a reply within one month as required under Article 12, which I will be forwarding in my inquiry to the appropriate data protection authority. Please advise me of the following. Please confirm with me whether or not my personal data is being process. If it is, provide me with the categories of data that you have in your databases. In particular, please" -- this is the next point -- "tell me what you know about in your information systems whether or not contained in databases or voice or media you may store. Additionally, please advise me which countries my data is stored in, in case you make use of cloud services that store or process my data, and where those servers are located in the last 12 months. Please provide me with data that you are currently processing. provide me with a detailed accounting of the specific usage you have made for my data." Most of this is already in privacy policies, by the way. "Please provide me with all third parties which you may have shared my data, personal data. If you cannot identify the third parties, please provide a list of third



1 parties who you may have shared or disclosed my data. 2 Please identify which jurisdictions you have identified 3 in which third parties can access my personal data. 4 Please provide insight as to legal grounds for 5 transferring my data. Additionally, I would like to 6 know what safequards you've put in place in relation to 7 these third parties and then you have identified in relation to the transfer of my data. Please tell me how 8 long you have stored my data and if retention is based 9 on category of personal data. If you are additionally 10 11 collecting personal data about any source from me, 12 please tell me what that source is. If you are making 13 automated decisions about me, please provide me with the 14 information concerning for the logic for making such decisions. And I would also like to know whether it has 15 16 been disclosed any time inadvertently in the past. 17 so, please tell me each individual breach that has 18 occurred, the time, the date, the source, the details of 19 what information was disclosed, and also tell me whether 20 my data has been encrypted with strategies." 21 This could go on for a while. This is about 22 two pages. 23 Before you say this is just an extreme

situation, I want you to know that I have at least one

client that has received this letter. It does happen.



24

25

So the regulations that you all been putting forward are going to be very important to make sure that they are based on the reality of how technologies in these companies work. And I think many of the insights that we've seen today will reflect some of those realities.

In closing and as my final point in this, I do think that some regulation with respect to article --GDPR Article 13 and 14, collectors, those who collect data from public sources may need to be clarified as well because those do fall, I think, more squarely than the intent of the legislation just to go after data brokers, not small companies that would buy or sell data in one particular way or another or that would merely process data, which is really what probably most of the companies that are people in this room are -- do as well.

So thank you again so much for your time.

This is a very granular area to have to learn about very quickly, and I really appreciate the effort that you all have put in putting together all of these hearings.

Thank you very much.

MR. NAULLS: Hello. My name is Ron Naulls.

I'm from Protiviti, a cyber security and privacy

consulting. Wanted to get some clarification or

probably some awareness on the CCPA in regards to the



minimum level of security that's defined by the attorney general, the minimum level of security that a business must have in place if they process or store personal information.

And a lot of the engagements that I have been on are not aware of the minimum security standards for personal information. The attorney general, Kamala Harris, expressed in 2016 that since the CCPA stresses that under the California professional business code, if you process or store information, then you must have the minimum level of security as defined by the CIS top 20.

And so I just think there should be some clarification around the minimum security standards or they should be stressed or there should be some awareness for organizations to put in place proper security measures in that whether or not -- if they don't have those minimum security measures in place, will that constitute willful negligence or will that constitute some level of liability for the organization, just as a -- as a default for not having the minimum level of security in place? And that's it.

MR. CHANDRA: Hi. My name is Ashok Chandra. I'm a data privacy attorney at an advertising agency.

I just want to briefly reiterate what several speakers before have mentioned, the use of



AdChoices icon that the DDA has created. It's been about five or six years, I think, and it's widely used.

I think that would integrate fantastically with the opt out in 1798.185 Section 5. So I would like to encourage you all to consider integration and not necessarily recreating the wheel, but using what we already use in business.

If you see that on almost every IDC, you see a little blue arrow at the top right-hand side. I think that as an industry we need to educate the consumer, but there are opt-outs out there that are usable at this point. Thanks.

MS. HOBBS: Good morning. My name Linda
Hobbs. I'm 70 years old, a graduate of UCLA. I'm a
community volunteer, a strong supporter of Jamie Court
and Consumer Watchdog.

I'd like to address categories 1 and 6 very, very briefly. In November of 2018, my question is why did Apple collect millions of customers' fingerprints and five day later lock us out of our phones and iPads?

A November 11, 2018 episode of 60 Minutes, attorney Matt Schems, S-C-H-E-M-S, the key force in creating Europe's General Data Protection Regulation stated data should be owned by consumers. But because a tech company, Apple being the largest in America,



controls data, Apple owns our fingerprints. Attorney

Schems stated tech companies use coercion, force consent

and take-it-or-leave-it approach.

In my case, there was no warning that Apple was going to be collecting my fingerprint, although I called the tech support department on my cell phone, because I have proof of that, and I asked them about this -- this upgrade. In the middle of this, it says "Fingerprint." I'm a senior. I didn't know what to do and I needed to use my phone, so I had no option but to continue with it.

I'm going to wrap this up because I don't want it take too much time, just 30 seconds more.

Because I'm a community volunteer, I needed the 300 phone contacts of the people that I volunteer for, the text messages, the notes. And when I went to Apple, Apple said I had to do a reset, which I could lose all of that data. I pay -- millions of customers like myself, we pay Apple money each month to store information in the clouds. But with the reset, Apple does not guarantee that.

And I would like to see that Apple in the future is required to pay for any damages. I had to buy a new phone, I had to pay the double phone services.

And they have to give us notice 30 days in advance



before they are going to collect our fingerprints.Thank you.

MS. GROSS: I've got a couple. I thought there would be much more participation so I'm not really prepared, but as -- I'm Jessica Gross, just here as a person who is interested, not on anyone's behalf.

It seems that you are kind of limited in the things that are you able to do in this law. And it's also very clear from many of the comments that we heard that the law itself has problems with the way it's written, the way the definitions are, the way the scope might actually be applied. So I don't know how much of this is for you or for the legislature, but I know that Attorney General Becerra has given some comments to the legislature in the past.

I would recommend using these public comments as another way to push what the attorney general might not have the ability to do back to the legislature because from a compliance perspective, it's a nightmare. It's not really clear what companies may have to do.

The number one question we always get is,
I'm GDPR compliant, is that good enough? And I know
that in some of these public forums, people have asked
for an exemption or exception for GDPR compliance.



Whether or not that meets the same goals is something ultimately for the lawmakers to decide.

And from that very moving comment we just heard made me think about personal information unique identifiers. It could be really valuable to separate out two categories in the way that GDPR has done, to put aside some of the more sensitive types of information, maybe like fingerprints, DNA and, you know, medical data, things that we're a little more concerned about as opposed to an IP address or an online identifier that has to be kind of put together with a couple pieces of information, and maybe you only get a name or something from that.

So thinking about ways to truly protect what we're most concerned about and require reasonable security over those types of information would be valuable.

The other thing I would note is the seemingly conflicting definition of personal information in CCPA and what personal information was PII historically. And the breach section of CCPA does refer to the historic PII definition as the type of information being subject to reasonable security. It should be all personal information that's sensitive, not just maybe your name and social, but your fingerprint or



other pieces of information that could really expose you to identity theft or other issues.

And I guess that's. Everybody's had good comments. Good luck.

MR. GRUDEN: Hi. My name is Joseph Gruden (phonetic). I'm a financial institutions attorney. Thank you for providing us the opportunity comment on the proposed regulations today. The question I have is the scope of the GLBA SB-1 exemption.

Now, the questions I'm receiving from a lot of my clients is, is this an industry exemption? Are we out of the regulation? Or is this just part of the data that we process, collect, use, share, process?

So GLBA and SB-1, the way they're really defined is tied to the consumer relationship. The financial institutions collect a broader scope of data, for example, marketing materials, one example, and there are other different regulatory frameworks. So, for example, if there's a firm offer of credit extended, the way that data is obtained through the FCRA framework, which isn't mentioned in the regulation, but it's an important facet of the way financial institutions conduct there business and market their products and services.

Also number of ways there is employee data



that is outside the scope. You may have employees that aren't financial institution customers. You can get data from -- you know, if you're doing a commercial loan and you get individual guarantors that aren't customers, you're not taking that data under the framework of GLBA or SB-1. So I can think of a number of other frameworks and data that is collected that isn't necessarily subject to SB-1 or GLBA.

So if we can get some clarification as to, you know, the scope of that exemption, I think that would be very helpful for us to determine, you know, what -- how to comply with your regulation and what we need to do in advance before -- before an effective date of the regulation. Thank you.

MS. KESSLER: Good morning. My name is Kyle Kessler and I'm an attorney with the cyber, privacy and data innovations unit of Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe. Thank you to the Attorney General's Office for being here and taking comments.

In relation to CCPA, we have a couple of things that, as mentioned before by several of the members here, things that keep coming up with our clients. So a little clarification on some guidance on some of these matters might be helpful.

In terms of other regulatory bodies and



other regulations, we would love to get more clarity on the impact and conflict with FERPA, California SOPIPA, all of those other Shine the Light. We have several conflicting or overlapping regulations that we're currently working with with our clients for compliance. So that's a recurring question we're getting, How does CCPA overlap or become in compliance with some of these regulations that have no mention within the act? And for those that do, how do they interact?

In relation to public compliance opting consent for children 13 through 16, clarity on to -- as far as the age requirement, is that 16 and under or is it under 16? Also, the nature of consent mechanism, are we asking individuals to provide affirmative obligation to screen for age? What does that look like? Are we in compliance with COPPA using similar mechanisms? Or what is the -- what does that look like, essentially?

Now, we work with several ad tech providers and we have iab present as well. Welcome. We would like to know the impact on compliance for bills providers. When it comes to opt-out requirements, who is responsible for those opt outs? We've seen that there may be an overlapping responsibility for the actual providers. But ultimately it's not very clear where that line can be drawn. Do we have an industry on

opt-out solution similar to what we have now within that exist in NIA mechanism.

For -- specifically I'm actually going back to conflicting relations or current realtor framework for Ed tech providers, specifically similar to ad tech, Ed tech. So we have a lot of providers who work with schools. What does that look like? Do they fall within the exceptions/exemptions? Or any of those frameworks is -- again, we have FERPA.

For their final consumer request, clear mechanisms for what that looks like? Again, that's one of the questions we get from clients as well, what does it mean to verify the consent? Once we verify it, what does it mean to provide disclosures?

Will the AG -- as far as the disclosure requirement for the privacy policy, will the AG be providing guidance or template language that can be used for those disclosures?

