1	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	MEETING OF THE
4	CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY
5	
6	PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING
7	
8	FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2025
9	
10	Pages 1 - 110
11	
12	California Public Utilities Commission Board Room
13	505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, California 95811
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Transcribed by: iDepo Reporters 898 North Pacific Coast Highway
24	Suite 475 El Segundo, California 90245
25	(323) 393-3768



1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	Jennifer M. Urban, CPPA Chairperson
4	Alastair Mactaggart, CPPA Board Member
5	Drew Liebert, CPPA Board Member
6	Brandie Nonnecke, PhD, CPPA Board Member
7	Jeffrey Worthe, CPPA Board Member
8	Philip Laird, General Counsel, CPPA
9	Liz Allen, Attorney, CPPA
LO	Serena Marzion, CPPA Moderator
L1	Lydia de la Torre
L2	Tim Burnell
L3	Zane Witherspoon
L4	Tasia Kieffer
L5	Public Speaker Mates
L6	Public Speaker Eric
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1	FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2025
2	9:15 a.m.
3	-000-
4	
5	CHAIR URBAN: Good morning. Welcome back
6	from recess and to the continuance of this meeting of
7	the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. It
8	is March 7 at 9:15 a.m.
9	I am Jennifer Urban. I'm the chairperson
10	of the Board, and I'm pleased to be here in person
11	with the Board and the members of the public, and to
12	welcome many of you via Zoom.
13	Before we get started with the meeting, I
14	have some logistical announcements.
15	First, I'd like to ask everyone to please
16	check your microphone is muted when you are not
17	speaking.
18	Second, I'd like to ask everyone who is
19	here in person to turn off or silence their cell
20	phone to avoid interruption.
21	Third, please be aware that this meeting
22	is being recorded. Our temporary ability to meet
23	remotely and still comply with Bagley-Keene expired,
24	so this meeting is in a hybrid format.
25	My fellow Board members and members of the



2.2

2.4

CPPA staff are here in person, and I know most members of the public are joining us remotely. The hybrid format does require -- create technical complexities. So if we have any technical kinks during the meeting, we will pause the meeting and address the issue.

Today's meeting is physically being held in the -- at the California Public Utilities

Commission in San Francisco. We appreciate the CPUC team for their hospitality and not only allowing us to use their boardroom, but providing AV assistance here in the auditorium today.

Let me say a little bit about logistics and meeting participation. Today's meeting will be run according to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, which is required by law. We will proceed through the agenda, which is available as a handout here in San Francisco and also on the CPPA website. Meeting materials are available both as handouts here and online.

You may notice Board members accessing laptops and phones and other devices during the meeting. They are using the devices solely to access Board meeting materials.

After each agenda item, there will be an

2.

2.2

opportunity for questions and discussion by Board members.

I will also ask for public comment on agenda items. Each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item.

We also have a designated item for general public comment. That is agenda item No. 4 today.

And I'll say a little bit about the timing in a moment.

If anyone hasn't joined us for a while, we have been scheduling the general public comment at the top of the meeting or near the top of the meeting to aid in stakeholders planning. It can be difficult to predict when to -- public comments on specific agenda items will occur, and so by placing the public agenda -- the general public comment near the top of the meeting, our hope is that members of the public who are unable to participate in the entire meeting will have a more predictable opportunity to share their comments.

If you are attending via Zoom and you wish to speak on an item, please wait until I call for public comment on an item and allow staff to prepare for Zoom public comment. It takes a second to set it up. Then please use the raise-your-hand function,

2.2

which is in the reaction feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen. If you wish to speak on an item and you are joined by phone, please press Star 9 on your phone to show the moderator that you are raising your hand.

Our moderator will call your name when it is your turn and request that you unmute yourself for comment at that time.

Those using the Webinar can use the unmute feature, and those dialing in by phone press Star 6 to unmute. When your comment is completed, the moderator will mute you.

Please also know that the Board will not be able to see you if you're joining this remotely, only hear your voice. So it is helpful if you identify yourself, but this is entirely voluntary. And you can input a pseudonym when you log into the meeting as well.

If you are attending in person and wish to speak on an item, please wait for me to call for public comment and then move towards the podium and form a line, and you will be called in your turn.

As with Zoom attendees, it's always helpful if you identify yourself, but, again, it is entirely voluntary and you're free to use a pseudonym or no



name.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

Please speak into the microphone so that everyone participating remotely can hear you, and more importantly, so that your remarks can be recorded in the meeting record.

As I mentioned, the hybrid meeting format is somewhat complex.

So first, I'd like to thank Mr. Robert Stanford and his team for managing the technical aspects of that meeting today.

And second, I would like to explain what to do if those of you attending remotely experience an issue with the remote meeting.

For example, the audio drops. If that -something happens, please email info@cppa.ca.gov.

That is India, November, Foxtrot, Oscar at CPPA dot,

CA dot gov. This email address will be monitored

throughout the meeting. And if there's an issue that
affects the remote meeting again, we'll pause and let
our technical staff work on it.

The Board welcomes public comment on any item on the agenda, and it is the Board's intent to ask for public comment prior to voting on any agenda item. If for some reason I forget to ask for public comments on an agenda item and you wish to speak on

2.

2.2

that item, please let us know by using the raise-your-hand functions and the moderator will recognize you.

If you're in person, please raise your hand and let me know that I forgot, and you will be called to the podium to provide your comment.

Once again, each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item, and if you are speaking on an agenda item, Board members and members of the public must contain their comments to that agenda item.

These discussion parameters are required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Both Board members and members of the public can discuss agenda items only, with the exception that the public can bring up additional topics when the Board brings up the general public agenda -- general public comment item.

As I mentioned, it's No. 4 today, but I'll say a little about that in a minute. However, when we -- when we take general public comment, we can only listen. We can't respond other than to later discuss whether to agendize it for a future meeting.

There is also an item for the -- discussing future agenda items, and that is on No. 7

2.

2.2

2.4

on today's agenda. We will take breaks as needed, including one for lunch.

Please note the agenda Item 8 today is a closed session item. When we move to closed session, I will announce that item, and the Board will leave this room to go into closed session. The Zoom will stay open. When we are finished with the closed-session item, we will return to the public meeting.

A word about the timing: We are -- I'm very happy and excited that we'll be able to honor our Former Board Member Lydia de la Torre today. She is not going to be able to be with us right away this morning, and given that we are actually going to start with the general public comment item as our first item once we establish a quorum.

So with that, my thanks to all the Board members for their service and to all the people working to make the meeting possible: Mr. Philip Laird, who's our meeting counsel today, Ms. Tiffany Garcia, who's here in our capacity as interim executive director, and our moderator, Ms. Serena Marzion, whom I would like to ask to please conduct the roll call.

MS. MARZION: Thank you. Board Member

1	Liebert?
2	MR. LIEBERT: Here.
3	MS. MARZION: Board Member Mactaggart?
4	MR. MACTAGGART: Here.
5	MS. MARZION: Board Member Nonnecke?
6	MS. NONNECKE: Here.
7	MS. MARZION: Board Member Worthe?
8	MR. WORTHE: Here.
9	MS. MARZION: Chair Urban?
10	CHAIR URBAN: Here.
11	MS. MARZION: Madam Chair, you have five
12	present members and no absences today.
13	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you very much,
14	Ms. Marzion. We have established a quorum. I would
15	like to remind the board members, we will take a roll
16	call vote on any action items.
17	With that, we will move to what is
18	numbered on our agenda today as agenda item No. 4,
19	the item for public public comment on items not on
20	the agenda.
21	As I alluded to earlier, please be aware
22	that while the public can bring up topics as they
23	wish under this item, board members cannot respond.
24	We can only listen. We recognize that this may be
25	frustrating, but this protects both the Board's



2.

2.2

ability to fulfill its work and our ability to respond to the public's questions and request to get an -- appropriately under Bagley-Keene.

Before we begin taking comments, I'd also like to note that while the Agency is in the midst of a formal rule-making process for a rule-making package concerning CCPA updates, cybersecurity audits, risk assessments, automated decisionmaking technology, and insurance companies, the public comment period for that rulemaking is currently closed.

So today's board meeting is not a hearing for receiving public comments on those draft regulations. And as mentioned earlier, the Board will be considering comments -- sorry.

The Board will be considering comments already received during the comment period at an upcoming meeting, which we expect to be held on April 4. So with that background information, please let me know if there are public comments on items not on the agenda.

Ms. Marzion?

MS. MARZION: If you'd like to make a comment at this time, please raise your hand using the raised-hand feature or by pressing Star 9 if

you're joining us by phone. This is for agenda item 1 Public comment not on items on the agenda. 2. 3 Mates, I'm going to unmute you at this time. 4 5 You'll have three minutes to make your comment, so 6 please begin as soon as you're ready. I just 7 PUBLIC SPEAKER MATES: Thank you. wanna make sure audio's coming through. 8 MS. MARZION: Yes, we can hear you. 9 10 Thank you. 11 MR. MATES: Great. Thank -- thank you. 12 Hello, Board Members, and welcome new Board Member Brandie Nonnecke. I hope I said that 13 14 correctly. 15 Thank you for being here today. I'm here representing the Alliance to Preserve 16 17 California's Innovation Economy, and we're a group of about more than a about a 100 small businesses, 18 19 local, state, and ethnic Chambers, and associations 20 to express just opposition and concern of some -some of the CCPA proposed regulations and -- and 21 2.2 recent things. 23 As you know, affordability is -- is top issue for a lot of small business owners who are 24 25 facing higher costs for energy, transportation, and

25

1	basic business supplies and services across the
2	Board. Our businesses are highly concerned about the
3	Agency's findings and the recent standardized
4	regular regulatory impact assessment, which
5	estimates direct costs of businesses and consumers
6	of about \$3,500,000,000 and a potential job loss of a
7	126,000 employees.
8	These regulations will disproportionately
9	harm small businesses, which are the backbone of our
10	economy, as we hear over and over again.
11	Moreover, a former director of California
12	Finance Department released an analysis of that
13	says that the CPPA has overstated the benefits and
14	underestimated the cost to businesses. This
15	misrepresentation of the economic impact of your
16	assessment will have negative consequences for small
17	businesses.
18	Additionally, we urge you to follow the
19	guidelines of the legislature and the executive
20	branch when it comes to AI and ADMT regulations.
21	There are better positioning sorry, they are
22	better positioned to create a balanced and effective
23	regulations.

Also, Politico has just reported recently that a group of about 18 legislators have submitted a

2.

2.2

letter to your Agency during the open public comment period, and we wanna make sure that it's drawn to your attention, that they're demanding that the Agency redraft all your regulations to minimize the cost of Cal- -- to Californians and the work -- and to work with their branches of government to get the regulations, correct, and right, and affordable.

Lastly, we wanted to express our disappointment in the lack of participation from the board members on the public comment meetings that recently happened. Small businesses -- sorry, small businessowners take time out of their valuable day away from their businesses to participate in public comment sessions. Yet, no -- not a single board member appeared at either one of those more -- public comment section -- sessions, even though you've shared that you would like to hear input and affect -- that are affecting stakeholders.

Supporting small businesses are vital to the State's economy. And the over -- overly burdensome regulations and costs of compliance are tremendously high, and come in at a time when all of California is struggling with the issues of affordability, and as we rebuild from the fires that have recently happened.