In connection with definitions, do we have -- the current definition of what constitutes a sale of data is very broad. It could be interpreted to include even standard disclosures that a business doesn't necessarily have a direct monetary benefit to the company. But because we have such a broad definition, it could be any benefit. So what does that

1 really look like? Is there any way to narrow down 2 definition that is now all-encompassing of any sharing 3 of data for any benefit. 4 Everything else has already been mentioned. 5 Thank you so much. 6 We're going to take a brief break MS. KIM: 7 to let our court reporter just have a moment for a rest 8 and reconvene in about five minutes. 9 (Recess.) Speakers, if you would like to 10 MS. KIM: 11 come down and provide a comment. 12 Problems with the mic. 13 (Discussion off the record.) 14 MR. COHEN: So my name is Greg Cohn. 15 the cofounder and CEO of a consumer mobile application 16 company that makes an app called Burner, which is a 17 consumer privacy focused app. And so -- and we have 18 been in business five-plus years. We are a category 19 leader in both the Apple app store and the Google Play 20 store from the revenue point of view. 21 So we are not public about our numbers per

se, but sort of on the order of millions of downloads,

sort of in the category of people here who are likely to

be regulated, but also somewhat, if I may, a subject

hundreds of thousands of paying customers scale.



22

23

24

25

matter expert on consumer demand for privacy-related products, things that they are willing to pay for and to some degree what they're caring about in the realm of protecting their own privacy.

There are obviously lots of others in a similar space. And I apologize for having just arrived here, I don't know if these, hopefully, brief remarks I will make will be repetitive with others or exactly the right level of sort of legal expertise or sophistication. I'm not an attorney, so bear with me.

I'm really coming from the point of view of a company that will likely be subject to regulation.

Certainly under GDPR in Europe, we are subject when active in Europe and so CCPA would ostensibly apply to us. And also as somebody who wants to see more consumer protections around privacy and hopes to see that kind of worked out in the right way.

So I guess first I would like to say thanks for having this seminar and the opportunity to speak and for what I know if a lot of hard work going into revving the legislation which is kind of well underway. And also to say while I'm not personally a technical expert, I am very knowledgeable and there are a lot of very real technical experts on the nuances of various aspects of the way the mobile app ecosystem works, the mobile



advertising ecosystem work. And I just -- I hope that the folks -- the stakeholders in this legislation process are availing themselves of that sort of technical expertise where appropriate and to make myself available as useful and help identify others who could be where needed.

In a more concrete set of things, I guess, you know, just a few recommendations to make. One being to say, first of all, consumers are increasingly aware of privacy issues and I think understand that their data is being sold, traded, targeted, et cetera, including understanding some of the nuances of those things as to how they play out, not just very high level.

So, for example, you know, if I'm a consumer availing myself of a sleep tracker app or pregnancy tracker app, there is a clear understanding -- and particularly if that app is free, there is an understanding that I'm entering data that might be sensitive data, certainly personal identifiable data into a system that is being run by a company and that that company is going to provide me services, you know, that respond to that data, but at the same time very uncomfortable with the idea that suddenly I'm targeted all over the universe based on that data or Facebook knows I'm pregnant or what have you.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think on the technical side, there is also an important distinction to make and one that I'm not sure is clear in the draft legislation that I've seen around the need for explicit distinction between data that is shared with a third party who is acting under the direct sort of control, if you will, of the developer. So if I'm collecting data as an application developer, I might have fairly granular data being collected about a user and put it into a third party metrics system that is under my control that I can delete, that is not commingled with other people's data, but might be -- you know, might be sort of scary in a disclosure or in a privacy policy if it's not clearly delineated as under my control as distinct from that, there are systems I can put data into that are -- where they are commingled.

There's a paper that recently came out, and I could provide that reference if needed, that goes into technical detail about how the Facebook mobile SDK operates to collect data, you know, from mobile app experiences. And in that paper, there are specific details. I think, for example, they go into a travel search example whereby literally -- I believe it's Kayak, not to throw them under the bus, I think that's industry standard practice -- is sending an event when a



customer does a search for an airline ticket to Hawaii on a set of dates with an originating airport, and that search is made at a certain time.

Like that level of granularity of data is actually getting sent in through the Facebook SDK into Facebook and then is becoming both available as an ad targeting model for that developer, but is clearly, at least potentially being commingled with other data. And at least up until the GDPR and the period thereafter, there was no real opt out, even if there was disclosure. And I think Facebook has made some changes to that SDK.

But that's just example of a whole class of things particularly involving the ads ecosystem whereby a real distinction could be made to whether, you know -- I would like the ability to handle my user data in a way where I'm being a good custodian, but that might involve some third parties. And I think that's importantly distinction from when I'm being cavalier about the set of third parties that receive it.

And, you know, the simple sort disclosure where there's a big pop-up that says we accept this isn't really enough. That doesn't make a meaningful distinction to a consumer to a world where everybody continues to do all the same things, but now there is lots of disclosures and buttons to click to accept terms



of service I don't think really solves the problem that consumers would like to see solved that has developed into an ecosystem that we would like to see solved.

To go one click deeper on that, as it were, as a developer in participating in these ecosystems and other software applications that are marketing to potential new customers, it's very difficult to compete without using the Facebook SDK and similar kinds of things. Almost like significant percentage of advertising spend in the mobile ecosystem is driven by, you know, performance-based marketing. Performance meaning I'm paying per install or per event subsequent to an install as opposed to I'm paying just for the impression of my -- my ads showing up on a page.

So in order to measure the actual events, there needs to be something in the app, typically a software development kit, or SDK, that is connecting those dots. So if I want to advertise on Facebook, I want to give Facebook a budget of dollars a month and say please find me the people that are most likely to subscribe to my product or please find me new people who are most like my best customers, I have to provide to them access to that SDK. There is no other way to participate in that ecosystem on a performance basis.

And so if I choose to opt out of that as a



developer in order to be a good citizen or in order to
have a higher privacy standard of care with my
customers, then I am at a great disadvantage to my
competitors because they are marketing in that system.
So they stick a button on their app that has a
disclosure and then they get to do all that.

And that's not really what consumers want.

Consumers don't necessarily want Facebook to know that they are installing a pregnancy tracker or pay to convert to subscriber status or all these other events that like kind of do get thrown to Facebook or to Google or other programatic networks throughout the known ad universe.

That's a level of distinction I don't know that I've sort of seen in the dialogue around this space. Perhaps it is, and that's great. But I wanted to bring that to this group's attention. Sorry, my notes are on my phone and it keeps closing.

And I guess I think there is potentially an opportunity to make this a -- in this example, and I definitely, you know, don't mean to single out Facebook, because I think they are among a number of actors in this, but to carry through with this as an example, there is an opportunity to solve this problem at the Facebook level and at the Apple and Google level who do



gate and have the ability to control what is in mobile applications that are sent on their -- that are, you know, distributed by their networks.

So Apple, for example, has recently cracked down on location data being collected without consumer consent. I think a lot of people are happy to see that, myself included. But again, this problem of an uneven playing field for people who are compliant with these things is something that could be solved at the Apple level and certainly from a regulatory burden and from a risk of, you know, consumer class act lawsuit and so forth, the stakes are much larger and the larger players at the Apple scale have the ability to enforce those things more -- both more rigorously from a technical point of view. And frankly, I think you have a bigger stick with which to force them to enforce it than I think some of the, you know, sort of the size and the thresholds and size, you know.

So I think in the thresholds that were in the latest legislation draft, we would be qualified to have to comply with CCPA, and yet we would have to, you know, figure out how to resource that and do a lot of work and you would have to regulate a bunch of people our size. And I think that's probably lot less efficient way than getting one large player or one or



two ecosystems largely to be compliant with this model.

So that would be, I think, my feedback on that on that point.

A number of commentators about GDPR have said both in the run-up to that legislation being passed and taking effect and posting in effect have said that some aspects of it help incumbents because it's -- you know, they've established their audiences and new emerging players have a harder time meeting the burdens of the regulation. And I think there's some truth to that.

So I think as somebody who employs people and, you know, pays taxes in the State of California, I think the innovation economy is driven by startups and investment and growth so I would -- you know, I would identify that as a very real factor in terms of the ability for smaller and emerging and growing businesses within -- within the pool of people who would be potentially subject to this regulation as compared to the larger players who now have these large mass of audience.

And then finally, you know, I think, again, I would just come back to what I hear from customers and consumers, which is that, you know, the real issue is selling and transferring our data, not whether, you



know, in any particular experience there is disclosure.

And so I think, you know, the work that is going into this in the realm of electronic and web and mobile software and applications, you know, is a little bit moot if any direct mail house can also sell the fact that I'm pregnant or someone in my family is and all of that sort of, you know, end user experience can be appended behind the scenes without the disclosure or any other way.

And so I think that, again, I would just, you know, at the risk of repeating myself, sort of urge anyone involved in this as a stakeholder to consider what the consumer really wants here, thank you, is ultimately to not have their data, you know, being transferred around with or without disclosure.

Thank you very much.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. OLSTHORN: My name is Steve Olsthorn and I'm, as many other folks in here, a cyber security assessment specialist. And there is just a couple of minor points -- well, maybe not minor points, but points that I didn't hear yet that I would like to also pass on for consideration. It's around HR data and whether this falls under a key umbrella, if that can be clarified.

We heard about -- we've heard about a better



interpretation around can't discriminate and I think there needs to be a lot more clarity there.

One thing from an assessment perspective, if we can get some guidance clarity on what the auditors will be seeking once an investigation is started or what, you know, the company should be keeping ahead of time, especially with the 12-month lookback.

The other piece too is the suppressing of rights by location may also be an issue, if there could be clarification there. So a Californian living temporarily, let's say, in Florida or Alabama, some quidance on how companies should consider that.

And then finally some guidance on mergers and acquisitions for companies that are doing acquiring, what kind of notice has to be given to the folks that are in that data source that is being acquired.

Thank you.

MS. ROBINSON: This comment might be coming out of left field a little bit, but I have been hearing a lot from participants today that a lot of people are very concerned with the cost of compliance for this new regulation and all of the requirements that are going into effect. And I'm kind of taking this out to the federal level almost where a lot of federal agencies are now granting safe harbors or regulatory sandboxes, so to



speak, for firms hoping to take a more innovative approach to compliance.

Wondering whether the AG's Office might be considering something like that for firms that are hoping to take more innovative approaches, namely artificial intelligence or machine learning, since the cost of compliance could be so great with all of the nuances of the regulation. So just wondering whether or not innovative approaches might be seen as something that is desirable in the field.

THE REPORTER: Can I get your name, please?

MS. ROBINSON: Leah Robinson.

MS. SCHESSER: We're going to keep the forum going a little bit longer because we want to make sure everybody who wants the opportunity to speak provides comments today. So although it seems rather awkward that we're just sitting up here and looking out at the crowd, we're just giving everyone the opportunity to make sure they are absolutely heard. So by all means, step up to the microphone. If you want to leave, that's okay too, but we're just going to hang tight up here.

MR. MYERS: I know nobody has been saying anything for quite a while. I just want to say a couple small items.

My name is Robert Myers -- testing, testing.



1 | Can you hear me now? All right.

Since we haven't had anyone talk for a while, I thought I should just make a couple comments that I kept thinking about over and over again. My name is Robert Myers. I come from the cyber security side.

One of the things that I just really want to ask your team to really keep an eye on is under Category 6. We need to make sure that everyone gets privacy, has the opportunity for privacy, that people know what they're getting into that's simple, easy to understand. A lot of times you have people that don't have the technical understanding, they just click through things. They don't know what they're clicking.

How many people have clicked through a user license? Has anybody read a hundred page user license other than me? We have someone. A couple of them.

It's nice, but the fact of the matter is it gets so complicated and people always look at saying, well, I fulfilled the requirement of the law, but they don't actually fulfill the whole point of the law.

People have the option for privacy and not just if you can afford it. The other -- so I just want to make sure people have privacy, not just those who can afford it.

The other thing is under personal information. Personal information is a broad topic.



Category of personal information, oddly enough as 1 convoluted as the GDPR did, they did a pretty good job. 2 3 They opened it up. But it's like I was having a 4 conversation earlier, it goes back to those IP 5 addresses. If I have an IP address and a time, I can 6 track down who that is. Anyone can. That's how law 7 enforcement does it every day. 8 But as long as you have two pieces, you can 9 take two pieces of data and identify a person or a 10 household very, very rapidly. It's a lot easier than 11 people think. And please consider that when you are 12 looking at your categories of data. Thank you much. 13 MS. SCHESSER: Would anybody else like to 14 speak? 15 (No response.) 16 Okay. Thank you so much for MS. SCHESSER: 17 coming. You can sign up, check the website, submit 18 written comments to privacy regulations at doj.ca.gov. 19 You can also use mail. We have a mailing address as 20 well. Of course, I'm speaking, it's not up on the slide 21 because that's how it rolls. Thank you so much for 22 coming and we hope to hear further feedback from people 23 if they would like to provide comments to us regarding

(Proceedings concluded at 12:19 p.m.)



the regulations. Thank you.

24

25

1	
2	
3	
4	I, ALICIA SANTANA, CSR NO. 12824, A CERTIFIED
5	SHORTHAND REPORTER FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO
6	HEREBY CERTIFY:
7	THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS WAS
8	TAKEN BEFORE ME ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2019, AT THE TIME
9	AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH; AND WAS TAKEN DOWN BY ME IN
10	SHORTHAND, AND THEREAFTER TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPEWRITING
11	UNDER MY DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION.
12	AND I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT
14	TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES SO TAKEN.
15	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NOT A RELATIVE OR
16	EMPLOYEE OF ANY ATTORNEY OF THE PARTIES, NOR FINANCIALLY
17	INTERESTED IN THE ACTION.
18	I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS
19	OF CALIFORNIA THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.
20	DATED THIS 11TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2019.
21	
22	. . .
23	Claraca Escentrana
24	ALICIA SANTANA, CSR NO. 12824
25	



	5:19		accept	17 18:12,
\$	20	6	50:21,25	22 21:11,
	37:11		access	15 26:17
25		6	23:17	27:21
10:18	2000s	6:2 38:17	25:16,23	44:8
11:3	31:13	58:8	27:20	53:11
17:22	2016	60	29:18	acting
	37:8	60	35:3	49:5
	2018	38:21	51:23	action
1	38:18,21	650	accessing	7:7 8:19
		23:4	23:15	24:4
	2019		23.15	24.4
5:16,18	3:1 7:7	7	acclaim	actions
38:17	24		24:15	27:7
L	12:16		account	active
38:21		7	12:18	47:14
	25	5:16 6:4		
2	3:1 31:25	70	accountabil	actively
8:8 34:5,	29	38:14	ity	25:6
18	33:13,18		24:12	activities
2-month			accountable	6:20
56:7		8	12:7	22:17,20
2:19	3		accounting	activity
59:25		85	30:12	8:10
39.23	3	11:24	34:20	0.10
3	5:20 6:14		34.20	actors
21:17	30	A	accounts	52:22
36:8	39:13,25	A	22:12	actual
44:11	200		accurately	27:12
1	300	ability	19:16	32:21
36:8	39:15	19:5		44:24
		25:25	accustomed	51:15
5	4	26:25	23:15	
21:16		29:13	acquired	ad
44:11,12,	4	40:18	56:16	23:21
13	5:22	50:15	acquiring	44:18
798.185	5.22	53:1,13	56:14	45:5 50:6
5:13 38:4		54:17	30.14	52:12
996	5	absence	acquisition	ad-
23:4		10:7	s	supported
4J•4	5	absolutely	56:14	23:19
	5:24 38:4	24:10	act	25:14
2		57:19	3:7 6:16	26:6
		57.13	12:2	Adchoices
		abused	17:13,15,	19:3 38:3
		33:23	= - =	±2.0 00.



	F PROCEEDING DNSUMER PRIVA			January 25, 201 Index: addarro
add	ads	agent	11:22	Apple
32:5	50:13	6:5	Americans	38:19,25
- 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	51:14			39:1,4,
addition	adanaa	aggregate	11:24	17,19,20,
17:20	advance 39:25	20:23	23:15	22 46:19
30:6		agree	amount	52:25
additional	43:13	24:10	10:16	53:4,9,13
5:18 7:1	advantage	agreeing	11:3	annligabili
18:20	21:6	15:8	16:25	applicabili
20:16,20	advertise	13.0	amounts	ty 17:13
additionall	51:18	ahead	10:20	17.13
	31.10	56:6	10.20	application
y 34:15	advertising	airline	analyst	46:15
35:5,10	19:6	50:1	4:6	49:7
33.5,10	23:3,6,17	30.1	analytics	1:
address	24:13	airport	28:13	application
5:4,5	25:20	50:2	20.13	S
6:21,22	26:25	Alabama	Andrew	51:6 53:2
16:19	37:23	56:11	31:8	55:4
17:4,6	48:1	50.11	Angeles	applied
20:4	51:10	alert	3:1 18:2	40:12
21:19		9:17	3.1 10.2	_
24:14	advise	alike	announced	apply
29:19	34:7,15	24:16	12:15,20	47:14
32:8,10,	advocate	24.10		approach
17,19	32:1	all-	anti-	31:2 39:3
38:17		encompassin	privacy	57:2
41:10	affirmative	g	20:17	
59:5,19	44:14	46:2	anticipate	approaches
39.3,19	afford		7:4	57:5,9
addresses	58:22,23	Alliance		approximate
19:9		24:13	anticipated	ly
32:6,14,	AG	allowed	22:1	4:10
20 59:5	14:20	13:4	anyone's	1 10
adds	45:15,16	15:23	40:6	area
30:7	AG's	-11		10:16
30 • 7	14:9 57:3	allowing	apologize	11:4,11
Administrat		25:24	47:6	28:19
ive	age	alternative	app	36:18
6:15,19	21:16,17	25:13,25	46:16,17,	areas
7:3	44:12,15	26:5	19 47:25	5:15 7:18
adont	agencies		48:15,16,	10:15
adopt	6:18	Alyssa	17 49:20	29:15
18:20	56:24	17:10	51:16	79·13
22:25	50.24	America	52:5	arrived
adopted	agency	38:25		47:6
3:18	37:23		appended	222011
		American	55:8	arrow



	F PROCEEDING ONSUMER PRIV			January 25, 201 Index: articlebu
38:9	39:1		beginning	28:23
rticle	40:14,17	В	3:8,13,23	breach
34:5	42:6		12:9	12:21
	43:16,18	back	hahalf	
36:7,8	47:10		behalf	35:17
rtificial		6:11 10:9	3:4 40:6	41:21
57:6	attorneys	12:25	benefit	breaches
	30:16	20:14	18:17	12:8,14
shok	audience	31:13	45:23,25	1 1
37:22	3:11	33:8,23	46:3	break
spect	54:21	40:18		46:6
31:20		45:3	Bertoni	briefly
	audiences	54:23	4:5 9:13	37:24
spects.	54:8	59:4	big	38:18
47:24	auditors	hade and	50:21	
54:7	56:4	back-and-	30.21	bring
ssessment	50.4	forth	bigger	22:16
	authenticat	8:25 9:8,	53:15	33:21
55:20	ion	9		52:17
56:3	20:6,8	background	bill's	
sset		31:11	24:19	broad
22:15	authority	31.11	billionaire	29:10
	18:20	Balber	s	45:21,24
ssociation	34:7	11:19	10:3	58:25
31:18	at.ama.t.ad	16:18	10.3	broader
ttend	automated		bills	
	35:13	bank	24:9	42:16
29:23	automatic	12:17	44:20	brokers
ttended	8:23 9:7	based	• • •	36:12
30:1		7:24	bit	
	availing		29:16	brought
ttention	48:3,15	19:5,25	55:4	25:8 32:4
4:7 52:17	avenue	23:10	56:19	33:16
ttorney	10:25	32:2 35:9	57:14	budget
3:5,24	10.25	36:3	1.1	
4:4,6	avoid	48:24	blog	51:19
	25:22	basis	14:15,17,	bunch
5:15 7:24		28:21	18	53:23
8:18	aware	51:24	blue	
11:16	21:22	51.24	38:9	burden
14:11	37:6 48:9	bathrooms	30.7	53:10
17:11	awareness	5:6	board	burdens
18:14,20	36:25		30:13	54:9
22:18		bear	hodi og	フェ・シ
23:1 25:3	37:15	47:10	bodies	Burner
26:4,18	awkward	Becerra	43:25	46:16
27:5,9,18	57:16	3:6 40:14	brand	•.
37:1,7,23		2.0 40.14	18:3	bury
38:22		begin		15:23
30.22		8:14	Brazilian	