Your regulations will stunt business
growth, stifle innovation, cause job loss, and
overall have long-term negative impacts on the
state's economic health. Our opposing groups are
including, but are not limited to the Silicon Valley
Leadership Group, Los Angeles Business Federation,
American Hotel and Lodging Association, Asian
Industry Business to Business, Bay Area Council,
California African American Chamber of Commerce,
California Asian Chamber of Commerce, California
attractions of parks and parks and association
sorry, California Attractions and Parks Association,
California Automotive Business Coalition, California
Black Chamber of Commerce, California Fuels and
Convenience Alliance, California Hispanic Chambers of
Commerce, California Restaurant Association, Central
Valley Business Federation, Chamber of Progress,
Chamber of San Mateo County, Chattsworth, Porter
Ranch Chamber of
MS. MARZION: Thank you. That is your
time.
Eric, I'm going to unmute you at this
time, you'll have three minutes to make your
comments. So please begin as soon as you're ready.
PUBLIC SPEAKER ERIC: Yes. Thank you for



the opportunity to speak. My only concern is that 1 was apply (indistinguishable) this year -- last year 2. 3 (indistinguishable) unfairness --MS. MARZION: We're having a difficult 4 5 time hearing you. If you could speak a little bit louder. 6 7 PUBLIC SPEAKER ERIC: Sorry about that. Is that any better? 8 9 Thank you. MS. MARZION: Yes. PUBLIC SPEAKER ERIC: Okay. As I was 10 saying, my only concern is the unfairness around the 11 fee that was imposed (indistinguishable) registering 12 13 for CCPA starting this (indistinguishable) where 14 companies that are a small business are paying the 15 same fee as a company that's doing hundreds of millions of dollars versus a couple of million 16 17 dollars and the disparity -- how that applies to 18 those companies. 19 I'm hoping that there's some 20 consideration that will be given going forward, that a small business -- that maybe there's a sliding 21 2.2 scale on the fee based on company revenue or some --23 you know, it's -- it was very burdensome for my 24 business going into this year on short notice that 25 the fee was jumping from \$450 to \$6,600 for this year

and unknown going forward. 1 2. Thank you. MS. MARZION: Thank you for your 3 4 comments. 5 If there are any other members of the public who'd like to speak at this time, please go 6 ahead and raise your hand using Zoom's raise-hand 7 feature or by pressing Star 6 if you're joining us by 8 9 Again, this is for Agenda Item No. 4. 10 I see Tasia Kieffer? 11 MS. KIEFFER: Yes. 12 MS. MARZION: Okay. Tasia Kieffer, I'm 13 going to unmute you at this time. You'll have three 14 Go ahead and begin when you're ready. minutes. 15 MS. KIEFFER: Good morning. Thank you for offering public comment today. My name is Tasia 16 17 Kieffer, and I'm here on behalf of the LA County Business Federation, also known as BizFed. 18 19 composed of over 245 diverse business organizations 20 representing 420,000 employers and 5,000,000 21 employees across southern California. 2.2 At the Agency's February 19 meeting, 23 nearly 80% of the verbal public comment opposed the 24 proposed regulations. That overwhelming opposition 25 reflects serious concerns from those who will be



directly impacted.

2.

2.2

And as regulators, you have a legal responsibility to align with both public and legislative intent when crafting rules, yet these proposed regulations fail to do so.

A recent Cal-Tax editorial highlighted that the true cost of these regulations have been significantly under -- underestimated while potential savings have been overstated. And the concern was echoed by the small businessowners who came onto the public +comma and testified that compliance costs could put them out of business. We respectfully urge you not to ignore these comments.

Additionally a bipartisan coalition of 18 legislators from the California legislature recently sent a joint letter to the Agency urging the Agency to reconsider these rules, emphasizing the economic harm they could cause. With California already facing a projected \$2,000,000,000-dollar budget deficit in 2025, we cannot afford to impose regulations that will further burden businesses, hinder job growth and reduce state revenue.

The letter specifically reads:

"Moving forward, the CPPA must move -- work responsively with other branches of government



2.

2.2

to get these regulations right, in order to avoid significant and irreversible consequences to California."

And in fact, there's an impressive statistic that California's home to 35 of the world's top 50 AI companies and our economy depends on the technology and innovation sectors. Overregulation in these industries risks stifling growth, driving businesses out of state, and worsening California's affordability crisis, as mentioned in the earlier comment.

And now, we recognize that halting rulemaking could require restarting the process, and we respect the effort and the labor that has gone into creating these regulations. However, moving forward with flawed rules will cause more harm than good, and we urge the Agency to pause this -- this process and work collaboratively with the legislature, policy experts and industry stakeholders to craft regulations that protect consumers without jeopardizing businesses and the broader economy at large.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

MS. MARZION: Thank you for your

25 | comments.

Tim Burnell, I'm going to unmute you at 1 this time. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead and 2. 3 begin when you're ready. MR. BURNELL: Hi, there. Can you hear 4 5 me? 6 MS. MARZION: Yes, we can hear you. 7 Thank you. Okay. Thank you. MR. BURNELL: 8 9 appreciate you taking public comments today. 10 I would like to echo the sentiment shared by the -- a call or a couple back, Eric, talking 11 12 about the really onerous charge of the CCPA data 13 broker registry. 14 While I appreciate what the registry is looking to accomplish for a small business, that is 15 an entirely burdensome fee. My -- and I recognize to 16 17 that, the State of California is most concerned about 18 the happenings of the state of California, but for a 19 small business that works on a nationwide level, if 20 the other 50 states were to institute something along the same lines as California, the small business 21 would be looking at, you know, potentially 250 to 2.2 23 300,000 dollars a year just in fees. And it has 24 often been noted that as California goes, so goes the nation. 25



So I look at what's happening in 1 2 California, and I question the long-term viability of my business. I've had other colleagues, you know, 3 that I've spoken to who have really felt this, and I 4 5 actually had one who said, you know, his business was so small, he had to shut down. He couldn't continue 6 working. 7 You know, I'm a small business owner. 8 I -- you know, I employ, you know, five people total. 9 10 That's -- that's the kind of fee looking forward, that would, I mean, effectively crush the business. 11 There's -- there's no way that a small business 12 13 could -- could work under that kind of burdensome fee 14 structure. 15 So I would ask you to, you know, reconsider how you determine the fees based on, 16 17 again, either company's size or a company revenue, 18 because the small businesses will not be able to stand up to this, you know, moving forward. 19 20 appreciate you taking the time to hear what I have to say today. 21 2.2 MS. MARZION: Thank you. 23 Zane Witherspoon, I'm going to unmute you 24 at this time. You'll have three minutes to make your

comments, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

2.2

MR. WITHERSPOON: Hi, everyone.

Thanks for being here today, and thanks for taking these comments. My name is Zane
Witherspoon. I am the CEO of a startup business that helps other companies in their data-compliance practices. I'm also a member of several working groups on consumer privacy. I'm a big fan of the privacy laws as they exist today and a big fan of the CPPA in general.

I speak to dozens of businesses a week who are legally classified as data brokers, and many of them are just flat-out refusing to register because of the high cost of doing so. And this isn't going to be another bitch of it's-a-too-expensive burden on small businesses. I do think that's true, but I really think that the raising of prices deterring companies from registering is really, really impactful on consumer privacy.

I understand that the goal of the price raises is to fund the Drop system and the opt-out, but really there are so many private market solutions for that between Optery, Mine and DeleteMe that offer the same service of letting consumers opt out of data brokers where they can be found.

And that "where they can be found" is



2.2

crucial, because that's really the problem with the data broker industry from a privacy perspective. We don't know where they are. We don't know who has our data.

And so I'm really worried, as a fan of privacy and as a believer in data rights, that funding the opt-out system that already exists is actually detrimental to the privacy of Californians and people across the country because they still don't know where to go to exercise their opt-out and data-deletion rights. I think that that's the thing that the CPPA is positioned to do very uniquely in the market.

And doing things to lower that burden or data brokers to register, to do the right thing, raise their hand and say, yes, you can come to us and exercise your rights, would be so beneficial for the privacy of Americans all across the country.

So, yes, this is still at the end of the day, a weak, you know, "lower the burden."

But if it takes, like, reducing the scope of the Drop system to, you know, allow for some of that private market technology to also step in and be able to supplement the goal of it, I really think, you know, we -- we're seeing already the number of

1	registrations has gone down between last year and
2	this year in the registry. I think that's a pretty
3	clear indication that I think we could be doing
4	something a little bit better to get data brokers to
5	register.
6	So thank you for your time. I really
7	appreciate it.
8	MS. MARZION: Thank you.
9	Once again, if there are any other members
10	of the public who like to speak at this time, please
11	go ahead and raise your hand using some raised-hand
12	feature or by pressing Star 6 if you're joining us by
13	phone. Again, this is for Agenda Item No. 4.
14	Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any
15	additional hands at this time.
16	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you very much,
17	Ms. Marzion.
18	And thank you very much to the
19	stakeholders who took the time to provide public
20	comments under this item this morning. We will be
21	taking up an item later today that relates to the
22	Drop system. So at some point, there will be a
23	discussion of some aspects of that later today.
24	Let's see. It's 9:40. I think I'm going
25	to go ahead with the chairpersons update, and then we

2.

2.2

will -- we will probably take out the -- take the closed-session item out of order and go into closed session while we wait for Ms. De La Torre.

So item No. 3, that is the chairpersons update. For those of you checking the agenda as you join us, I'm going to have a few updates that I'm delighted to share today.

First, I'm pleased to announce that as of February 24, 2025, the data broker registry is live on the CPPA website. So it's been updated. And thank you to everyone who did the work to do that, and the data brokers whose information is in there and everyone who -- who needs to use it. It's there, available now.

cppa.ca.gov/data\_broker\_registry to view a list of the registered data brokers and contact them to exercise rights under the California Consumer Privacy Act.

You can visit

Starting in January 2026, we expect you'll be able to submit a single request to the CPPA via the Drop system that has come up this morning, and we'll talk about more today under agenda Item 6. But for now, you can view the registry and send requests to data brokers that way.

2.

2.2

Second, I'm thrilled to announce the release of our first annual report, and I wish I had a prop. I've been wanting to hand them out because they are most impressive, and they're a nice -- a nice point to put on the work that the Agency has done as it began, and has built itself, and grown over time under the amazing guidance of our deputies and their staff and our executive director Ashkan Soltani, former executive director, who just did amazing work to help build and grow the Agency.

I highly recommend page 11 to see some statistics and numbers. If you want to just get a snapshot, you can also read about how the Board and the Agency are thinking about our priorities and strategic plan, which is also available on our website. And you can find that on our website and on our social media, if you are interested.

I want to say one last thing about it, which is that it's beautiful and my many things to Deputy Director Megan White's staff, whom I won't name in case you know she doesn't -- I don't want to name her without warning her, but it looks absolutely wonderful, and that and makes it easy to digest as well. So thank you all for all of your work on that.

Also, as I mentioned a little bit



2.

2.2

earlier, we are working on a wide ranging set of regulations, and we are not currently in public comment period. On February 19, the public comment period closed for those regulations, which, again, are on automated decisionmaking technology, risk assessments, cybersecurity audits, insurance businesses, and updates under the CCPA.

On behalf of the Agency, I would like to sincerely thank the more than 600 members of the public who submitted public comments. Your participation and input are crucial to this process, and we do take your comments and your thoughts seriously.

And if you've tuned in, you've heard me say this before, but it is through hearing how the co -- how the rules would affect you, your business, yourself, as an individual, your constituencies, or the community you serve that we are able to make good decisions. So thank you for taking the time to do that.

Although this is not on the agenda for today's meeting, we will consider the comments received and deliberate on next steps for this rulemaking in our next public meeting, currently planned for April 4. That is not on the quarterly

1	regularized calendar on the website. It's a backup
2	date that we held, and we need to use it for this
3	because we added extra time to the rule making
4	comment period and we added an extra hearing to
5	accommodate people who were affected by the LA wild
6	flowers wildfires. It would be so much better if
7	it were wild flowers.
8	Gosh, in any case so, so thanks again
9	to everybody who commented, and we will pick that up
10	in April.
11	Last week, the Agency was well represented
12	at the California Lawyer Lawyers Associations
13	Third Annual Privacy Law Summit, which was held at
14	UCLA. Six of our senior staff members presented on
15	panel covering a variety of topics including
16	enforcement, data brokers, and privacy legislation.
17	The Agency's grateful to the California
18	Lawyers Association for organizing these events and
19	for having Agency staff and giving them the
20	opportunity to educate privacy professionals and to
21	share the work of the Agency.
22	I'd also like to say a little bit about
23	recent enforcement activity. You will have noticed
24	that it is at a high level. There have been

there's been a stream of announcements coming out of

25

2.

2.2

the enforcement team, ultimately through the Board.

And I wanted to thank the enforcement team most sincerely for all their work on behalf of Californians. Enforcement work is labor intensive and it requires judgment and care. And I've been in -- really impressed with the decisions the enforcement team is making and very pleased to see enforcement off to such a good start.

Thank you very much to them.

Finally is, we do see increasing changes in development at the federal level regarding privacy regulations, and it's more important than ever for California to know that their privacy rights are protected here at the state level.

The California Consumer Privacy Act provides strong protections that ensure Californians have control over their personal information.

While -- while federal laws and practices continue to evolve, the CCPA remains a crucial safeguard, and the CPPA is very aware of our responsibility to further that protection and protect that safeguard off -- and offer clear state level privacy protection for all California.

So thank you all for your attention to my announcements. I -- I'm also excited to share the



news of the Agency, and I'll ask if there are any 1 comments or questions from the Board. 2. 3 Ms. Marzion, is there any public comment? MS. MARZION: This is for Agenda Item 4 5 If you'd like to make a public comment at this time, please raise your hand using the 6 raise-hand feature or by pressing Star 9 if you're 7 joining us by phone. This is for Agenda Item No. 3. 8 9 Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any additional 10 hands at this time than. CHAIR URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you all 11 for your attention. With that, we will take Agenda 12 13 Item No. 8 out of order, and the Board will go in to 14 closed session. Apologies. I need to get to the 15 point in the agenda where I have the description of the closed session for everybody. 16 The Board will be meeting in closed 17 18 session for discussion and possible action on the 19 appointment of an executive director under authority 20 of Government Code 11126 Subdivision (a)(1), and also pursuant to Government Code Section 1126, subdivision 21 2.2 (e)(1) and (2)(a). 23 The Board will meet in closed session to 24 confer and receive advice from legal counsel 25 regarding litigation for which disclosing the names

1	would jeopardize the Agency's ability to conduct
2	existing settlement negotiations to its advantage.
3	We will keep this public meeting open, as I noted,
4	and we will return when the closed session is
5	complete or when we when we have decided to pause
6	for the moment and recall it later.
7	Thank you very much for your attention,
8	and we will be back later.
9	(Closed-Board Session Commences.)
10	-000-
11	CHAIR URBAN: Hello and welcome back,
12	everyone, into the open session of this meeting of
13	the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. At
14	this time I am delighted to move to Agenda Item
15	No. 2, which is a resolution to recognize
16	distinguished service by our former Board Member
17	Lydia de la Torre.
18	I Ms. Lydia, she was on the Board as a
19	founding member from the very beginning, and I
20	remember vividly meeting her only in a Zoom meeting
21	in June of 2021. We had the little squares, and
22	that's what we understood of one another's faces.
23	And we had the, as you've all noticed, I'm
24	sure, in the public, rather formalized discussion of
25	a of a California open meeting. And yet, even so,



2.

2.2

we were able to work together very productively, starting in a subcommittee to begin immediately the Board's work on regulations.

And I had the pleasure of working with Ms. De La Torre putting together a plan that would allow us to work towards our responsibilities to California when we lacked staff. And I had the process -- the pleasure of working with her late -- more lately on the rulemaking process subcommittee, and we have all had the benefit of her work on what was called the New Rules Subcommittee.

And a big portion of the large rulemaking package that's in public comment right now reflects that work.

Her work is thoughtful. It is perspicacious, and it is sophisticated because she is a longstanding member and expert of the privacy law community. She brought to us dual qualifications from Europe and in the United States, which is a perspective that is crucially important in a world where data doesn't recognize borders. But, of course, people's rights and people themselves do recognize borders.

This was just an absolutely key asset to the Board that we were very fortunate to have



2.

2.2

Ms. De La Torre share with us during her time here. She was a very responsible and thoughtful member of the Board, deliberated fully on all items before it, and we are extremely grateful for her service.

We put together a resolution that I would like to present and request a motion from the Board to -- to undertake this resolution on behalf of Ms. De La Torre. And to do that, I'm going to move down to the podium, actually, so that I can read it properly.

And I will remind the Board that I will ask for a motion to adopt the following resolution in recognition and appreciation of distinguished service by Lydia de la Torre.

Whereas Lydia de la Torre, a founding member of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board, through her dedication and countless hours of work, helped establish the first authority with full administrative powers focused on privacy and data protection in the United States, creating a legacy that will benefit Californians for decades to come.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre, through her dual US and EU qualifications as an attorney, international expertise in data protection issues and expertise in the European Union's approach to

2.

2.2

regulating data and AI has provided indispensable advice to the Agency Board.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre has advocated for the community of responsible privacy professionals to guide their organization toward responsible data stewardship and to seek transparency for the regulated community.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre helped shape California Consumer Privacy Act regulations that place consumers in a position to exercise meaningful control over their personal information.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre has consistently demonstrated expertise, commitment, and tenacity, contributing significantly to the mission of the Agency.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre's expertise and guidance have been essential to the Agency's efforts in establishing effective privacy regulations in California.

And whereas Ms. De La Torre's colleagues on the Agency Board recognize her many contributions and wish for success in future endeavors.

Therefore be as resolved that we, her colleagues on the Agency Board, extend our sincere appreciation for Ms. De La Torre's service to the

1	state of California and her role in advancing
2	consumer privacy protection.
3	The Board wishes Ms. De La Torre well in
4	all of her future pursuits.
5	May I have a motion to adopt this
6	resolution?
7	MR. WORTHE: So moved.
8	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. I have an adopt
9	motion from Mr. Worthe.
10	Do I have a second?
11	MR. MACTAGGART: Seconded.
12	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. I have a motion
13	from Mr. Worthe and a second from Mr. Mactaggart.
14	Ms. Marzion, would you please conduct the
15	roll call?
16	MS. MARZION: Yes.
17	Board Member Liebert?
18	MR. LIEBERT: Aye.
19	MS. MARZION: Board Member Mactaggart?
20	MR. MACTAGGART: Yeah. I Madam Chair,
21	if we can have a moment for discussion?
22	CHAIR URBAN: Yes.
23	MR. MACTAGGART: Okay.
24	MS. MARZION: Board Member Nonnecke?
25	MS. NONNECKE: Aye.



1	MS. MARZION: Board Member Worthe?
2	MR. WORTHE: Aye.
3	MS. MARZION: Chair Urban?
4	CHAIR URBAN: Aye.
5	MS. MARZION: Madam Chair, you have five
6	yeses.
7	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you very much.
8	The motion carries with a vote of 5-0, and
9	I will be very pleased to present this resolution to
10	Ms. De La Torre. I do apologize. I usually ask for
11	both board and public comments before we vote, which
12	I think was Mr. Mactaggart's observation.
13	Ms. De La Torre, would you like to make
14	your remarks before we do that, or would you like us
15	to go ahead and make further comments?
16	MS. DE LA TORRE: I will be happy to make
17	them now.
18	CHAIR URBAN: Okay. Wonderful.
19	Ms. De La Torre would like to address the
20	board, and I'm going to put this gift of token of
21	our appreciation here for her to look at while she
22	gives us her remarks.
23	MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. Thank you,
24	Jennifer.
25	It was an extraordinary honor to serve as



2.

2.2

general counsel, Eric Dang. Their unwavering support and guidance were instrumental in the success of my	an inaugural board member of the California Privacy
Tony Atkins and her outstanding team, especially her general counsel, Eric Dang. Their unwavering support and guidance were instrumental in the success of my	Protection Agency. I would like to express my
general counsel, Eric Dang. Their unwavering support and guidance were instrumental in the success of my	deepest gratitude to Senate President Pro Tempore
and guidance were instrumental in the success of my	Tony Atkins and her outstanding team, especially her
•	general counsel, Eric Dang. Their unwavering support
service on the Board.	and guidance were instrumental in the success of my
	service on the Board.

Special thanks is due to Board Member Alastair Mactaggart, whose visionary leadership through California for consumer privacy laid the foundation for the enactment of the strongest consumer privacy protection in the nation.

We began as an almost impossible journey in 2016 with an ambitious ballot initiative, evolved through sheer determination, one step at a time, into the landmark California Consumer Privacy Act.

Your tireless efforts didn't stop there,
Alastair as you went on to author and champion the
California Privacy Rights Act passed through
Proposition 24. Today, thanks to you, my children's
data and the data of a Californian's children cannot
be sold.

Your dedication has ensured that
Californians enjoy some of the most comprehensive
privacy rights in the world. It was my privilege to

be part of this journey, and when I stepped down, I 1 found great reassurance in knowing that the 2. 3 foundation we build is in safe hands under your stewardship. 4 5 I also want to extend my heartfelt appreciation to my fellow board members and the 6 Together, we made significant 7 Agency's staff. strides in safequarding the privacy rights of all 8 Californians, and I'm deeply proud of the groundwork 9 10 we laid for the future. I am grateful for the ongoing inspiration 11 that I get from my experience of serving on the board 12 13 as I now dedicate my efforts to continue my work 14 through Golden Data Law, GDL. My mission-driven legal practice, that 15 plans top tier privacy compliance service with a 16 17 strong commitment to education and social 18 responsibility. Attaining the goal of sustaining and 19 20 growing GDL has at times felt impossible, but my experience with Californians for consumer privacy 21 taught me that no goal is unreachable when 2.2 23 well-intentioned people come together to lend a hand. 24 At GDL, we provide cutting-edge



custom-tailored legal services designed to address

2.

2.2

every facet of privacy law ensuring our clients remain compliant. I'm proud to share that last year we expanded into the area of expert witness testimony and had our first successful engagement with a national litigation firm.

What makes GDL different is that we have structured ourselves as a teaching law firm. We are dedicated not only to serving our clients, but also offer the hands on guidance of our academic partner, Judith Saucedo, who is here with me.

Our legal fellowship program offers experiential opportunities to serving the students, preparing them to become future leaders in the field. Involving our fellows in the work we do for our clients allows us to foster the development of the next generation of legal professional.

A heartfelt thank you to Judith for her endless hours of dedication and unwavering commitment. Your passion and perseverance are truly inspiring, and I am deeply grateful for the impact you had not only in our work, but also in my life.

I want to thank GDL's clients for entrusting us with their legal needs. Their support not only fuel to our commitment to excellence, but also strengthens our mission. If you're interested

2.

2.2

2.4

in supporting us, the most powerful way to do so is to help us grow our client base.

Please take a look at our website. And if you're looking for the kind of service we provide or know someone who is, please reach us through GDL or to me through LinkedIn.

I would also like to thank Alan Friel for the -- for reaching out to offer me an opportunity to rejoin the impressive privacy practice at Squire Patton Boggs as of counsel, a role that was designed to align perfectly with my dedication to teaching and to GDL.

Finally to my wonderful children, Carmen and Hector. Thank you for your patience, for your love, and for being understanding of the hours I had to sacrifice away from our time together during my service to the Board. Like so many professional matters, I know the weight of that balance, but I also know that every moment it's spent in service is driven by the hope of living in a better future for you and for generations to come.

CHAIR URBAN: Thank you so much,

Ms. De la Torre for those beautiful remarks.

Are there comments from the Board?

Yes, Mr. Mactaggart.



2.2

MR. MACTAGGART: Well, Ms. De la Torre, I said much the same when you announced your resignation, but I'll -- just in case different people are listening, I'll say the same thing kind of again, which is that personally for me, as I went around -- followed my privacy journey, there were people who were more ready to put out a hand and help me, help educate me and help guide me. And what was unique about you as you were an expert in both fields, both -- both countries or both worlds, the GDPR and US privacy law.

You were a professor. So you were sort of temperamentally willing to teach and help me. And you didn't laugh too much at the fact that I didn't know anything. And so really your approach is all over this law to the -- in many respects where it -- where it sort of emulates GDPR. A lot of that was because of your educating me.

And then as we did the initiative and figured out what to put in and what to leave out, I remember long conversations with you, you know, pushing for one point of view or another and always with -- without any sort of -- sort of personal interest, but just more like what was best for the -- for the law, for the country.

2.2

You have a deep personal commitment to privacy. Many people are in it because it's a good business or it's a good law. I mean, a good -- you know, they have a job and they -- and they, you know, they're -- they're good lawyers. You have a deep -- really a deep personal connection to the concept of freedom and privacy. And it's -- which is not for every practitioner, you know. And so that's something that separates you, in my mind.

I think it's why you've chosen to be in your, you know, Golden Day Law kind of hybrid world where you're trying to train the next generation, which is really important to you.

So the Board was lucky to have you in my -- in my experience, in my estimation. They were certainly lucky to have you for all those years of -- tireless years, which were much busier than we think we're busy now, Board, but they were really busy back then. You and Jennifer, all those thousands of hours getting the regulations off the ground. And so thank you for your service. Really, truly, it was service to -- to not just the people of California, but the people of the country.

Thank you.

CHAIR URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Mactaggart.