California

January 25, 2019

CALIFORNIA CO	JNSUMER PRIVA	<u> </u>	ex: cianiycompiy	
55:24	33:1,2,9	12:1	17 42:4	8:17
clarify	42:11	20:16	43:19	13:17,21
17:21	43:23	35:11	57:16	14:23
18:15	44:5	39:5 49:7	58:3	16:18,21
24:22	45:12		59:18,23	19:20
24.22	#1-#	collection 11:23	commercial	20:1,2,4,
clarity	closer 8:3	17:8	43:3	5,12,22
17:13	0.3		43.3	24:25
44:1,11	closing	20:20	commerciall	28:5,19
56:2,4	36:6	collectors	У	29:11,21,
class	52:18	36:8	27:8	25 38:25
50:12	cloud	collects	commingled	45:24
53:11	34:16	16:21	49:11,16	46:16
33.11			50:8	47:12
clawing	clouds	combined		48:20,21
10:9	39:20	32:11	committee	56:6
clear	code	commend	31:12,14	-
13:10	5:13 37:9	23:1	communicate	compared
15:5		23.1	19:19	26:13
16:13,23	coercion	comment		54:19
40:9,20	39:2	3:17 4:24	community	compete
44:24	coercive	7:2 9:4	38:15	51:7
45:10	13:20	18:23	39:14	competitors
48:16		19:22	companies	52:4
49:3	cofounded	20:25	8:8,12	52.4
	31:11,17	33:11	10:5,17,	compliance
click	cofounder	41:3 42:7	19 11:2,	10:14,19
50:25	46:15	46:11	8,9,14,24	11:17
51:4	COLLEGE	56:18	12:1,7	21:12
58:12	COHEN	commentator	13:3,25	40:19,25
clicked	46:14	s	14:10	44:5,7,
58:14	Cohn	54:4	15:23	10,16,20
	46:14		16:25	56:21
clicking	Colio	comments	17:2	57:2,7
58:13	9:16	3:21 4:16	18:5,15,	compliant
clicks		5:3,17	25 19:12	11:14
15:13,17,	collect	6:8,24	20:7	40:23
25 33:19	33:2 36:8	7:10	21:6,10	53:8 54:1
 alia=+	38:19	12:13	23:5,14,	
client	40:1	13:2	21 26:13	complicated
33:1	42:13,16	16:11	27:7 33:1	58:18
35:25	49:20	18:13	36:4,12,	complied
clients	collected	22:25	15 39:2	8:19
11:10	12:5 43:7	25:3,8	40:20	
21:2	49:9 53:5	27:15	56:12,14	comply
28:21		32:5		5:24 22:3
31:24	collecting	40:9,14,	company	25:7



January 25, 2019 Index: complying..County

ssman S	32:25 45:20 consulting 11:7 36:24 consumer 3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2 13:16	12:12,17, 23 13:4, 18,22 14:1,2 15:5,7,22 16:8 18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	19:20 24:11 34:3 49:6,10, 14 53:1 controllers 29:9 controls 39:1 conversatio
ssman ied of 17:6 ing ion ation	consulting 11:7 36:24 consumer 3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	18,22 14:1,2 15:5,7,22 16:8 18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	34:3 49:6,10, 14 53:1 controllers 29:9 controls 39:1
ssman ied of 17:6 ing ion ation	11:7 36:24 consumer 3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	14:1,2 15:5,7,22 16:8 18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	49:6,10, 14 53:1 controllers 29:9 controls 39:1
ssman ced cing ing ion	11:7 36:24 consumer 3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	15:5,7,22 16:8 18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	14 53:1 controllers 29:9 controls 39:1
ted of 17:6 ting tion	36:24 consumer 3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	16:8 18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	controllers 29:9 controls 39:1
ced of 17:6 cing 17 cion	3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	18:6,9, 17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	29:9 controls 39:1
17:6 ing ion ation	3:7 4:4 5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	17,18 19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	29:9 controls 39:1
ting 1 7 tion 9 ation	5:22 6:5 8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	19:5,10 21:4 23:12 25:17	controls 39:1
1 7 zion 9 ation	8:16,25 9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	21:4 23:12 25:17	39:1
1 7 zion 9 ation	9:8,17 11:20,21 12:2	23:12 25:17	
7 cion 9 ation	11:20,21 12:2	25:17	conversatio
etion	12:2		
etion			n
etion	12.16	27:3	59:4
ation		38:24	
	14:14,18,		convert
5	20 15:11,	52:7,8	52:10
	14,17	54:24	convince
=	16:16,22,	consumers'	13:18
-	23 17:6	13:24	convoluted
1,13	18:12,22	14:6,12	59:2
3	19:13,23	18:18	39.2
)	20:3,13,		copies
	15,21	contacted	25:8
ience	23:12,18,	20:1	COPPA
)	23 24:18	contacts	21:17,19
erati	25:1	39:15	44:16
	26:8,10,	contained	
3	15,17,24	34:13	core
3	27:1,6,9	34.13	24:14
	28:11	content	cost
ered	29:18	23:14	26:9
4	33:15	25:17,22	56:21
4	38:10,16	28:22	57:7
_	42:15	29:5,11,	
7	45:10	12 30:8	costly 26:20
,12	46:15,17	continue	20.20
centl	47:1,15 48:14	39:11	counter
			24:20
5			countries
7110115		50:24	32:10
uous	22.12	contrast	34:15
_	consumer's	20:12	
C	5:24		country
	14:23		30:21,25
tute	onsumers		31:1 32:7
c ute 8,19	6:1 11:22	11:25 12:4	County
	t ute 8,19	50:23 53:5,11 55:13 consumer's tute 5:24 8,19 14:23 tutes consumers	50:23 continues 53:5,11 50:24 cuous 55:13 contrast consumer's 20:12 tute 5:24 8,19 14:23 control 9:24 tutes consumers 11:25



January 25, 2019 Index: couple..Depot

	JNSUMER PRIVA	<u> </u>		iex: coupieDepo
7:24	curiosity	10:1	50:4,8,15	30:19
couple	24:3	11:5,8,	53:5	37:1,11
13:2 40:3	current	23,25	54:25	42:15
41:11	45:4,20	12:4,7,	55:14,23	defines
43:20		14,17,20	56:16	17:15
55:20	custodian	13:5,19,	59:9,12	17.13
57:23	50:16	23,24	databases	definition
58:3,16	customer	14:3,6,	34:11,14	5:20
30.3710	20:3 50:1	12,13,19,		17:18
court		23 15:20	date	21:23
4:15 5:1	customer's	16:9 17:8	8:9 35:18	22:17
9:2 38:15	19:13,20	18:4	43:13	29:9
46:7	customers	19:21,25	dates	41:19,22
cover	10:22	20:5,20	50:2	45:20,25
6:14	18:8	21:24		46:2
28:10,12	26:11	22:14,15	Dave	definitions
	39:18	23:13,18,	23:2	24:22
cracked	43:2,4	20,25	day	40:11
53:4	46:23	24:6,19,	30:10	45:19
craft	51:7,22	24 26:10	38:20	
10:6	52:3	27:4,20	59:7	degree
	54:23	28:12,14		14:8 47:3
create		29:1,6	days	delete
21:2 28:7	customers'	30:2 31:9	12:25	49:11
33:11	38:19	32:11,12	39:25	
created	cutting	33:3	DDA	delineated
24:13	30:22	34:7,9,	38:1	49:14
38:1		10,15,17,	d]	delinquent
anostoa	cyber 36:23	19,21,24	deals 22:19	22:11
creates 13:12	43:16	35:1,3,5,	22.19	dalimamina
13.12	55:19	8,9,10,	decade	<pre>delivering 23:6</pre>
creating	58:5	11,20	24:15	23.0
30:16	20.2	36:9,11,	decide	demand
38:23		12,14	41:2	47:1
credit	D	37:23		demonstrate
42:19		38:23,24	decision	24:3
	DAA	39:1,18	15:19	
critical	24:13	41:9	decisions	denial
17:7		42:12,16,	35:13,15	13:15
24:23	damages	20,25	·	department
25:22	39:23	43:3,5,7,	deeper	3:5 6:18
cross-	Dan	17 45:21	51:4	17:12,21
-	4:5	46:3	default	39:6
industry	-	48:10,18,	37:20	
industry 24:12				
24:12	data	19,22,24		Depot
	data 7:24 9:21,25		defined 19:18	Depot 9:20



CALIFORNIA CO	DNSUMER PRIVA	Index: de	eputyelectronically	
deputy	difference	disclosures	51:18	33:17
3:24 4:3	14:5	45:14,18,	double	easy
describe	differs	22 50:25	39:24	58:10
19:16	21:16	discriminat	33・44	20.10
		e	downloads	economy
desirable	difficult	e 56:1	46:22	23:11
57:10	28:25		draft	54:14
desired	30:14	discriminat	49:3	ecosystem
25:21	51:7	ion	53:20	23:20
	difficulty	14:25		47:25
desperately	23:16	discussion	drafters	48:1
12:23	27:2	7:22	22:1	50:13
detail		32:23	drawn	51:3,10,
49:19	digital	46:13	44:25	24
detailed	23:6,17	55:17	dreams	
25:2	24:13			ecosystems
34:20	25:23	disparate	13:18	51:5 54:1
34.40	26:2,24	14:5	drive	Ed
details	direct	30:15	31:6	45:5,6
35:18	4:7 45:23	distinct	driven	edge
49:22	49:6 55:5	49:14	51:10	30:22
determine	directly	distinction	54:14	
43:11	14:22	49:2,4		educate
	33:3	50:14,18,	DSL	38:10
determining		23 52:14	32:16	effect
27:2	director		duty	11:13
developed	11:20	distinguish	23:23	54:6
6:1 19:4	31:17	27:10		56:23
51:2	disadvantag	distributed	dynamic	
	e	53:3	32:15	effective
developer	52:3			43:13
49:7,8 50:7 51:5		DNA	E	effectively
50:7 51:5	disclose	41:8		19:19
27.1	14:20	documents	E.U.	efficient
development	16:22	6:17	10:9	53:25
18:23	17:2	DOJ		33.43
24:12	disclosed	3:25	earlier	effort
51:17	35:1,16,	3.45	59:4	28:6
device	19	doj.ca.gov.	early	36:19
20:14	disclosure	59:18	31:13	efforts
	45:15	dollars		27:8 28:2
Devin	49:13	51:19	easier	
4:3	50:10,20		20:7	electronic
dialogue	52:6	domain	59:10	55:3
52:15	55:1,8,15	32:19	easily	electronica
	55.1,0,15	dots	21:3	lly



27:22	engine	event	23:9 30:7	19:1 21:9
email	16:4	49:25	exists	expressed
5:3,4	engineering	51:12	23:19	37:8
20:4	28:6,7	events	28:5	
30:12	•	51:15		expressly
30112	enshrine	52:10	expands	21:18
emerging	24:17	32.10	21:23	extended
54:9,17	ensure	Everybody's	expectation	42:19
employee	10:10	42:3	9:6	-
42:25	14:24	examples		extent
	15:4	12:22	expense	27:23
employees		22:10	23:16	28:2
30:7,8	entering		expenses	extra
43:1	48:18	exception	26:14	25:5,8
employs	entice	5:21		
54:12	13:4	40:25	experience	extreme
		exceptions/	32:3	35:23
enabled	entity	exemptions	55:1,7	extremely
23:10	17:15	45:8	experiences	20:22
enables	episode	43.0	49:21	29:10
23:17	38:21	excessive		25.10
23.11		26:18,19	expert	eye
enactment	equal	exchange	10:14	58:7
24:2	13:12	14:18	47:1,22	
encourage	Equifax	23:19	expertise	F
6:23	9:20	24:25	47:9 48:4	
22:18				
38:4	eroded	excited	experts	face
	23:23	30:21	11:17	26:14
encrypted	essence	executive	47:24	Facebook
35:20	13:21	4:6 11:20	explain	48:24
end		23:2	15:21	49:19
55:7	essentially	23.2	21:21	50:5,6,11
	44:17	exemption		51:8,18,
ends	established	22:5,18	explanation	19 52:8,
6:25	5:21 20:9	40:25	s	11,21,25
enforce	54:8	42:9,11	15:13	11,21,25
53:13,16		43:10	explicit	facet
	Europe	exemptions	15:3,7	42:22
enforcement	24:5	21:10	49:4	facing
8:10 27:7	29:25	ZI•IU		30:5
59:7	31:1 32:8	exercise	explicitly	50.5
engaged	47:13,14	13:14	14:25	fact
22:8	Europe's	exist	expose	13:18
	38:23	45:2	42:1	29:20
engagements	50.45	40.4	47.T	30:18
37:5	European	existing	express	55:5
	32:10		15:17	