Mr. Worthe? 1 2. MR. WORTHE: It's hard to follow that, 3 because I spent less time with you than Board Member Mactaggart. But I think you know, both Chair and 4 5 Alastair listed your qualifications, which are very impressive. But it was even more impressive that we 6 7 all saw your -- your commitment to getting it absolutely right. 8 You weren't going to budge if a word 9 10 didn't fit with where you thought it should go. I think for all of us, at least for me, that was a 11 heck of a lesson is what I signed up for; right? 12 13 I've been on a few boards and, you know, when I saw 14 the amount of effort you were putting in, and I think 15 you and Vinhcent were on the subcommittee, when I saw that effort coming back here at every meeting, I was 16 17 most impressed by that with all the other things 18 you've accomplished. That, to me, was the most 19 impressive thing. 20 So I appreciate that -- all that you put in to get this right, and we all benefit from that 21 2.2 today. 23 Thank you, Mr. Worthe. CHAIR URBAN: 24 Please, Mr. Liebert? 25 MR. LIEBERT: That old expression, "it's



big shoes to fill, " and I felt very honored to fill 1 2. yours from the State Senate. And Lydia, I have been in awe of what 3 you and all the original board members managed to 4 5 achieve. It's easy, as we're in this beleaquered world right now, to not take note of just the great 6 7 progress that's made by various governmental entities. And this entity started from scratch. 8 9 the Chair and everyone who's been part of this, 10 building it up, always should be applauded for the success. And you were very much a part of that, and 11 12 I observed your work, and it was extraordinary. So 13 thanks for your service. Thank you, Mr. Liebert. 14 CHAIR URBAN: 15 Is there -- is there public comment? This is for Agenda Item 16 MS. MARZION: 17 No. 2, resolution to recognize distinguished service by Former Board Member Lydia de la Torre. 18 If you'd like to make a comment at this 19 20 time, please raise your hand using the raised-hand feature or by pressing Star 9 if you're joining us by 21 2.2 This is for Agenda Item No. 2. 23 Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any comments 24 at this time.



CHAIR URBAN:

Thank you, Ms. Marzion.

And again, my deep, deep gratitude for 1 2. your service, Ms. De la Torre, and for your 3 friendship and for, as Board Member Worthe alluded to, your quest for the right answer and your quest 4 5 for things to be workable and transparent and to get things right. Your service has been incredibly 6 value -- valuable. Thank you so much. 7 With that, we will take a short pause to 8 take a celebratory picture with our former board 9 10 member and then recall agenda Item No. 8, which is a closed-session item. So the Board will move to the 11 to the closed-session room and return after we have 12 13 completed or are taking a pause in closed session. 14 Thank you very much for your attention and 15 attending our meeting today. (Closed-Session Commences.) 16 17 -000-CHAIR URBAN: Good afternoon. 18 19 back to the public portion of today's California 20 Privacy Protection Agency Board meeting. 21 We're going to proceed with the agenda with Item No. 6, which is an update regarding 2.2 23 development and implementation of the delete request 24 and opt-out platform, nicknamed Drop, including

discussion and possible action on proposed Drop

regulation. 1 And this item will be presented by our 2. general counsel, Philip Laird, and attorney, Liz 3 Thank you very most -- both very much for 4 Allen. 5 being here and for these materials, which I'll ask everyone to turn their attention to. 6 And please go ahead. 7 MR. LAIRD: Thank you very much, Board 8 9 We have a presentation for you today, and 10 we will start with my colleague, Ms. Allen. MS. ALLEN: Great. 11 Thank you. So next slide. 12 All right. Just a quick run-through of 13 14 our agenda today. So we are going to do a just a 15 brief overview of the Delete Act. We'll do an update about data broker registration, which has been 16 17 mentioned has gone live, the 2025 registry. We'll 18 talk about our build update to the Drop, which we'll 19 go into, and then, of course, our regulations 20 overview, which was included in the board meeting 21 materials. 2.2 We'll discuss next steps, and then we'll 23 open for any questions or comments at the end. 2.4 Go ahead and next slide. All right.



So for those who don't know, of course,

SB 362 is a separate law from the CCPA, and there's 1 2. two parts to it. One part is the data broker registration, 3 which has been live in California since 2021 and is 4 5 live on our website. And then the other part is the -- the delete request opt-out platform of the 6 7 Drop. In the law, it's called the accessible 8 9 deletion mechanism, and this is a new 10 requirement that will go live. 11 Starting on January 21 -- January 1, 2024 12 for consumers and August 1 -- sorry, 2026 for 13 consumers in August and August 1, 2026 for data 14 brokers. 15 Next slide. Okay, great. 16 Registration update. 17 And go ahead to the next slide. All 18 right. Perfect. 19 So we published our 2025 registry 20 update on February 24. You can go to cppa.ca.gov/data broker registry to find the full 21 list of the 2025 registry. As of this morning, we 2.2 23 pushed a new update. We are now up at 496 registered 2.4 data brokers. And that list today actually exceeds 25 how many registrants we received this time last year,



24

25

Okav.

but ultimately, it's a little below year-end total 1 2. for 2024. We had a number of data brokers, about 30 3 or so, who registered last year who told us they were 4 5 no longer registering for various reasons that included things like they're out of business, they 6 7 sold their company, they're stopping the data broker arm of their business. Some just said they were 8 9 registered out of an abundance of caution because it 10 was \$400 a year. And now that things have changed, they're -- they no longer think they fit in the 11 definition of data broker. And, you know, this 12 13 number was kind of similar from DOJ when we took over 14 from DOJ the year before. 15 We had about 50 folks also not register. So there's people who they're new folks who have 16 17 registered, and there's people who fall off the list. 18 And this list, of course, will be updated 19 periodically. So last year, we tried to update it at 20 least once a quarter with anyone who registers late so that it reflects the most recent information. 21 2.2 All right. Let's go to the next slide.

So that is where we are on the data broker registration, and we're going to move over to the

2.

2.2

Drop system because that is what we're going to give you the biggest update on today.

Go ahead to the next slide. Great.

So the accessible deletion mechanism, which is the Drop system, just a quick overview for those who are listening who may not know. It will allow a consumer, through a single verifiable con -- request, instruct every data broker to delete their personal information that's related to the consumer, that's held by that data broker, and also any associated service provider or co -- or contractor. It's essentially the first of a kind delete platform that we know of nationally or internationally, and it's similar to its more basic cousin, the Do Not Call Registry.

And we're excited about it because it really helps consumers to quickly and easily exercise their deletion and opt-out rights. So this -- the law enumerates the number of requirements for the -- for the data brokers who use this sort of system. And one includes registering annually, which we just talked about.

Registration includes payment of a registration fee. They must update mandatory public disclosures July 1 of every year. That is on their

2.

2.2

privacy policy. So there's a number of metrics they have to report to -- to the public about how many deletion requests they've processed, the median number of days to processing, whether they've processed in part or in whole, they have to do that every year, by January -- by July 1 for the previous year. They also have to report those numbers to us annually.

During the registration, they have to process consumer deletion requests once every 45 days once the Drop goes live, which will start August 1 next year. And then down the pike, they do need to undergo these independent audits. So that is coming down, but that's not currently in effect.

Okay. Next? Perfect. So timeline -you've seen this slide before. It was in the
November deck, but just to give you a sense of where
we've been and where we are, we are, of course,
signed into law in 2023. Registry went live last
year for the first time. We've ran our second
registry this year. And right now we're between
2020 -- July 1, 2024 and July -- January 1, 2026.

And there's so much in there that needs to get done. But we will open to consumers the Drop system January 1, and then August 1, we'll open to

2.

2.2

data brokers. Well, data brokers will need to pull down and access the system. And then that's when the deletion request we'll start. And, of course, we just mentioned the audit request -- the audit requirement.

Okay. Next slide.

MR. LAIRD: I'm going to give Liz a break here.

So to help us meet this timeline. If you recall, in November we talked about the need to procure the system, and we had spent a portion of time up until that point last year trying to define system requirements and how exactly this would work so that we could appropriately procure it.

Since that time, I'm happy to report that we have officially partnered with the California's Department of Technology, CDT, to construct the Drop system for us.

As the state's lead department on IT development infrastructure and oversight, it was a strategic move on our part to leverage the significant resources and talent available within the department to assist our still new and growing Agency to carry out the statutory mandate. So we signed an interagency agreement that has an effective date of

2.

2.2

January 1 of 2025 to -- and so construction of the system is actively underway with CDT.

Our team meets several times a week with the CDT team to ensure that the product development keeps pace, meets the needs of the Agency and accurately reflects the requirements laid out in the statute.

And in addition to that primary contract, that interagency agreement with The Department Of Technology, we're also in the process of going through a handful of supplemental procurements to further support the development of the system, including an RFO that was released in late January to procure supplemental support for the system build, as well as an eventual RFP for a ticketing system to help support data brokers and consumers. So just some component pieces essentially of -- of the greater system that we have to still procure for.

But with that said, I'm -- I'm happy to say that as of today, we are on track to have this thing built and launched in January of 2026, but we are still definitely in development stage right now and staff is actively working on this project.

So to describe a little bit more about



2.

2.2

sort of what Drop is shaping up to look like, we'll move to the next side, and I'll pass it back to Liz.

MS. ALLEN: Thanks. Okay. So we're going to run through the kind of different users here and what their experience will be. So we'll start with the consumer side. And here I'd like to note that we really were practicing privacy by design and data minimization standards, including, like -- ensuring that we were requesting the minimal amount of personal information from consumers.

You know, last year we spent quite a bit of time doing research both with data brokers and consumers in terms of how the system should work and a bunch of time trying to architect it in a way that would keep consumer data safe while effectuating, you know, the requirements in the law.

So essentially, when a consumer lands on the Drop, they will first have the residency verified by a third party. So essentially this will mean that a consumer lands on a web page; right, they get kind of moved over to a third party to verify that they are a California resident.

And the reason for that is, that is one of the requirements in the law. So within our law, if there's a term that is not defined that is defined in

2.

2.2

the CCPA, that is the definition that sticks. Here, we talk about California consumers, which is a defined term which means a California resident, as according to the California Tax Franchise Board. So that is something that we need to determine. So we will be determining that.

Right now we'll be working with the California Department of Technology, digital ID platform, which is a statewide service that provides identity verification for all agencies across the state of California.

So we're working with this team to verify the consumers residencies. And part of that will be using -- including using login.gov as a way to verify residency.

So essentially, you come in, you enter some information to a third party, they're like, yes, this person is a California resident, and you get pulled back into the Drop system where you can then go and -- and add personal information into our system.

Right now, we're only architected to collect first and last name, email, phone, ZIP code, date of birth, and then pseudonymous identifiers, such as a made or cookie ID, et cetera. And so they

can -- consumers can add these different elements of 1 personal information. And then they essentially can 2. request that every data broker who is registered or a 3 subset of data brokers that have registered, delete 4 5 their personal information, and they'll have essentially a dashboard where they can check and 6 see -- check back and see the status of those 7 8 requests. 9 And so they, you know, the data brokers by law have 45 days to effectuate those requests, and 10 that dashboard will be updated as this come in. 11 12 MR. LIEBERT: (Indistinguishable.) 13 MS. ALLEN: No. 14 MR. LIEBERT: Thank you for that. If the consumer wants to see then through 15 that dashboard whether compliance is happening, 16 17 what -- what does that kinda look like? In other 18 words, it might be 60 different data brokers or 19 something? 20 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Yeah. So we're working on the kind of user experience on that part 21 right now. And you'll see kind -- at one -- well, 2.2 23 I'll talk about it now, but you'll hear it again in a 2.4 second. 25 But data brokers are required to send us



```
back to status on each individual identifiers.
 1
                                                      So
     let's say they pulled down a list of emails and
 2.
 3
     they're like, yes, we found Drew -- Drew was deleted.
                MR. LIEBERT:
 4
                              Okay.
 5
                MS. ALLEN: You know, we tried to find
     Liz Allen, there's too many of them and, you know, we
 6
     couldn't -- couldn't find any at all or whatever.
                                                         So
 7
     they'll be, you know, not found. And so those get
 8
 9
     given back to us -- to the Drop system, and those get
10
     serviced to the consumer. So they could go by
     individual data broker to see if they were deleted.
11
     You could go in and see whether you were deleted.
12
13
     And they would also kind of raise the general
14
     statuses of -- of, you know, you had of your 500
15
     requests, so many were deleted effect -- you know,
     effectively. And this again, nothing is final right
16
17
     now.
                We are -- we are building in real-time.
18
19
     And so there's all sorts of problem -- not problems,
20
     but like, you know, whether how --
21
                              Challenges?
                MR. LIEBERT:
2.2
                MS. ALLEN: Challenges with data, data
23
     management, and servicing, and 45 days, and what does
24
     that mean?
25
                MR. LIEBERT:
                              Right.
```

And so, you know, you may 1 MS. ALLEN: 2 tweak or add to your request, or you could cancel 3 your request, and that would change your statistics. So all to say, we do hope to service information to 4 5 the consumer. And in the regs, you'll see that right now the response codes which are in here are --6 7 MR. LAIRD: And that that's all I was going to bring up. It's -- it's in the draft 8 9 regulations under section 7 --10 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. 614. And I -- I'm realizing 11 MR. LAIRD: 12 now we don't have page numbers. I apologize for 13 that. 14 But the four options will actually be 15 record deleted, record opted out of sale, record exempted, or record not found. So those are the four 16 17 statuses that would be reported back by a -- by a 18 data broker. Yeah. 19 MS. ALLEN: Does that help? 20 Great. Okay. So and that is and, you know, the 21 2.2 law does contemplate a consumer changing or canceling 23 a request, which is something they'll be able to do. 24 So they can come back in and add a different email or tweak their name or whatever to try to increase the 25



2.2

Perfect.

number of deletion, positive deletion requests that they get, for example.