ALIFORNIA GC	JNSUMER PRIVA	AUT AUT		dex. lactorGDF
58:17	27:18	fingerprint		14:17
factor	53:8	s	3:19 7:4,	23:19
54:16	56:19	38:19	5,9	48:17
	57:10	39:1 40:1	format	frequency
fairly	figure	41:8	27:24	16:5
49:8	14:13	firm	28:4,7,11	10.3
fall	53:22	23:3 31:9	20.4,7,11	front
7:7 19:17	33.42	42:19	forms	4:21 6:9
36:10	file	42.19	27:6	7:20
45:7	30:11	firms	forum	13:11
43.7	filed	57:1,4	3:7 4:9	16:1
falls	27:22	Fisher		£
55:24	21.22		20:24	frustration
familiar	filing	27:18	57:13	24:4
19:3	25:9	five-plus	forums	fulfill
19.3	27:14	46:18	3:8,14	58:20
family	final	£1	4:18 6:20	£1£!11-3
55:6		flexibility	16:24	fulfilled
fantastical	15:19,24	26:8,23	40:24	58:19
	36:6	Florida		fully
ly	45:10	56:11	forward	18:18
38:3	finally	_	25:2 36:1	. .
FCRA	12:2 22:5	focus	forwarding	future
42:20	26:22	29:16	34:6	3:16
c '1 7	54:22	focused		39:23
feasible	56:13	46:17	found	
27:24			33:25	G
28:1	Finance	focuses	founded	
federal	6:18	31:9	23:4	
5:21 10:7	financial	folks		gained
21:13	6:4 9:21,	10:2	fourth	24:15
30:24	24 13:3,	33:15	3:6	29:17
56:24	17,22	48:2	framework	gaining
	20:7 22:7		23:9	24:7
fee		56:15	42:20	24.7
25:13,16	42:6,16,		43:5 45:4	gate
26:5,16	22 43:2	font	43.3 43.4	53:1
feedback	find	16:6,7	frameworks	gathered
18:11	26:11	force	42:18	29:20
54:2	30:14	38:22	43:6 45:8	
54.2 59:22	51:20,21	38·22 39:2	frankler	gathering
ンフ・ムム			frankly	9:25
felt	fines	53:16	32:1	CDDD
31:20	30:18	forced	53:15	GDPR
EEDDA	fingerprint	14:2,3	fraudulent	28:22
FERPA	39:5,9	E	27:3	29:8
44:2 45:9	41:25	<pre>forgive 13:10</pre>	free	33:24 36:8
				:) € • □



January 25, 2019 Index: general..Henry

42.5			
43:5,8	56:25	guess	hard
alogged	aranular	16:10	47:20
		42:3	handan
15:12		47:18	harder
goal	49:8	48:7	54:9
3:19	granularity	52:19	Harris
goalg	50:4	aud danaa	37:8
_	arest	-	Hawaii
41.1	_		50:1
good			30.1
4:1 7:23			hear
17:25	57.7		3:10,11,
22:24	greatly		15 17:25
28:17	18:9		54:23
31:5	Croa	13	55:22
33:16,19		quidelines	58:1
38:13	40.14	~	59:22
40:23	Grimaldi		h a a a a d
42:3,4	22:24	-	heard
	23:2	24:11	12:14
	a	guvs	16:24
			40:9 41:4
	40:3,5		55:25
-	grounds	20.17	57:19
13:16	35:4		hearing
Google		H	7:11
			56:19
		hand	
	33:13,18		hearings
	group's		7:8 36:20
	52:17		heavily
6:15		50:15	29:16
government		hang	
_	24:16		held
	growing	57.21	19:25
	54:17		28:12
_		35:25	helpful
38:14	-	happened	4:25
Gramm-			20:10
	54:15	27.23	21:5,18
	Gruden	happy	22:2
-		53:6	33:14
		harbor	
∠∠・♡			43:11,24
grant	39:21	Z1·Z,U	helping
25:23	guarantors	harbors	18:15
23.23	quatantors		
granting	43:4	56:25	Henry
	3:19 goals 41:1 good 4:1 7:23 17:25 22:24 28:17 31:5 33:16,19 38:13 40:23 42:3,4 43:15 50:16 52:1 59:2 goods 13:16 Google 15:12 46:19 52:11,25 governed 6:15 government 8:23 24:16 graduate 38:14 Gramm- leach- bliley 21:11 22:6	goal 49:8 3:19 granularity goals 50:4 41:1 great good 52:3,16 4:1 7:23 57:7 17:25 22:24 28:17 18:9 31:5 Greg 33:16,19 46:14 38:13 22:24 43:15 23:2 50:16 Gross 52:1 59:2 40:3,5 goods grounds 13:16 35:4 Google group 15:12 18:3,4 46:19 33:13,18 52:11,25 group's governed 52:17 6:15 groups government 8:23 24:16 growing 54:17 54:17 graduate 38:14 Gramm- 54:15 leach- Gruden 21:11 42:5 22:6 guarantee	Sich Sich



	SINGOINIEIR I INIVI	1017101	macx. 11	crinigionnaasi
10:13,14	hopes	48:23	implementat	12:17
Herrington	47:16	ideal	ion	53:7
43:17	hoping	20:18	12:11	includes
	11:15		implementin	16:15
high	57:1,5	ideally	g	21:12
9:23		7:25	22:3	
48:13	hosting	identifiabl		including
higher	29:11	е	important	6:3,18,24
52:2	house	32:9	13:7	20:7 22:7
highlight	24:8 55:5	48:19	14:24	33:1
25:4	household	identified	15:9 23:1	48:11
23.4	16:16	20:24	25:11	income
Hill	17:6	35:2,7	26:7,22	14:2
31:15	21:21	33.4,7	30:21	increase
HIPAA	59:10	identifier	32:22	24:18
11:5,8	33.10	17:5	36:2	74·T0
21:11	Howard	20:13,14	42:22	increased
	17:25	41:10	49:2	23:24
historic	18:1	identifiers	importantly	increasingl
26:1	HR	5:20 41:5	50:17	y Y
41:22	55:23			4 8:9
historicall		identifies	<pre>imported 16:20</pre>	
У	hundred	5:14	10.20	incumbents
41:21	58:15	identify	imposing	54:7
	hundreds	4:23	30:18	individual
Hobbs	32:17	34:24	impression	20:15
38:13,14	46:23	35:2 48:5	51:14	29:10,22
hold		54:16		35:17
3:12 12:6	hyperlink	59:9	improve	43:4
18:10	19:8		26:11	
27:10		identity	inadvertent	individual'
	I	12:19	ly	S
holding		42:2	35:16	21:23
23:1		illustrated		individuals
hole	iab	23:23	incentive	21:25
15:13	25:2		6:4 13:17	26:10
homo	44:19	imagine	incentives	30:3
home 9:20	iab's	31:6	9:22	44:14
9:20 16:2,5	23:14	impact	13:3,22,	
	igor	24:22	23,25	industries
19:1,8	icon	44:2,20		18:7 22:7
32:16	19:4 38:1	imposts	include	25:6
33:19	IDC	impacts	22:10	industry
hope	38:8	31:22	26:19	20:8 22:8
48:1	idea	impersonate	45:22	26:25
59:22	33:9	12:20	included	33:7



	F PROCEEDING DNSUMER PRIVA			January 25, 20 Index: informkii
38:10	6:20	intent	50:16	job
42:11	initiated	19:19	involved	59:2
44:25		22:4		
49:25	7:5	36:11	25:7	join
	innovation		55:12	10:8
nform	23:11	interact	involves	Joseph
6:1	54:14	18:6 44:9	19:22	42:5
nformal		interacting	20:25	
3:9,14	innovations	10:22		JP
6:25	18:4		involving	9:16
	43:17	interaction	50:13	jurisdictio
nformation	innovative	21:19	IP	ns
5:19,23	57:1,5,9	Interactive	16:19	35:2
6:2,5	37.17	23:3	17:4,5	33.2
8:8,22	inquiry	23.3		Justice
9:6,23,24	34:6	interest	32:6,8, 10 14 16	3:5
10:12,21	insight	10:4 19:5	10,14,16,	17:12,21
11:10	35:4	24:16	18,20	4
12:19	35.4	3	41:10	justificati
15:4,14	insights	interested	59:4,5	on
16:14,15,	36:4	40:6	ipads	16:20
17,19,21		interior	38:20	
17:1,2,7	install	16:3		K
	51:12,13		issue	
19:2,7,13	installing	internation	30:7	
20:16,21	52:9	ally	54:24	Kamala
21:24		17:24	56:9	37:7
22:9,12	institution	internet	issues	Kayak
28:3,9,10	43:2	29:17		49:24
29:17,19,	institution	29.11	25:4 30:4	43.24
20 30:11,		interpret	42:2	keeping
15 32:9,	S	26:19	48:10	4:12 56:6
25 33:2,	9:19,22	!t	items	Kessler
5,10	42:6,16,	interpretat	57:24	
34:13	22	ion		43:15,16
35:14,19	integral	56:1		key
37:4,7,10	23:18	interpreted	J	38:22
39:20		45:21		55:24
41:4,7,	integrate		Jamie	
12,16,19,	38:3	introduce	38:15	Kim
20,23,24	integration	3:22	20.13	3:4,12,24
42:1	38:5	investigati	JANUARY	4:7 6:13
		on	3:1	8:3 9:4,
58:25	intelligenc	56:5	Tonon	12,14
59:1	е	50.5	Japan	46:6,10
nformed	57:6	investment	28:24	le de est
5:11 7:13	intended	54:15	Jessica	kind
		in	40:5	8:15
nitial	18:13,17	involve		14:24
	21:21	22:8		