Okay. Let's go to the next slide.

So the data broker on the other side will be creating an account, and within that account, we'll essentially have a dashboard where they can manage their re -- registration, as in giving us the information that we need every January, giving -- paying, effectuating payment. They'll have a dashboard that shows whether they pay the last time they registered, you know, their data registration, kind of a bunch of information that will be useful to them.

And then at the first time creating an account and registering, they will also choose which set of identifiers they need to best match. So within their own databases, you know, there's data brokers wire -- vary widely in terms of their practices and what PI they collect and how they do their businesses and run their businesses.

So some data brokers have lots and lots and lots and lots of pieces of information, and some of them very few, and some use email as a main identifier to, you know, catalog everything. Some use a unique

2.

2.2

identifier within their own company.

And so right now they could choose a list of just emails. They can choose a list of just phone numbers.

Let's say they use a phone number as a unique ID. They could choose just pseudonymous identifiers and just take, like, mades (sic) and stuff like that, but they choose the list that would effectuate the most matches essentially within their own system.

Once they've chosen and selected those lists -- so let's say, like, we do everything by email address, which is a really durable identifier, not sensitive PI. So they that means every 45 days starting our August 1, they can hit either our API or they can manually download a CSV with all of these email addresses from any consumer who has input a deletion request. They then will match those within their own system. And they have to delete anything that matches.

They then will have to maintain a suppression list. So if they get any matches, they the -- they have to take the whole list, essentially and maintain it as a suppression list, which is -- the basic idea is you're -- if you are buying bulk

data, which they all do, you would essentially check 1 2. it against a suppression list. 3 And if there is any California consumers that are already on your suppression list, they can't 4 5 come into your database. So they maintain the suppression list, and then they report back to us 6 after 40, you know, after 45 days or at least 7 within -- within 45 days, I quess, the status of each 8 9 of those deletions, whether they were deleted, opted 10 out of sale, exempted or not found. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indistinguishable.) 11 12 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. To -- oh, sorry. I 13 shouldn't call -- can you -- can you put your --14 yeah. 15 MR. LAIRD: Gotta keep this thing open. MR. LIEBERT: On the suppression list? 16 17 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. MR. LIEBERT: It's -- reminds me of how 18 19 do we do this type of auditing to even know whether 20 they're doing this kind of stuff; right? So they have a suppression list, but do they use it, and will 21 there be mechanisms in place that are at all 2.2 23 reasonable and doable? 24 How does that -- I'm -- I know you're all 25 grappling with this, and it's -- it's fascinating.



2.

2.2

MR. LAIRD: It -- from my perspective, if I may, I think that's part of the beauty of the audit requirement that this particular law incorporated essentially data brokers that are going to have to engage independent third-party auditors to come in and audit their own comp- -- their own systems compliance with this. And that does a couple of things.

First of all, it means there will be an audit record that our Agency can review upon request. And the law requires, I think, within five days, they have to provide us those audit reports if we request them. And that becomes a sort of a -- an immediate tool for us to consider whether or not compliance is happening.

Now, obviously, we'd have the ability to further audit as our -- as the CPPA with our audit authority. We could go look ourselves further, but there's going to be sort of this inherent self-checking that has to go on.

But you're absolutely right. There's risk there as well, that compliance could be just not always there, in which case, you know, we'll be actively looking for those instances and trying to enforce.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Yeah, we did hear from data MS. ALLEN: brokers. This is -- you know, it's a very common industry practice because so many states have these deletion rights, and so a lot of folks have and maintain a suppression list already. So it's not an This is mostly industry standard. addition. MR. LIEBERT: Excuse me if I missed it, but how do -- how do we address the -- the hashing -sort of, as opposed to you being Liz Allen, everybody sort of in an (indistinguishable) refers to you by some hash, you know, identifier, and we all pretend we don't know who you actually are, but we kinda know all -- everything about you, that you're this kind of consumer, this kind of age, with these kind of, you know, and actually we could link it to an email if we needed to, but we -- we tend not to. I mean, how -- how, you know -- and there's different degrees that sometimes it's overt that we have two separate lists. Sometimes it's we -- we pretend -- what's your -- obviously, it's a -it's a kind of boil-the-ocean question, but. MS. ALLEN: Yeah. MR. LIEBERT: How -- what's -- what's the approach there? MS. ALLEN: Yeah. So you're a couple of



2.2

slides ahead, but -- but I'll answer it now, which is yeah.

So the database our database will be completely hash. There won't be any plain text, obviously, and our database will be using a pretty industry standard hash. And the requirement would be that the data broker hash on their side. So -- and the way we've written, you know, the expectations of the law and the regulations is that you're not gaming the system. I mean, that's part of it; right? So if you can -- you have to pull down -- you have to choose the list and pull down and attempt to match to the best of your ability. And that is that's clear in the regs and that's clear in the law.

And so there will always -- you know, kind of a like there will always be bad actors and as we figure out, if industry is moving, we'll update the regs and we're going to, you know, move to try to address.

But, yeah, the -- there's a -- there is a, you know, the burden of keeping consumer information safe and providing just the right amount of information without over, you know, over providing information to the data broker. I mean, yeah, it's a tricky --

MR. MACTAGGART: 1 Because the statute says, you know, however you identify it; right? 2 3 you, the industry, however you identify it, you're supposed to -- when they make a request, they're 4 5 supposed to delete. So if they have -- they only look at your phone, you know, your identifier, that's 6 covered as well. But the -- conceptually, it's 7 covered even if it's not --8 9 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. 10 MR. MACTAGGART: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Do you want to MS. ALLEN: Yeah. 11 12 add something? 13 MR. LAIRD: So, yeah, I was just going to 14 make the point they may track people based on their own unique identifying system, but it really requires 15 them to focus on what data pieces they have. 16 So 17 regardless of how they track Mr. Mactaggart, if you 18 put your phone number in the system and they have 19 phone numbers that they track, once they make a match 20 with that phone number, it's going to line out all of Mr. Mactaggart in their database. 21 2.2 MS. ALLEN: Yes. 23 MS. NONNECKE: I recently got a new cell 24 phone number. My old cell phone number has been



reassigned to somebody else.

2.2

What happens in that instance?

MR. LAIRD: That's a great question, and that's -- that's certainly something, I think, we're going to be grappling with, because right now, I think what we're contemplating is for email addresses and phone numbers, actually multifactor authentication to ensure that you are the holder of that device or a cap -- you're the one controlling sort of that identifier.

And so with phone numbers, I think we're going to be limited to the phone numbers you have direct control over.

But at the same time, to the extent the data broker has at some point then updated their files to say, you know, Board Member Nonnecke has two phone numbers. As long as one of those appears on the list, they're still going to have to delete everything associated with your profile.

And the same goes if they held any other data point. So, again, the more you enter as a consumer, the more likely you're going to get a match. So even if a phone number doesn't appear on a list, but you also put an email address and that -- and they also track emails and they also will have that email. Your whole record will still get

deleted.

2.

2.2

So we're trying to create sort of the greatest chances of a match. But that is certainly a constraint, especially as we're trying to balance the responsibility of trying to provide relative certainty that this is the consumer who's protecting the request, and that they're not just adding every phone number they come up with, for instance.

So it -- it's sort of a policy balance in all honesty.

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Yeah. There's like the residency verification, and then any phone number that you enter in any email will have to be authenticated. Essentially, you have control over it. Yeah.

CHAIR URBAN: I suggest that maybe we let the attorneys get through the presentation. Feel free to skip or repeat the materials for any answer questions that you've already been asked.

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Okay. Let's move forward.

Next slide? Okay. Great. So it's is just a visual of how the system works.

Of course, the Drop system for us is a CRM, which stands for customer relationship

2.

2.2

management tool, and the database that kind of hosts that tool and data brokers, both sides; right? So it's a two-sided platform.

Both sides can both read or both can pull down and write back in so the consumer can find in -- find information about their status.

They can also enter information. Data brokers are pulling information out, but they're feeding information back. And so it's a dynamic platform on both sides. And we talked about quite a -- quite a bit of this already, so I'll just kind of skip over it.

But, you know, the part of the law is that it must be privacy protective. And in order to do that, we've made a bunch of decisions in terms of architecture, hashing data minimization that we were trying to make sure we're not a honey pot or a -- you know, an easy target for consumer data.

Okay. Next slide. Great.

And, like, let's not forget ourselves here. The Agency also is working in the same Drop system, and so we have spent a bunch of time trying to figure out how we -- what we need the system to do on our end. And, of course, you know, we're trying to facilitate the registration.

2.

2.2

We're trying to ensure audit compliance and investigate violations. We will be, you know, managing the consumer residency verification, and, of course, dealing with all the support tickets that come in from both consumers and data brokers as they, you know, integrate with the API, pull down list, et cetera. So a lot for the system to do in terms of helping the Agency do its job.

Next slide.

Okay. Next slide. Great.

So this is just -- we provided the regulations. These are just proposed -- these are proposed regulations that essentially because the law is so prescriptive about what the system means to do. And we have put together kind of an architecture process. The regulations essentially walk through and tell the business, the data brokers what they need to do in order to interact with the system. So this just kind of follows the flow.

These regs follow the flow of what we just described, which is that data brokers need to create an account. They have to register -- they have to register annually. And when, you know, once they've made an account, they have to access and process deletion requests. They have to report the status,

2.

2.2

which we talked about, the different status codes that we have. So in the regs, they -- then there's like rules -- there's some rules around deactivating accounts or ceasing to access the accessible deletion request.

So ceasing to access the API or ceasing to pull down the CSVs. So the regs are written in a way that kind of walk the business through their requirements at each stage of interaction with the Drop.

Next slide.

And then you'll see at the end of the regs, we have some consumer or their authorized agent's deletion request and kind of describing what we need. In that there's a residency verification review process. In case, you know, the third-party residency verify is incorrect. We have a deletion request.

We essentially map up -- we describe the content and the process the consumer will need to go through and then requiring of -- of authorized agent disclosure. So collecting some information from the authorized agent who interact with the system. So yeah, we can -- we'll continue and we'll take questions.

Yeah, I -- before we turn it 1 MR. LAIRD: 2. over to the Board for questions, I'll just mention, 3 too, I think we've built in some appropriate flexibility in these regulations and in the system. 4 5 For instance, as Ms. Allen mentioned, data brokers will be able to select between whether 6 7 or not they want to actually set up an API interaction and sort of save them -- save themselves 8 9 time for processing these requests or do a manual 10 process. So there's flexibility based on sort of 11 12 the nature and sophistication of the data broker. 13 And then also in terms of these ideas of lists that 14 include identifiers, it's left flexible in 15 the regulations so that over time, if we determine ti's appropriate and we're able to add additional 16 17 lists, for instance, or change certain lists for 18 sending out information for data brokers to check 19 against, we can do that. 20 So with that said, though, happy to take any questions. 21 2.2 MS. ALLEN: Next, you have one more 23 slide. 24 MR. LAIRD: Oh, do I have one more? 25 okay. Oh, look at that. I got ahead of myself.



| right.

2.

2.2

2.4

Next slide, please.