32:24	largest	leave	Li	49:23
40:7	38:25	17:9	7:23 8:5	litigation
41:11	latest	27:15	9:3,5	8:18
47:16,21	12:20	57:20	liability	17:11
52:11	53:20	1.4	37:19	1/・11
56:15,23	53.20	led	37.19	live
1-33	law	24:5	license	7:9
kinds 32:13	4:4 5:22	left	58:15	living
	6:19 7:3	4:15,22	Lieu	56:10
51:8	8:1,7	56:19	31:16	30.10
kit	10:18	legal	21.10	loan
51:17	11:6,13	35:4 47:9	light	12:17
l 1 3 l-	12:11,22	35.4 47.9	19:11	22:11
knowledgeab	13:9,10,	legislation	21:15	43:3
le	15,17,21	10:8 22:1	44:3	located
47:23	14:25	36:11	Lily	34:18
Kyle	15:2	47:21	-	34.18
43:15	16:13,23	48:2 49:3	7:23 9:3	location
	24:24	53:20	limit	53:5 56:9
	31:8,9	54:5	16:25	1
L	40:8,10		25:25	locations
	58:19,20	legislative	22.21.2	30:15
Lachman	59:6	31:17	limited	lock
31:5,8	37.0	legislature	17:22	38:20
	lawmakers	40:13,15,	20:22	T a a b
language	41:2	19	26:25	Loeb
6:25	laws		40:7	18:2,5
19:1,7	19:11	legitimacy	limiting	logic
24:19	21:13	27:1	16:21	35:14
45:17	21.13	legitimate		-
lapses	lawsuit	27:3	Linda	logo
12:7	53:11		28:18	5:25
12.7	1	length	38:13	18:24
large	lawyer	9:9	Linkedin	19:6,18
9:19	33:23	letter	33:25	33:8
24:23	lead-up	33:24		logon
28:25	24:2	35:25	Lisa	29:24
53:25	laadan		3:24	
54:20	leader	level	list	logs
largalı	46:19	14:5	7:16	29:18
largely	Leah	37:1,2,	12:14	long
54:1	57:12	11,19,21	34:25	23:8 35:9
larger	1.00	47:9		59:8
16:6	learn	48:13	listen	
26:13	36:18	50:4	3:20	longer
53:12	learning	52:14,25	18:11	25:9
54:20	57:6	53:10	literally	27:15
31 20				57:14



RANSCRIPT C ALIFORNIA C	ONSUMER PRIVA	ACY ACT	Index: lo	okbackminimu
lookback	41:4	managing	14:4	43:22
56:7	50:3,11,	28:21	16:17	mention
looked	14	manifestly	17:18	44:8
10:23	mail	26:18	27:11	44.0
10.23	5:4 55:5	20.10	57:19	mentioned
Los	59:19	manner	measure	27:14
3:1 18:2		21:5	51:15	32:25
lose	mailing	Mark	31.13	37:25
39:18	5:5 7:16	10:2	measures	42:21
	59:19		37:16,17	43:21
lost	majorities	market	mechanism	46:4
26:2	11:22	42:23	44:13	mergers
lot		marketing	45:2	56:13
10:19	majors	23:7 25:6		30.13
11:7,8	31:16	28:13	mechanisms	messages
32:25	make	42:17	44:16	39:16
37:5	9:22	51:6,11	45:11	metrics
42:10	12:10	52:4	media	49:10
45:6	15:19	0_ 1	5:8 23:4	
47:20,23	27:8	mass	25:6	mic
53:6,22,	28:2,3	54:20	34:14	8:4 46:12
24 56:2,	31:24	materials		microphone
20,24	33:6	42:17	medical	4:22
58:11	34:16		11:9 41:8	57:20
59:10	36:2 47:8	Matt	medium	
33.10	48:4,8	38:22	26:3	mid
lots	49:2	matter		14:1
47:5	50:22	47:1	medium-size	middle
50:25	52:20	58:17	26:9	39:8
love			meet	
23:15	57:14,19 58:3,8,22	matters	29:1,14	million
44:1	30.3,0,22	43:24	30:19	10:18
	makes	Mauney		11:3
low	28:24	4:3	meeting	12:16
14:2	46:16	•	54:9	17:22
luck	making	Maxine	meets	31:25
42:4	29:5,12	10:13	17:16	millions
10 1	32:21	meaning	41:1	10:1
	33:16	28:1		38:19
M	35:10	51:12	Melanie	39:18
	33.14,14		18:1	46:22
machine	manage	meaningful	member	
57:6	15:11	10:7,10	4:11	mind
	29:1	23:13	23:14	5:16 7:18
made	managomont	50:22		10:5 29:3
10:2	management 30:8	means	members	minimum
34:21	30.8	13:25	3:17 24:7	37:1,2,6,



CALIFORNIA CO	DNSUMER PRIVA	ACY ACT	Index: minoroperationa	
11,13,17,	moot	45:23	56:15	occurred
20	55:5	52:8	notices	35:18
minor	morning	needed	6:2 21:3	oddly
55:21	4:1 7:23	12:23		59:1
	17:25	26:23	notified	
minutes	22:24	39:10,14	9:18	offer
4:11	28:17	48:6	November	13:4,21
38:21	38:13	49:18	38:18,21	14:17
46:8	43:15	49.10		23:14
mirror	43.13	negative	nuances	42:19
30:25	mortgage	19:15	47:24	offering
	12:17	negligence	48:12	4:24
mission	move	37:18	57:8	1.71
24:21	31:1	37.10	number	offers
mobile	31.1	Netherlands	5:18 20:5	6:4
46:15	moves	32:9	22:7	office
47:25	29:5	networks	40:22	4:6 6:19
49:19,20	moving	52:12	42:25	7:3 14:9
51:10	41:3	53:3	43:6	11 18:2
53:1 55:3	41.3	53.3	52:22	43:18
53.1 55.3	multiple	NGRC		
model	15:24	10:14	54:4	57:3
25:14	29:21	NIA	numbers	oligarchs
26:1,6	Vivona	45:2	5:16	10:5
50:7 54:1	Myers	45.2	12:18	01 mth
	57:22,25	nice	46:21	Olsthorn
models	58:5	58:17		55:18
13:8		nightmare		ongoing
modern	N		0	22:10
23:11		33:24		
		40:20	oag.ca.gov/	online
moment	narrow	nondiscrimi	privacy/	11:24
46:7	46:1	nation	ccpa.	17:8
momentum	nation	13:5	7:15	20:23
24:3	12:4	25:12,15		21:15
			obligation	23:19,21,
monetary	nationally	note	44:14	25 24:19,
45:23	17:23	21:9,13	obligations	25 25:21
money	nature	41:18	30:19	41:10
39:19	20:6	notes		open
	44:13	29:4	obtained	18:11
month		39:16	42:20	
34:5	Naulls	52:18	obvious	opened
39:19	36:22		15:5	59:3
51:19	necessarily	notice		operates
months	11:9 38:5	7:6 21:1,		49:20
	43:7	7 33:8	8:10 9:10	
8:9 34:18	43.7	39:25	15:1	operational



optimizing 23:6 opting 15:22 44:10 option	outlined 21:7 outs 44:22	42:12 participant s	11:10 pay 39:18,19,
opting 15:22 44:10	outs 44:22	s	
15:22 44:10	44:22	s	
15:22 44:10	44:22		ンプ・エロ・エグ・
44:10		56:20	23,24
			47:2 52:9
option	outset	participate	
	20:22	51:24	paying
16:8	overlap	participati	46:23
39:10	44:7	ng	51:12,13
58:21		51:5	pays
options			54:13
	44:4,23		
	overwhelmin		peeling
_	g	40:4	22:14
13:16	11:21	parties	people
oral	-	10:11	4:14
			31:21
	38:24		32:18
	owner		36:15
7:24	31:8		39:15
order		•	40:24
13:3,4			46:24
14:3 33:5	39:1	18:1	51:20,21
46:22		partners	53:6,8,23
51:15	P	26:12	54:12,18
52:1			56:20
			58:9,11,
	-		14,18,21,
	39.43		23 59:11,
	pages		22
	15:24		
	16:3	49:5,9	people's
37:19	35:22	pass	49:11
organizatio	paid	55:22	percent
ns	_	200000	11:24
28:25	23.21		
37:15	paper	24.0	percentage
	49:17,21	passed	51:9
	Paramount	8:11 54:5	performance
50.2		nagt	51:11,24
Orrick	31 11		
43:17	part		performance
ostensibly			-based
		path	51:11
	22:19,21	11:15	period
outline	23:10	patients	3:9,14,19
20:19	33:6 34:1	F	6:25 50:9
	58:21 options	58:21 overlapping options 44:4,23 copts 0verwhelmin f 11:21 oral owned 6:24 7:10 owned 38:24 owner 7:24 31:8 order owns 13:3,4 39:1 46:22 pm. 52:1 pm. organizatio p.m. 15:24 16:3 37:19 35:22 organizatio paid 15:24 16:3 37:19 25:24 paper 49:17,21 paper 49:17,21 originating 50:2 Orrick part 43:17 part ostensibly 6:20 11:5 47:14 22:19,21 outline 23:10	58:21 44:7 ng options overlapping 51:5 23:13 overwhelmin on opts 13:16 11:21 parties oral 10:11 27:10 38:24 34:23,25 orange owner 35:1,3,7 31:8 50:17,19 order owns partner 13:3,4 39:1 18:1 46:22 partners 26:12 51:15 p 26:12 partners 26:12 partners 11:1 partners 26:12 party party 11:1 organizatio p.m. 11:1 n 59:25 19:14 28:2,13 pages 25:20 29:6 15:24 29:7 30:13 16:3 49:5,9 37:19 35:22 pass organizatio paid 55:22 ns 25:24 passage 28:25 37:15 paper 49:17,21 passed orrick 43:17



ALII OINIIA CO	ONSUMER PRIVA	ACT ACT	IIIU	ex: permitpriva
permit	31:14	54:3	powerful	president
26:4	piece	58:20	9:22	23:3
person	12:19	points	Powerpoint	pretty
27:12	16:10,12	4:9 7:17	4:8,20	59:2
29:24	56:8	9:1 20:5		
40:6 59:9		30:2	practice	prevent
	pieces	33:16	18:3	12:5
personal	41:11	55:21	49:25	25:12,15
5:19,23	42:1	55.21	practices	previously
9:20,23,	59:8,9	policies	20:10	21:17
24 10:21	PII	21:3	22:3	21.1
15:4		30:17	22.3	price
16:14	41:20,22	34:22	pragmatic	13:13
17:1,7	place		24:21	14:5,14
20:16	7:8 18:25	policy		
21:24	19:6 20:9	31:22	preceding	primary
22:9,12,	28:24	33:17	4:18	16:7
	30:17	45:16	precisely	principles
14 29:18		49:13	24:14	24:11
32:11,12	35:6	_	24.14	24.11
34:9,24	37:3,15,		preference	prior
35:3,10,	17,21	54:18	15:18	8:9
11 37:3,7	places	pop-up	_	
41:4,19,	30:10	50:21	preferences	priority
20,24	30.10	30.21	15:12	9:23
48:19	play	portability	pregnancy	privacy
58:24,25	46:19	27:20,21	48:15	3:7,25
59:1	48:13		52:9	4:2 7:24
33.1	_	portable	32.9	
personally	player	27:23	pregnant	10:9
47:22	53:25	28:11	48:25	12:2,3
	players	portfolio	55:6	13:14
perspective	53:12	22:11		14:3
28:7		22.11	preliminary	15:12
40:19	54:9,20	possibly	6:20	18:3,8,
56:3	playing	20:23	prepared	12,18,22
phone	53:8		40:5	19:9,18
20:5		posted	40.5	21:3,15
	point	4:19	present	23:9,12
32:16	8:12,15,	posting	5:9 44:19	24:21
39:6,10,	21 14:21	54:6		
15,24	15:14	34.0	presentatio	27:18
52:18	22:2	potential	n	31:10,12,
_	34:12	51:7	4:8	13 33:17
nhoned	36:6	make 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	procented	34:22
phones		potentially	presented	36:23
38:20			01.1	
	38:12	50:8	21:4	37:23
38:20 phonetic	38:12 46:20			37:23 43:16
38:20	38:12	50:8	21:4 preserves 24:24	



	ALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT			index: privacy-centricquestions	
47:4,16	processing	protected	17:17	27:10	
48:10	29:12	24:1	20:4,19		
49:13	34:19		27:23	purposes	
52:2		protecting	28:10,11	18:21	
58:8,9,	processor	23:12		pursue	
21,23	29:10	47:4	providers	26:1	
59:18	processors	protection	25:20		
	29:9	9:20 11:4	29:7	push	
privacy-		12:3 18:3	44:18,21,	40:17	
centric	product	21:15	24 45:5,6	put	
24:8	51:21	24:6,21	providing	11:13	
privacy-	products	34:7	5:17 25:2	16:12	
related	26:11	38:23	42:7	34:2 35:6	
47:1	42:23		45:17	36:20	
47.1	47:2	protections	43.17	37:15	
problem		12:11,24	provision	41:6,11	
51:1	professiona	47:16	27:21	49:9,15	
52:24	1	protective	provisions	40.0,10	
53:7	37:9	12:12	25:12	puts	
problems	profile	12.12	23.12	27:3	
40:10	20:6	Protiviti	proviso	29:18	
	20.0	36:23	25:15	putting	
46:12	programatic	2222	public	36:1,20	
Procedures	52:12	prove	_	30.1,20	
6:15	prohibitive	14:20	3:6,17		
7.	26:9	provide	4:24 6:9,	Q	
proceedings	20.9	4:25 6:3,	19,23	~	
59:25	prohibits	23 8:8	7:1,8,11	1:6:-3	
process	14:25	14:1	9:25	qualified	
3:8,9 4:9	promulgatin	17:13	10:4,9	53:20	
5:11	-	18:16	14:9	quality	
6:14,16	g 0.4 - 0.2	19:4	24:16	19:25	
7:4,5,9,	24:23	21:2,9	31:19		
14 8:23	proof	25:21	36:9	quantity	
9:7,9	39:7	26:7,23	40:16,24	19:25	
11:12		29:1 33:5	44:10	quarterly	
12:10,13	proper	34:9,18,	46:21	14:10	
19:23	37:15	20,23,25	nublice.		
	proposal		public's	question	
20:19	20:25	35:4,13	6:21	8:2 17:5	
34:9,17		44:14	published	27:19	
36:14	propose	45:14	7:3	38:18	
	21:20	46:11	nublich	40:22	
37:3,10		48:21	publishers	42:8 44:6	
42:13	proposed	40 -0			
	<pre>proposed 6:16.24</pre>	49:18	23:21	anestions	
42:13 48:3	6:16,24	51:22	25:12,16,	questions	
42:13				questions 3:20 7:25 8:6 42:10	