Oh, yes. Yes. Absolutely. So there's -there's a few things we're focusing on for sort of
rolling out the Drop system.

Obviously, we're continuing to work daily essentially on developing the system, working with CDT to -- to work through the construction of it, to begin testing in the fall and launch in January of next year.

To compliment that, though, again, where the law has many general prescriptive requirements, sort of the details of how data brokers need to interact with it and consumers do need to be established through rulemaking. And so we are working on these regulations now and recommending to the Board today that we at least move to begin the formal rulemaking process so that we can work towards having final regulations in place in time for its launch.

And then finally, we are also aware that this is a really impressive first-of-its-kind system that we want to promote. And we want to get the word out to Californians that this is available to them.

And we certainly want to also continue to



promote compliance with data brokers to register with 1 2. us if they haven't and to then start using the system 3 next year when -- when the statutory deadline arrives. 4 5 MS. ALLEN: And just on that, we know there's quite a bit of public education, too. What's 6 a pseudonymous identifier and, you know, how to find 7 it, all of that. So how that will be a part of it. 8 9 CHAIR URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you so 10 much. 11 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Could you walk us 12 CHAIR URBAN: 13 through -- probably this is a question for Mr. Laird. 14 Could you walk us through the timeline 15 that you envisioned for the regulations and how that interacts with the January 1 deadline to have 16 17 consumer access to the Drop system? 18 MR. LAIRD: Yes, absolutely. So, again, 19 if anybody's followed our rulemaking to date, 20 rulemaking is a lengthy process. And even once you start the formal rulemaking, you know, it's -- it's 21 not uncommon to take the full year that you have to 2.2 23 sort of complete those regulations and submit to the 2.4 office of administrative law. So by opening public comment now, we 25



2.

2.2

would start a public comment process that would be a 45-day public comment period in which anybody, data brokers, the public consumers, could comment about these regulations, about the requirements described in them. And then we'd have an opportunity, as you all would, as a board, to then evaluate whether or not the regulations were accurate in their current stage at a -- at a future meeting or if they need to be further updated.

And -- and this is to say a -- and if we determine there's update -- updates required, then we would propose modifications to the text of these regulations to reflect sort of changes in either the infrastructure of the system or the requirements on data brokers.

We would have another public comment round, and then there'd be yet another opportunity for the Board to decide if they wanted to adopt these regulations.

Again, I think part of the reason we're encouraging to begin formal public comment now is we really do want to hear from the public how we're doing with the construction of the system. We're --- we're sort of having to build the plane and fly it too, which I know we're used to at this Agency, but

25

there.

at the same time, to have regulations in place at the 1 right -- at the same time, we're -- we're trying to 2. 3 match these against the construction as we understand it now. 4 So I'm acknowledging also as development 5 continues, we may determine something else needs to 6 change, and therefore, we would do need to modify 7 these regulations to adjust to those as well. 8 very cognizant that it's very possible these are not 9 10 the final regulations, but just the opening regulations. 11 And so, again, with January 1 only nine 12 months off now, we wanted to make sure we had the 13 14 opportunity to go through this process completely before that deadline. 15 I can't believe I'm going 16 CHAIR URBAN: 17 to say this, but it's there. So what is the 18 drop-dead date which we need to finally approve these 19 regulations to meet the January 1 deadline? 20 MR. LAIRD: First of all, I have to compliment you. I have thought that joke many times, 21 but I haven't said it out loud, so --2.2 23 CHAIR URBAN: See, I had to compliment



you for being able to see it and to leave it right

MR. LAIRD: So, we would love to have
these regulations in place by January 1 of next year,
particularly to the extent they do define some
processes for consumers interacting the system.
And as Ms. Allen mentioned, consumers need
to be able to start at least submitting their request
as early as January of next year.
At the same time data brokers will be
won't be required to start pulling from these lists
and performing deletions until August. And so if we
had to push a little bit beyond, we could afford to
take the extra time.
So but I would say especially because
we really need data brokers to start integrating with
the system probably in advance of August 1 so we
don't just have sort of a mad dash and sort of set
ourselves up for failure.
Certainly by first quarter of January of
2026, I would say is our drop-dead deadline.
CHAIR URBAN: Thank you.
Further questions and comments from the
Board?
Yes. Oh, sorry.
Are you pointing, Mr. Worthe?
MR. WORTHE: Thanks for that. Couple of



The old fee was \$400. I forgot what the 1 questions: new fee is. 2. 3 MS. ALLEN: \$6,600. MR. WORTHE: And that's -- this may have 4 5 come up earlier, but -- but that fee is applied irregardless of the volume of business that you have 6 7 or the size of your business; right? MR. LATRD: That's correct. 8 9 MR. WORTHE: Did we ever think about a 10 ceiling? 11 MR. LAIRD: So that's a great question. We did think a lot about that. 12 13 Part of our challenge is we don't really 14 have a mechanism to learn or verify the income, the revenues of data brokers. And because we don't have 15 that data already, again, these fees are calculated 16 17 to best pre -- based on predictions of what we think 18 we'll need in the coming year. 19 So if, for instance, we made assumptions 20 that, you know, on a scaled system, so many data brokers would find on each scale, but, in fact, there 21 2.2 was many more small businesses and so the revenues 23 were low, that would actually inhibit our ability to 2.4 then use that money in the coming year. Does that make sense? I guess my point 25



```
is --
 1
 2.
                MR. WORTHE: No, I get it.
 3
                MR. LAIRD:
                            Yeah.
                MR. WORTHE: I will say it's a -- it's an
 4
 5
     interesting business plan to back into your pricing
     based on what you think you need; right? Because the
 6
     world's going to -- and what you'll find is 50 people
 7
     leave, because $6,600 is too much, and they close the
 8
 9
     business down. So then you're in a worse position
10
     the next year; right?
                But isn't -- doesn't your business
11
12
     license require you do state revenues?
13
                CHAIR URBAN: If I -- if I under -- I
14
     might be wrong about this, but I understand part of
15
     the problem is we don't know who the data brokers are
     until they register.
16
17
                MR. WORTHE: Yeah, the 493 -- is that
18
     right?
             4 --
19
                MS. ALLEN: 496.
20
                MR. WORTHE: 496 that we have now.
                            So -- but they're not all
21
                MS. ALLEN:
2.2
     registered in California because -- right, because
23
     they just have to be using California consumer data.
2.4
     They don't have to act like --
25
                MR. WORTHE:
                             Okay.
```



```
So there's a little bit of
 1
                CHAIR URBAN:
 2
     a --
 3
                MR. WORTHE: I mean, let's -- just a
     thought for the --
 4
 5
                CHAIR URBAN: Yeah.
                MR. WORTHE: If we find ways we could
 6
 7
     monitor that, maybe it's something we look at, just
     throwing it out there. And one other thing, is this
 8
 9
     appropriate time --
10
                              May I respond to that,
                MR. LIEBERT:
11
     please? Just because I totally agree with you in
12
     regard to this -- this is on by the way.
13
                MR. LAIRD: Okay.
                              I just want to tell you
14
                MR. LIEBERT:
15
     this is on.
                As more and more data comes in,
16
17
     ironically, there probably will be ways to kind of
     determine whether someone can prove themselves, some
18
19
     data broker, that look, these are my revenues
20
     voluntarily. So there could be such a schedule
     offered; right?
21
2.2
                If you can show as a data broker once you
23
     register, that your business is small versus big,
24
     something to think about; right? And then I don't
25
     know if that require a legislative fix or regulatory
```



in other state entities.

2.4

25

action, whatever, but that's when we could think 1 2. about. 3 Absolutely, and I -- I'll MR. LAIRD: just note, you know, this is -- a common model for 4 5 many licensed professions is that license fees essentially pay for a -- pay for the regulator then 6 to sort of do all of its business. 7 It's, you know, attorneys pay license 8 9 fees; doctors pay license fees. A lot of license 10 fees are flat rate for those professions, but there are examples to where there's tiers like you're 11 describing. 12 13 One thing that's apparent, though, in 14 those legislations is often the authority to maintain 15 a reserve at a certain amount so that you can take some risk with the -- with the system, watch trends 16 17 over time and then adjust fees appropriately. We've been trying to target our cost so 18 19 much to not have over -- any overages and to not 20 create sort of a risk -- an unintended reserve. That's been part of the strategy here. 21 2.2 But I hear you loud and clear. I just wanted to kind 23 of note those practices as we -- as we've seen them



MR. WORTHE: I think probably it's a --

it's a unique issue now because you went from \$400 to 1 \$6,600; right? And so will it settle down? 2. but that's -- in any business, if you have a jump 3 like that, you're going to get a reaction to it. 4 5 MR. LAIRD: Absolutely. Yeah. MR. WORTHE: And the other thing I was 6 going to ask about, is this a good time to go 7 through --8 9 MS. ALLEN: Do any folks have further, sort of factual questions? 10 11 Of course. You know you're not -- you can think of them later. 12 13 Yes, Mr. Liebert. MR. LIEBERT: A simple one. And that is 14 15 that obviously, this is exciting and so important, and we don't want to find ourselves in a situation 16 17 where -- excuse me, where consumers don't know about it. And so that is about our whole marketing and 18 19 information educational process. 20 Do we have sources of funding to do that? Will we have needed funding to do that? And what 21 does that look like. 2.2 MR. LAIRD: At this point, I think we've 23 24 been plan -- we did not budget I will say, with the 25 fees we've assessed so far for marketing efforts.



2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We've been planning to use existing resources to promote as best we can. And I think that is the immediate plan.

But certainly, I think we could entertain the need to sort of look at how we could use fees in addition for those purposes as well, because that is part of the implementation of the system.

CHAIR URBAN: Thanks -- thank you. Okay.

Were you thinking, Mr. Liebert, that we might also consider requesting additional appropriations for this purpose or a purpose that encompasses it?

MR. LIEBERT: Perhaps. I certainly think the Agency needs to be focusing on that as a key priority. We can come up with the best Drop system in the world that should be replicated across the country and perhaps the world.

But if consumers don't adequately know about it and its advantages and how it can really make a difference for them and how easy it is to use, then we haven't met our mission; right? That's the great challenge.

So that whole educational part clearly has to be such a key part of this, not just that we put it up right, but that we get the word out right.

1	CHAIR URBAN: Great. Thank you. Yeah.
2	Additional questions?
3	Okay. Mr. Worthe had something on the
4	draft text?
5	MR. WORTHE: Yeah, it would be the first
6	page in the direct relationship definition. I just
7	want to understand that. It's really the two ads at
8	the end.
9	The first one it says, if I don't intend
10	as a consumer to interact with the business, they can
11	still collect my information. Is that did I
12	understand that correctly?
13	MR. LAIRD: That is something you're
14	saying when you don't intend that they're still
15	directly
16	MR. WORTHE: Yeah.
17	MR. LAIRD: In some way, yes, we're aware
18	of instances where that occurs.
19	MR. WORTHE: Well, I guess what I'm
20	saying is this giving that is this giving the
21	business an out?
22	MR. LAIRD: I think not.
23	So our intent here is actually to close
24	what was a potential loop hole between information a
25	business collects from you directly in a first-party



2.

2.2

relationship where you knowingly engaged the business.

You knew they collected personal information about you. Under the CCPA, you have the right to request that business to delete information they have about you, and they have to right now.

So if a data broker ever engaged you in that way, or you engaged the data broker, I should say in that way, you could make a request today to that data broker saying, please delete my information, and they'd have to do that. But that is different from information that they either collected from a different source or a type of system that can be set up is -- Liz, I'm going to let you describe it because you --

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Yeah.

Just imagine if you're going to buy something and you've got a bunch of cookies on the bottom, and so they're actually like pulling your geolocation and they're pulling your IP address, et cetera. You are directly trying to buy the pair of shoes, just to chose an innocuous example, but you can imagine more sensitive examples.