quickly	realtor	46:8	20:18	x: quicklyreque relation
36:19	45:4		21:8,20	35:6,8
30.19	13.1	record	24:6 34:2	43:20
quiet	realtor.	7:22	36:7	44:10
9:15	com's	30:13	38:23	44.10
quote	31:12	46:13	42:12,21	relations
13:10	reasonable	55:17	43:12,14	45:4
13.10	14:8	recordkeepi	47:12	relationshi
	25:13,16	ng	54:10,19	p
R	26:5,16	8:13,14	56:22	20:3
	27:8		57:8	42:15
rabbit	41:15,23	records	5/.8	42.13
15:13	41.15,25	8:17	regulations	relative
	receive	12:16	3:17	26:20
raise	14:12	recreating	6:16,22	release
5:9	50:19	38:6	7:2 8:11	24:8
ranging	received		13:1	24.0
9:19	7:10	recurring	16:11	rely
	35:25	44:6	18:14,21	25:19
rapidly	33.43	reduction	21:1,13,	26:10
59:10	receiving	10:16	18 28:23	remarks
rate	14:23	10.10	29:2	47:7
13:6	42:10	refer	30:17,24	4/•/
21:16	magamb	41:21	32:21,24	repeat
21.10	recent 9:18	reference	33:14	9:4
reach		21:14,21,	36:1 42:8	repeating
21:24	12:15	22 49:18	44:1,4,8	55:11
read	recently	22 49.10	59:18,24	22.11
34:1	49:17	reflect	39.10,24	repetitive
58:15	53:4	32:21	regulatory	47:8
50.15	5	36:5	6:25 7:6	manler
readily	Recess	-	23:9	reply
27:24	46:9	refrain 27:7	42:18	34:5
28:3	recognize	21:1	43:25	reporter
reading	27:5	refuse	53:10	4:15 5:1
22:16		26:16	56:25	46:7
22.10	recognized	rogord	reiterate	57:11
real	21:17	regard 20:11	37:24	Penorts
47:23	recognizes	∠ ∪•⊥⊥	3/•44	Reports 9:17
50:10,14	26:15	regular	relate	タ・⊥ /
54:16,24		28:21	20:14	represent
realities	recommend	regulate	related	18:5 23:4
	40:16	53:23	6:4 11:1	*********
36:5	recommendat			request
reality	ions	regulated	13:24	5:22,24
36:3	48:8	46:25	14:22	6:5 8:16
		~~~~~	relates	26:17
realm	reconvene	regulation 19:24	18:23	33:25
47:3 55:3				



ALIFORNIA CO	ONSUMER PRIVA	ACY ACT	Index: requestedscop		
45:10	4:13	revving	4:21 6:10	32:25	
requested	respecting	47:20	7:20	45:21	
4:23	18:7	right-hand	rule	sandboxes	
requests	magnand	38:9	8:20	56:25	
6:7 19:23	respond 3:20	mi ahta	rulemaking	SAP	
	48:22	rights 10:9	3:19 5:14	30:12	
26:8,15,	40.22	13:14	6:14 7:4,	30.12	
17,19,24 27:1,2,4,	response	18:8,18	6,9	sat	
6,22	59:15	19:9	0,9	31:13	
0,22	responsibil	24:18	rules	Saviss	
require	ities	33:17	7:2 10:6	17:10	
8:8,23	24:24	56:9	13:6	17:10	
14:9		50.9	run	SB-1	
20:20	responsibil	rigorously	24:20	42:9,14	
41:15	ity	53:14	48:20	43:6,8	
required	5:14	risk	40.20	scale	
4:23 6:3	44:23	27:4	run-up	46:23	
16:22	responsible	53:11	54:5	53:13	
33:4 34:5	23:5,20	55:11	running	00 10	
39:23	44:22		18:19	scary	
39.23	11 22	Riverside	10 10	49:12	
requirement	rest	31:7		scenarios	
44:12	46:7	Robert	S	26:24	
45:16	restriction	57:25			
58:19	11:6	58:5	S-C-H-E-M-S	scenes	
requirement			38:22	55:8	
3	<b>result</b> 24:19	Robinson	<b>.</b>	schedules	
8:13,14		56:18	safe	18:10	
29:2,14	26:2	57:12	21:2,6	Schems	
44:21	retention	role	56:25	38:22	
56:22	35:9	23:21	safeguardin	39:2	
	revenue	11	g	39.2	
requiring	10:17,20	rolls 59:21	23:20	Schesser	
25:22	14:12,22	59.21	safeguards	4:1,2	
reserved	17:22,23	Ron	35:6	6:11	
4:21	25:20	36:22		57:13	
rogot	46:20	room	sale	59:13,16	
<b>reset</b> 39:17,20	10-20	5:7 9:8	5:23	schools	
39.17,20	reverse	36:15	10:11	45:7	
resource	13:2		12:5		
53:22	14:16	root	13:19,22	science	
respect	review	24:5	14:12,19	31:16	
18:18	7:5 12:5	rotate	15:20	scope	
32:6 36:7		32:20	16:9	10:17	
J_ J J J J	reviewed		22:11,15,	11:2 28:	
respectful	6:17	row	17,19	11.7 70.	



## January 25, 2019 Index: screen..social CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT

42:9,16	sell	33:5 51:1	44:3	situation
43:1,10	8:22 9:6	services	shortage	14:1
screen	13:5 14:2	13:16	31:21	15:10
44:15	15:4	18:16,17		33:23
44.13	19:1,7	20:8 22:7	show	34:2
SDK	33:2,9	23:14	8:19	35:24
49:19	36:12	26:11	14:13	situations
50:5,11	55:5	34:16	29:23	19:15
51:8,17,	seller	39:24	30:1	22:12
23		39.24 42:24	showing	22.12
search	15:20		51:14	size
	selling	48:21	51.14	26:20
16:4	9:25 17:3	sessions	side	53:17,18,
49:23	19:13,15,	18:11	38:9 49:1	24
50:1,3	17 23:5	23:2	58:5	-
seconds	54:25		a. J	sleep
39:13		set	sign	48:15
	seminar	11:18	7:15	slide
section	47:19	14:1 20:9	59:17	5:10
4:4 5:13	Senate	48:7	significant	6:12,14
38:4	24:8	50:2,18	26:14	7:17
41:21		setting	51:9	59:20
security	sending	29:14	a ! 3 !	
9:23	49:25	30:17	Silicon	slides
12:7,18	senior		10:5	4:20
18:4	39:9	share	28:19	slowly
36:23		30:11	similar	4:17
37:1,2,6,	sensitive	32:17	19:6	
11,13,16,	41:7,24	33:4	44:16	small
17,21	48:19	42:13	45:1,5	24:23
41:16,23	sentiment	shared	47:6 51:8	25:19
55:19	24:5	34:24		26:8 34:1
58:5	24.3	34.24 35:1 49:5	simple	36:12
50.5	separate	35.1 49.5	10:10	57:24
seek	41:5	Sharepoint	50:20	Small-
28:8	serve	30:12	58:10	26:9
	31:24	alb a i	simply	20.9
seeking	J	sharing	20:20	smaller
16:25	servers	13:19,23	∠∪•∠∪	10:20
56:5	34:17	14:19	single	26:13
seeks	service	15:20	52:21	54:17
24:17	13:13	19:14,17,	sites	amarch
		20 46:2	25:23	smart
seemingly	14:4,5	Sharp		24:21
	22:10	28:17,18	30:12	social
41:19	05.01			
	25:21		sitting	12:18
41:19	25:21 28:14 31:20	<b>Shine</b> 19:11	sitting 30:11	12:18 41:25



## January 25, 2019 Index: software..subsequent CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT

	JINGUIVILIX FIXIVA	101 A01	illuex. SoltwareSubsequeri		
software	47:19	stakeholder	12:18	strive	
28:18	57:1,15	55:12	states	21:2	
51:6,17	59:14	stakeholder	10:18	strong	
55:4	speaker	scarenorder	21:13	12:24	
sold	4:10	48:2		38:15	
48:11		40.2	static	30.13	
	speakers	stakes	32:14	strongest	
solution	4:13,21	53:12	status	12:3	
45:1	6:9 37:25	stand	52:10	strongly	
solve	46:10	9:14		6:23	
52:24	speaking		statute		
	7:21	standard	21:23	struggle	
solved	59:20	45:22	22:4,16	28:20	
51:2,3		49:25	stay	stuck	
53:9	specialist 55:20	52:2	5:11 7:13	15:10	
solves	55.40	standards	step	stuff	
51:1	specialists	37:6,13	57:20	28:14	
sophisticat	11:17	standpoint			
ion	specific	29:13	Steve	subject	
47:10	5:14		55:18	41:23	
	10:15	start	stick	43:8	
SOPIPA	13:1 19:9	3:22 8:13	52:5	46:25	
44:2	20:15	16:5	53:16	47:12,13	
sort	21:15	started	aton	54:19	
46:22,24	30:3	56:5	<b>stop</b> 17:3	subjects	
47:9 48:3	34:20	starting	17.3	33:3	
49:6,12	49:21	7:4 13:2	store	submit	
50:20		7.4 13.2	29:6	5:22 6:5	
52:15	specificall	startups	30:11	14:11	
53:17	<b>y</b> 17:14	31:25	34:14,17	25:7	
55:7,11	21:14	54:14	37:3,10	59:17	
source	45:3,5	state	39:19		
17:23		5:21 6:17	46:19,20	submits	
35:11,12,	spend	54:13	stored	8:16	
18 56:16	51:10	abobo b	34:16	submitting	
	spirit	state-by-	35:9	25:9	
sources	24:10	state		marks mars 4 lb s	
33:3 36:9		31:2	strategies	subscribe	
space	squarely	stated	35:20	51:21	
47:6	36:10	30:24	stressed	subscriber	
52:16	Stacey	38:24	37:14	52:10	
speak	4:1	39:2	stresses	subscriptio	
4:11,14,	staff	statement	37:8	n	
4·11,14, 16 7:19	4:12	30:20		14:16,18	
8:3 27:14	31:18		strict		
0.3 71.14	21.10	statements	22:16	subsequent	



	F0.10	22.21	
	58:12		time
T	technically		4:12 6:8
	27:24		9:9 18:9
table		58:24	31:3
	2011	things	35:16,18
3.43	technologie		36:17
Takatsuki	s		39:13
27:17	28:18		48:22
	36:3		50:3 54:9
			56:7 59:5
			30 / 37 3
39:3		47:2	times
taking	29:13	48:7,12	58:11
	30:4,18	50:13,24	L - 3
	31:9,22	51:9	today
	32:22	53:9,14	3:19 5:17
56:23		·	7:20
talk			15:10
	31:16	thinking	18:13
	template	41:14	22:25
50.2	<del>-</del>	58:4	25:3,10
talking			26:22
17:7	45:17		27:14,18
	temporarily	40:3 58:3	30:24
		thousands	31:4,23
29:8			32:2
targeted	ten		
	9:19		33:21
10 11 723	teng	46:23	36:5 42:8
targeting		threshold	56:20
50:7	12.10	17:21	57:16
<b>+</b>	terms		today's
	43:25		4:9
54:13	50:25		4.9
team		53:18,19	ton
		+hmor.	4:12
	testing		
	57:25	49.24	top
23:21	tout	thrown	37:11
31:18		52:11	38:9
38:25	39:16		topic
39:2,6	theft		
		50:1	58:25
45:5,6		tied	track
	thew		30:2 59:6
	29:9	16:16	
technical			
<b>technical</b> 47:22,24		42:15	tracked
	thief		29:19
47:22,24		42:15 <b>tight</b> 57:21	
	table     3:23  Takatsuki     27:17  take-it-or-leave-it     39:3  taking     43:5,19     54:6     56:23  talk     29:15     58:2  talking     17:7  talks     29:8  targeted     48:11,23  targeting     50:7  taxes     54:13  team     58:7  tech     23:21     31:18     38:25     39:2,6     44:18	table 28:1 3:23 technologie Takatsuki 27:17 28:18 36:3  take-it-or-leave-it technology 39:3 23:5 28:4  29:13 30:4,18 31:9,22 32:22  talk 31:16 29:15 58:2 template 21:1,7 45:17  talks 29:8  targeted 48:11,23  targeting 50:7 tems 43:25 54:13 50:25 team 54:16 58:7 testing tech 57:25 23:21 31:18 38:25 39:2,6 44:18 42:2	T         technically         41:18           27:24         56:3           3:23         technologie         things           Takatsuki         s         28:18         28:20           27:17         28:18         29:3 32:4           take-it-or-leave-it         technology         43:21,22           39:3         23:5 28:4         47:2           taking         29:13         48:7,12           43:5,19         30:4,18         50:13,24           54:6         32:22         53:9,14           56:23         32:22         53:9,14           talk         29:15         31:16         thinking           58:2         template         41:14           58:2         template         41:14           58:2         temporarily         40:3 58:3           talks         29:8         56:11         thousands           targeted         9:19         32:18           48:11,23         tens         12:16           taxes         43:25         17:17           team         54:16         53:18,19           58:7         testing         throw           text         57:25         49:24



## January 25, 2019 Index: traction..wanted

	JNSUMEN FIXIVA			K. tractionwante
52:9	8:9 23:23	48:23	unreasonabl	19:22,24
traction	truth	understand	У	20:19
24:7	54:10	18:19	26:20	verify
trade	turned	48:10	updated	6:6 20:21
29:23	24:4	58:10	5:20	26:23
30:1	21.1	understandi	upgrade	27:1,8
	turns	ng	39:8	45:13
traded	7:21	29:5		verifying
48:11	type	48:12,16,	urge	20:15
transcribin	5:25 6:2	18 58:12	10:4	27:6
g	8:17 19:6		12:10	_, ,
4:16	41:22	understood	15:7	versus
		21:3	17:12,20	29:9 30:1
transcripts	types	31:21	55:11	Viacom's
4:17	16:13	underway	URL	31:13
transfer	19:16 22:16,20	47:21	29:19	vice
22:9,19,	41:7,16		usable	23:2
21 35:8	41.7,10	uneven	27:24	23.2
transferred	typical	53:7	28:3	view
22:13	16:7	unfounded	38:11	46:20
55:15	typically	26:18	30.11	47:11
	20:17	uniform	usage	53:15
transferrin	51:16	5:25 8:22	28:14	visitors
g	31.10	9:5 15:2	34:21	25:24
10:21			user	
35:5	U	unintended	49:9	vividly
54:25		24:20	50:15	23:22
transparenc	UCLA	unique	55:7	voice
y	9:19	5:20 13:9	58:14,15	34:14
17:17	38:14	17:4		voices
23:8,24	]	20:13	usurious	
24:11	ultimately	41:4	13:20	26:2
transparent	41:2 44:24	unit		volunteer
10:11	55:14	3:25 4:2	v	38:15
21:4	55.14	43:17		39:14,15
21.4	umbrella	43.17	Valley	
travel	55:24	universe	10:5	W
49:22	unauthorize	48:24	28:19	W
tremendous	d	52:13		_
23:10	27:4	unjust	valuable	wanted
30:18		13:20	41:5,17	3:22
	unclear		vendors	29:15
triangulate	8:16	unreasonabl	11:1	32:5
29:24	uncomfortab	<b>e</b>		36:24
trust	le	13:20	verificatio	52:16
LIUSL			n	



warning

31:15

warning	31.15	5.12
39:4	36:4	
	44:18	
watchdog	45:6	X
11:20		·
33:15	47:20	•
38:16	48:1	Xavier
30.10	53:23	3:6
ways	55:2	
18:14		
21:25	worked	Y
	31:12,14,	
41:14	15,22	
42:25	47:17	year
web	47.1	8:13,14
	working	14:11
7:12 55:3	25:7	31:25
webcasted	28:21	
7:9		years
1.9	44:5	9:18 19:4
website	works	38:2,14
4:19,20	32:22	46:18
5:11 7:13		40.10
	47:25	yesterday
14:4	world	31:7
16:3,5,7	32:7	
29:17		Yuli
59:17	50:23	27:17
22 - 1		
	WP	
websites	WP 22.12 10	
	<b>WP</b> 33:13,18	z
websites 25:22		z
websites 25:22 Wednesday	33:13,18 wrap	
websites 25:22	33:13,18	Z
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25	33:13,18 wrap	
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25 wheel	33:13,18 wrap 39:12	<b>ZL</b> 28:18
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25	33:13,18 wrap 39:12 write 13:7	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25 wheel 38:6	33:13,18 wrap 39:12 write	<b>ZL</b> 28:18
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25 wheel 38:6 widely	33:13,18 wrap 39:12 write 13:7	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22 Wednesday 12:15,25 wheel 38:6	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22 Wednesday     12:15,25 wheel     38:6 widely     38:2</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22  Wednesday 12:15,25  wheel 38:6  widely 38:2  widespread	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22 Wednesday     12:15,25 wheel     38:6 widely     38:2</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22  Wednesday 12:15,25  wheel 38:6  widely 38:2  widespread	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22  Wednesday 12:15,25  wheel 38:6  widely 38:2  widespread 24:15	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
websites 25:22  Wednesday 12:15,25  wheel 38:6  widely 38:2  widespread 24:15  willful 37:18  wondering	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8  word</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote 33:23	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote 33:23  www.oag.ca.	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8  word     19:14</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote 33:23  www.oag.ca. gov/	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8  word     19:14  work</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote 33:23  www.oag.ca.	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg
<pre>websites     25:22  Wednesday     12:15,25  wheel     38:6  widely     38:2  widespread     24:15  willful     37:18  wondering     57:3,8  word     19:14</pre>	33:13,18  wrap 39:12  write 13:7  written 5:3 6:24 7:10 19:24 20:10 25:3 40:11 59:18  wrote 33:23  www.oag.ca. gov/	ZL 28:18 Zuckerberg