And you are intending to go and buy the shoes, but there's all these cookies that you don't



know exist and you -- you know you are interacting 1 with, but you do not intend to interact with those 2. cookies or give those -- give away your geolocation 3 or give away your --4 5 MR. WORTHE: Right. MS. ALLEN: -- IP address. And so that's 6 7 what this is trying to get at, which is like you may be somewhere, but someone is pulling your data, but 8 9 that does not necessarily mean that they have a 10 direct relationship. MR. WORTHE: Yeah, I quess just the way 11 I -- it's written, I just read it. I -- that's a 12 13 great explanation. But so --14 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. 15 MR. WORTHE: The business does not have a direct relationship with me unless I'm intending? 16 17 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Which is just like if you land somewhere and you've got 27 cookies that 18 19 fire at the same time, you know, to collect all this 20 information. So you didn't really -- that's not like, you didn't intend that. 21 2.2 MR. WORTHE: Okay. So let's go to the 23 next -- the next one then the --24 CHAIR URBAN: I'm sorry. Can I follow up 25 on -- this is the same definition if that's all right



if I -- if I --1 2. MR. WORTHE: Sure. CHAIR URBAN: -- piggyback on you, I 3 think it's a bit of a challenge to this point that 4 5 the business does not have a direct relationship and it's the direct relationship that gets them out of 6 needing to be a data broker. So I don't know if 7 that's what Mr. Worthe was --8 9 MR. WORTHE: Yeah, that's helpful. CHAIR URBAN: -- getting at. I had to 10 read it a few times. 11 12 MR. WORTHE: That's helpful. 13 CHAIR URBAN: I had a question in the 14 same definition about the deletion of -- within the 15 preceding three years. And I confess I may well have forgotten being briefed on this earlier. 16 I know we discussed it when we talked 17 about the regulations that this is founded on, the 18 19 sort of the light touch, data Delete Act regulations. 20 And with apologies for forgetting something, I probably have. Could you go into that a 21 2.2 little bit, please? 23 MR. LAIRD: Yeah, happy to, and it's a 24 great question. It -- it is something I think we 25 identified as we've now thought through the second



2.

2.2

phase of developing the Drop system.

So if you remember, we -- we sort of added the color to this or added this definition generally last year when we were really thinking about registration requirements, and what would make an in business a data broker.

But what has really become apparent and what we real -- recognize, then, is an incongruence within the definition itself was the idea that essentially what we are clarifying through this definition is that your direct relationship is actually an information-specific sort of event.

And so information that again, the shoe example, that Mr. Worthe goes to a shoe website intended to interact with that website, that is a direct relationship. They collected his personal information directly.

But if that shoe website is separately purchasing personal information about Mr. Worthe, and he has no knowledge of that, and then is sell -- turning around and selling that personal information, we are saying with that personal information, there was no direct relationship.

And, therefore, that activity was a data broker's activity, essentially. And so if you think



of it that way, is it always tracking the nature of 1 the information, information that's collected in a 2. first-party capacity is always going to be 3 first-party collected information, and then 4 5 information that was collected sort of outside your awareness or without your intent is always 6 7 going to be a third-party collection, an indirect relationship. 8 9 Thank you. CHAIR URBAN: 10 Mr. Worthe, you were moving on, I believe. MR. WORTHE: No. It's still in the 11 12 same -- I think you might have just answered the 13 questions to the last sentence of that definition. 14 I just assume regardless of how the information is 15 collected, it can't be sold unless I'm approving that. 16 17 MS. ALLEN: Yeah, you would think, but I 18 think people have -- this is why we clarified it, is 19 that there was a lot of companies or a lot of 20 business practices that don't -- were not -- did not 21 interpret the law that way. 2.2 So they could say, yes, you bought these 23 shoes, we're going to buy a thousand other pieces of 24 We're going to chop you up into four different

lists, like -- like wide feet, buy shoes every year,

whatever, and sell those inferences and sell these 1 things. And it's like, yes, if that's what you're 2 3 doing, that means you're a data broker after these inference lists as to this thousands of pieces of 4 5 data. And, again, this is a very non-nefarious 6 example, but you can imagine lists of people with 7 dementia, abortion, you know, there's just a lot of 8 9 things that you can imagine. 10 It's creating real harm. And so they still have your shoe data. That's still a 11 12 first-party data. 13 MR. WORTHE: Right. They can keep your shoe data. 14 MS. ALLEN: 15 But as to the other things that -- this law was written and created so that you can get to that data 16 and delete it before it does any harm. 17 18 MR. WORTHE: Okay. Yeah, it does. 19 Thank you. 20 And then just so the overall timing, right of --21 2.2 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. 23 MR. WORTHE: We just took in a bunch of 24 public comment that we're going to wade through on 25 April 4. I'm just more concerned about staff's

25

ability in the next two months to address another 1 wave. So I don't know where April 4 is going to go, 2 but I almost feel like we should get -- we should 3 get a better sense of that before we raise our hand 4 5 for another wave. MR. LAIRD: Great, great point. 6 I will 7 say, and I really appreciate you thinking about staff on this, because it's my division that bears the 8 9 brunt of sort of that processing. 10 At the same time we've really scheduled this out. We are prepared to take on both workloads 11 and on the timelines we've described. 12 In part, as 13 you know, we've received the public comments we are 14 act -- for the ADMT regulations. We are actively 15 processing those right now. By the time we come back to you in April, 16 17 we'll have already done the initial workload that we need to sort of at least have reviewed and processed 18 19 and considered those comments from a staff level. 20 This would then be 45 days of public 21 comment that we would start processing after that 2.2 closes. 23 So if we open in April, that means we're



them until late May probably. And so at that time, I

not really receiving those comments and processing

think we'd feel prepared to take on this workload as 1 2. well. 3 MS. ALLEN: I also just want to -- you know, we're government. We have to do it this way, 4 5 but we want to be as agile as possible. So getting feedback from the regulated industry while we are, 6 7 like, building and moving is extremely helpful to, you know, we're at -- when you're building product 8 9 it's, like, good to get the feedback in the door. 10 MR. WORTHE: Right. Okay. 11 MR. LAIRD: But thank you for the 12 concern. 13 MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Thank you. 14 CHAIR URBAN: I have a comment question. 15 I have a question also on the draft. I'm looking -- this is under article 16 17 37610(a)(1) and (c). It's really a question 18 about (a) (1). And I suspect that I'm not visualizing this fully as I imagine it, but my -- if we want to, 19 20 but if I am and we want to get this in the form where you can run with it, we can delegate that to you. 21 2.2 There may be something I might suggest. 23 So it is to -- requires the data brokers to maintain 24 account security and inform the Agency immediately in 25 writing through its Drop account if it's hacked



1	basically. What if it can't use it as a Drop account
2	because it's been hacked?
3	MS. ALLEN: Yes, or we could or email
4	data brokers yeah. Yeah.
5	MR. LAIRD: We can make for an
6	alternative. That's a great call.
7	MS. ALLEN: Yeah.
8	CHAIR URBAN: Okay.
9	MS. ALLEN: There's a possibility that
10	they could send you a letter
11	CHAIR URBAN: Yeah.
12	MS. ALLEN: or something.
13	CHAIR URBAN: Email.
14	MS. ALLEN: We want it to be them.
15	CHAIR URBAN: Yeah.
16	MS. ALLEN: And we need to know that they
17	are who they say they are. These situations are
18	are quite problematic
19	CHAIR URBAN: Yes.
20	MS. ALLEN: because all the fraud and
21	going on in every direction. Okay.
22	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you.
23	Any other questions or comments for the
24	staff?
25	Yes, Mr. Mactaggart?



1	MR. MACTAGGART: So I was in Boston for
2	a couple of days, and I was particularly annoyed
3	because every time I walked by a particular street
4	sign, like a like a advertisement, you know, like
5	a billboard, it was electronic and the flash would go
6	off, and it would take a picture of me. I mean,
7	I'm and it was really annoying.
8	So which if they don't keep my name,
9	they just have my face, is there a way that I can
10	say, "please don't sell my information"? They're
11	like, "we don't have your email."
12	You know, facial stuff like where are
13	we where would that come out?
14	MS. ALLEN: Yeah.
15	MR. MACTAGGART: Was this is that
16	covered?
17	MS. ALLEN: The thing is, yeah, if they
18	only have biometrics, that's something we do not want
19	to collect, maintain, or store within our system.
20	Yeah, I think that's like that, but
21	however, if they're collecting it from you, would
22	that be a direct you walked by, would that be
23	direct? I mean, I think there's like a question as
24	to whether you didn't and you intend to interact with
25	it.



```
MR. MACTAGGART: Can I just ask you kind
 1
 2
     of put that in your thought process, because clearly
 3
     that's not -- it shouldn't be an outcome that -- oh,
     yeah, take your face, you know, like, can you guys
 4
 5
     just put that on a mental to-do list and just think
     about it --
 6
 7
                MS. ALLEN:
                            Yeah.
                MR. MACTAGGART: -- as you're going
 8
 9
     through it.
10
                MS. ALLEN:
                            Yeah.
                MR. MACTAGGART: How would I --
11
12
                (Simultaneously speaking; unintelligible.)
13
                MR. MACTAGGART: Maybe it's not -- we're
14
     so much some -- unless they associate it with a name.
15
     So maybe at some point they associate it with a name.
     But just -- it's just a thought, you know, in light
16
     of whatever was clear to you. You know, all right --
17
18
                MS. ALLEN: Yeah.
19
                              Thank you. Additional
                CHAIR URBAN:
20
     comments, questions?
                Anything else from Mr. Laird or Ms. Allen
21
     that you'd like to tell us before I state the motion
2.2
23
     that I will request and open up for public comment?
24
                MR. LAIRD:
                            I don't think so.
25
     appreciate your attention to this today.
```



2.

2.2

CHAIR URBAN: Great. Thank you for all the intricate work to get everything to fit together. It's fun when it fits together, and it's definitely difficult to get there. And we appreciate you taking into account what you've already learned, or I appreciate what you've taken into -- what you've taken into account and already all -- having already learned from the regulated community and this process to get as much input as possible.

So the motion that I will request after public comment is to direct staff to advance the proposed draft regulations provided today in connection with this agenda item to formal rulemaking, including commencement of the 45-day public comment period, and to authorize staff to make additional changes where necessary to reflect the Board's discussion today and improve the text clarity or otherwise ensure compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act.

And with that stated in front of everyone, Ms. Marzion, could you let us know if we have public comments on this item?

MS. MARZION: This is for agenda

Item No. 6, update regarding development and implementation of the delete request and the

1	opt-out platform, including discussion and possible
2	action on proposed Drop regulations. If you'd like
3	to make a public comment at this time, please raise
4	your hand using the raised-hand feature or by
5	pressing Star 9 if you're joining us by phone.
6	Again, this is for Agenda Item No. 6.
7	Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any hands
8	raised at this time.
9	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Marzion.
10	In that case, do I have a motion as
11	stated?
12	MR. WORTHE: I have a question.
13	CHAIR URBAN: Oh, yes.
14	Any further questions or comments from
15	the Board.
16	Mr. Worthe?
17	MR. WORTHE: The public comment will be
18	received in what form? And how is that different
19	than how we receive public comment for ADMT?
20	MR. LAIRD: So essential it will match
21	exactly what we did with ADMT. So how it works is we
22	publish a notice both in the state's notice register.
23	We also put it on our website. We usually do social
24	media about it as well, saying that the public
25	comments opened.



2.2

The notice talks about the way to submit written comment, which folks can send in writing to our offices or by email address to regulations@cppa.ca.gov. And for 45 days, a minimum of 45 days, we'll accept written comments, and then we'll also hold a hearing at the end of that period, public hearing, where we can hear oral comment and testimony as well.

And, again, we -- we advertise that sort of across our social media. We also send it not just to those who've signed up for rulemaking listservs, but we will send it to our data brokers listservs, as well as really anybody else we can think to promote it to.

MR. WORTHE: And, again, I think we talked about this, but there's some restrictions on our ability to attend -- how do I say -- a public meeting.

MR. LAIRD: Yeah. Yeah. I certainly heard some comments about that earlier today. And I just want to address that the -- unfortunately, due to Bagley-Keene, there are constraints about board members being able to attend these hearings without them making itself a meeting that we have to notice publicly in compliance with Bagley-Keene to sort of

maintain the flexibility of hearings. 1 We've -- we've had an open staff led 2. format. And certainly, though, board members can 3 watch sort of the video feed of these a -- as well as 4 5 transcripts that are prepared of all of these that are published on our website. 6 7 So to assure you, if you're not able to attend virtually and watch the hearing live, you will 8 9 have the video recordings and the transcripts as Board members to review after the fact. 10 11 MR. WORTHE: Thank you. 12 CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. Other questions 13 or comments? 14 Yes. Mr. Liebert. 15 MR. LIEBERT: It's just a quick thank 16 you. Phil, you and Liz, you've been doing 17 fantastic work on this and we're -- I know all of 18 19 us are very excited about this process and really 20 grateful for all the great work you're doing. I appreciate that. 21 MR. LAIRD: 2.2 have to, second, then say, it's Ms. Allen that's 23 truly been a tremendous driving force behind this 24 whole system. So much to her credit we are as far as 25 along as we are now.



1	CHAIR URBAN: Wonderful.
2	May I have the motion as stated?
3	Don't be shy.
4	MR. WORTHE: I'll go.
5	CHAIR URBAN: And If not, then let me
6	know why.
7	MR. WORTHE: There's no reason why. It's
8	just end of the day. So moved.
9	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. I have a
10	motion. May I have a second?
11	MR. LIEBERT: Seconded.
12	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. I have a motion
13	and a second.
14	Ms. Marzion, could you please conduct the
15	roll call vote?
16	MS. MARZION: Yes, Madam Chair.
17	Board Member Liebert?
18	MR. LIEBERT: Aye.
19	MS. MARZION: Board Member Mactaggart?
20	MR. MACTAGGART: Aye.
21	MS. MARZION: Board Member Worthe.
22	MR. WORTHE: Aye.
23	MS. MARZION: Board Member Nonnecke?
24	MS. NONNECKE: Aye.
25	MS. MARZION: And Chair Urban?



1 CHAIR URBAN: Aye. Madam Chair, you have five 2. MS. MARZION: 3 added. CHAIR URBAN: Wonderful, thank you. 4 5 The motion has been approved by a vote of five to nothing. 6 We are going to table Agenda Item No. 5, 7 the annual administrative and budget update, to a 8 9 future meeting, which gratefully brings us to Agenda 10 Item No. 7, future agenda items. And my brief update and running list today is that the annual 11 administration updates will be on the running list. 12 13 I have reporting out on the public 14 awareness budget details and breakdown, and we have 15 a regularized item for that coming up, among other 16 things. 17 For May, we have on our table overtime as it makes sense to prioritize it. And we have 18 19 information discussion of GDPR adequacy. 20 Mr. Mactaggart brought that up. I think it was last May again. 21 And so my understanding is that is --2.2 23 attention is being paid to that. There is also 24 the hearing from the data broker industry from 25 Mr. Worthe, and we should be hearing from folks



1	both in the public public and the data broker
2	industry on that. And the report from the
3	rulemaking process subcommittee I had with
4	Ms. De La Torre, it has not managed to make it on the
5	agenda, but we do have a report on that when we
6	when it when we have time to talk about it
7	just a report and considering what we learned for
8	discussion.
9	And we do have usually today we would
10	have our regulation priorities from the board in
11	discussion, and we tabled that for a future meeting.
12	That's not too far in advance.
13	For for purposes of time, this is also
14	an opportunity to suggest those, and we still have
15	the right to delete to include partial deletion
16	from Mr. Mactaggart.
17	We had a lengthy discussion in our
18	December 2024 meeting, gathered dates for quarterly
19	meetings and holds in case of need.
20	That resulted in the regularized schedule
21	on the meeting page on our website.
22	Only those four meetings are on the
23	regularized schedule, but we also have hold dates
24	for, I believe, every month in case they were needed.
	<b>1</b>

So we can talk about the items on the

2.

2.2

regularized agenda and the hold we have talked about already adding April 4, which was a hold date, a regulatory package on ADMT risk assessment, cybersecurity audits, insurance issues, and CCPA updates as that process was extended to accommodate folks affected by the LA wildfires.

I won't go into the rest of the regularized agenda unless people would like to. And I'm happy to do this for the benefit of our new board member, for example, if that would be helpful. But in the interest of time, I'd like to ask if there are other agenda items from board members or items to talk about with regards to the calendar.

Mr. Liebert?

MR. LIEBERT: I think this is the time.

I just wanted to suggest that we are a unique state

Agency in the country right now tasked with trying to

protect consumer privacy expectations. We've been

showing that, I think, in the last hour.

Many of us are reading news accounts about the stunning attacks on American's most sensitive personal information by the new federal administration. Certainly seems appropriate and timely for us as a board to consider adding an informational session at some point soon to educate

us and the public about the ways that private 1 2. businesses may be pressured to improperly disclose 3 the personal information of Californians. And I'd -- I'd love to work with the 4 5 Chair and with the staff to consider how best to kind of consider those issues, but I think a lot of our 6 private businesses in California are going to be 7 under potential pressure to share that type of 8 9 sensitive personal information. 10 Thank you, Mr. Liebert. CHAIR URBAN: And so you're thinking of a notice 11 12 meeting? 13 MR. LIEBERT: Yes. 14 CHAIR URBAN: Where all the board would 15 be there to facilitate talking with staff about resources and timing, et cetera. 16 17 Would you like to form a subcommittee 18 with me that we --MR. WORTHE: Well, I don't know that we 19 20 need to get that formal. I think we can just have those conversations and figure out when --21 CHAIR URBAN: The staff? 2.2 23 MR. WORTHE: -- it makes sense to do it, 24 but it's certainly something that's happening right 25 now in our world that's somewhat time pressured.



## AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, on 03/07/2025 CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY

CHAIR URBAN: Okay. 1 Thank you. Additional items and discussion? 2 3 Mr. Worthe? MR. WORTHE: Am I -- am I allowed to ask 4 5 about the agenda for April 4? CHAIR URBAN: Oh, sure. 6 7 MR. WORTHE: I just wanted to -- it just seems to me like we should have only one item. 8 9 Is that what we are intending at this Because it's going to be every bit of the 10 point? 11 whole day. That would be staff's 12 MR. LATRD: 13 recommendation that we really prioritize --14 MR. WORTHE: Yeah. 15 MR. LAIRD: -- that item. MR. WORTHE: We could do that. 16 17 MR. LAIRD: But --MR. WORTHE: I mean, I'm --18 MR. LAIRD: -- if the chair has further 19 20 thoughts on that. CHAIR URBAN: I talked with Phil about 21 2.2 this in advance, and I apologize. I didn't think to 23 bring it up as to what could go a little bit later. 24 And my understanding was that the item, the one item 25 we didn't do today -- well, now two items we didn't

Page 103

do today could go after April 4. 1 And we had sort of a plan for spreading 2. them or well, I don't have the plan in my head, but 3 that there was the possibility of spreading them into 4 5 the other regular Board meetings; is that correct? MR. LAIRD: Absolutely fine. Yeah. 6 7 CHAIR URBAN: Yeah. MR. WORTHE: That was the budget. 8 And what was the second item? I'm sorry. 9 10 CHAIR URBAN: Annual regulation priorities. 11 12 MR. WORTHE: Got it. Okav. 13 CHAIR URBAN: Additional items? We do have a quarterly meeting scheduled 14 15 for August. Is that -- which is a of course, is a 16 challenging travel time, is that something that we 17 18 wanted to discuss? I think I might -- I 19 Yeah. MR. WORTHE: 20 mean, I -- listen, I appreciate what we did, and I'm happy what we did on a April 4 meeting because of 21 accommodating people that probably, you know, needed 2.2 23 more time. 24 I can speak personally, the idea of, 25 like, just holding dates out into the future is not

super helpful for me, because it means I gotta block 1 2 them out; right? And so we find out 30 days before, 3 oh, now it's free. Unfortunately, just the way my life, friends, it's not very helpful. 4 5 I can't plan, you know, but I can tell you right now, specifically those August dates are an 6 issue for me. So we -- if we need a meeting in 7 August, which it'd be the -- you know, every Board 8 9 I'm on chooses not to meet in August for these 10 reasons. We have, you know, something scheduled vacation wise, but if we need to move it, I just need 11 to find another date is all. 12 13 MR. LIEBERT: I would be in that 14 situation as well. 15 MR. WORTHE: Okay. MR. MACTAGGART: Yeah, I already know I'm 16 17 not going to be able to make the August meeting, 18 so... 19 Okay. So advice from CHAIR URBAN: 20 staff. So we have holds a -- around there. One of them is in July, July 11, and one of them is 21 2.2 September 5. 23 And my question to staff is whether and 24 how that might affect our ability to meet deadlines. 25 MR. LAIRD: Yes. I think we can work to



adjust for those deadlines. I think September 5 1 2 would be our preference. 3 CHAIR URBAN: All right. So September 5. Oh. 4 5 MR. WORTHE: Ish. September 5-ish. CHAIR URBAN: 6 12? MR. MACTAGGART: 12 would be better. 7 CHAIR URBAN: Okay. Wonderful. 8 9 September 5. 10 So for the benefit of everybody watching, we will not hold our -- at our August quarterly 11 meeting on that date. We will instead hold it on 12 13 September 5. The location for that meeting, I 14 thought, was going to be in Sacramento, but then I 15 looked and it was -- it said location TBD. We kept that TBD just for flexibility around finding a 16 17 southern California location, but internally we were 18 thinking just because of the logistical challenges 19 trying to find space, that it would likely be in 20 Sacramento. 21 MS. ALLEN: Okay. 2.2 MR. WORTHE: Sorry. Is that -- were you 23 saying September 5 is preferred over July 11 to 24 replace the August meeting? So July 11 is released? 25 MS. GARCIA: Correct. We were trying to



1	keep June and July open for vacation travel, and
2	that's why we had originally wanted to
3	MR. WORTHE: So release the hold on
4	July 11?
5	CHAIR URBAN: We could do that.
6	MR. WORTHE: Okay. Sold.
7	CHAIR URBAN: All right. Thank you very
8	much.
9	Any additional agenda items? I have
10	Mr. Liebert. In that case, are there any additional
11	agenda items from the public?
12	MS. GARCIA: Oh, apologies. Just while
13	we're having this open discussion, should we also
14	discuss June? Should we just release that now?
15	Because I think the big markers in time. And I
16	appreciate your comments earlier around the
17	regulation packages now, and so we are mapping
18	everything out. And so that's why September 5 is
19	really important for the other package.
20	Should we release June, too?
21	CHAIR URBAN: I my view is that we
22	take your advice because
23	MR. WORTHE: Good choice.
24	CHAIR URBAN: Because are we
25	realistically leaving enough time to do what we need



1	to do if we release that?
2	MS. GARCIA: Okay. Then
3	MR. LAIRD: Okay. So it sounds like
4	if we're releasing July and August, then I would
5	recommend we hold June still.
6	MS. GARCIA: Okay. Well, we'll get back
7	to you as soon as possible.
8	MR. MACTAGGART: And just so people are
9	aware, I've already let the staff know probably too
10	many times that I cannot make the June appointment
11	because my my son's got a graduation thing that
12	day. Well, middle school, but that's what happens
13	when
14	CHAIR URBAN: Well, you gotta be there
15	for that. You gotta be there for that.
16	All right. Are there any additional
17	agenda items from the public?
18	MS. MARZION: All right. This is for
19	agenda item No. 7, future agenda items.
20	If you'd like to make a comment at this
21	time, please raise your hand using the raise-hand
22	feature or by pressing Star 9 if you're joining us by
23	phone. This is for Agenda Item No. 7.
24	Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any hands
25	raised at this time.



1	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you very much.
2	With that, we will move to Agenda Item
3	No. 9, adjournment, our final item for today. I
4	would like to thank everyone, the Board members,
5	staff and members of the public for all of their
6	contributions to the meeting and to the Board and the
7	Agency's work.
8	May have a motion to adjourn the meeting?
9	MR. WORTHE: Okay. So moved.
10	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. I have a
11	motion.
12	May I have a second?
13	MR. MACTAGGART: Second.
14	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you. Ms. Marzion,
15	could you please conduct the roll call?
16	MS. MARZION: Yes. The motion is to
17	adjourn.
18	Board Member Liebert.
19	MR. LIEBERT: Aye.
20	MS. MARZION: Board Member Mactaggart?
21	MR. MACTAGGART: Aye.
22	MS. MARZION: Board Member Nonnecke?
23	MS. NONNECKE: Aye.
24	MS. MARZION: Board member Worthe?
25	MR. WORTHE: Aye.



1	MS. MARZION: Chair Urban?
2	CHAIR URBAN: Aye.
3	MS. MARZION: Madam Chair, you have five
4	yeses.
5	CHAIR URBAN: Thank you.
6	The motion carries with a vote of 5-0 and
7	this meeting of the California Privacy Protection
8	Agency stands adjourned.
9	Thanks to everyone for their
10	contributions.
11	(Proceedings were concluded.)
12	-000-
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

