## CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY BOARD 1 2 TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED PUBLIC MEETING 3 4 FEBRUARY 3, 2023 5 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 6 7 8 || Present: JENNIFER URBAN, Chairperson 9 LYDIA DE LA TORRE, Board Member 10 VINHCENT LE, Board Member 11 ALASTAIR MACTAGGART, Board Member CHRIS THOMPSON, former Board Member 12 ASHKAN SOLTANI, Executive Director 13 14 PHILIP LAIRD, General Counsel LISA KIM, Senior Privacy Counsel and Advisor 15 16 KEVIN SABO, Moderator 17 18 19 Transcribed by: JULIE HALL, Senior Legal Analyst CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY 20 21 Sacramento, California 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## TRANSCRIBED RECORDED PUBLIC MEETING

## February 3, 2023

MR. KEVIN SABO: Alright. It looks like the participation number is starting to level off.

1

2

3

5

6

11

12 ||

13

18

20

21

MS. JENNIFER URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. In that case: good morning, everyone. I'm very pleased to welcome all of you to this meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. It is February 3, 2023, at 10:04 am.

My name is Jennifer Urban, and I'm the chairperson of the board. Before we get started with the substance of the meeting, as usual, I have some logistical announcements and reminders for everybody.

First, I would like to please ask everyone in the panel to check that your microphone is muted when you're not speaking. For everyone, please note that this meeting is being recorded and that  $16\parallel$ it will be run according to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, which 17 | is required by law.

After each agenda item, there will be an opportunity for questions and discussion by board members, and I will also ask for public comment on each agenda item. Each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item. If you wish to speak on an item and you're using the Zoom webinar, please use the 'raise your hand' function, which is in the reaction feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen. If you wish to speak on an item and you're joining by phone, you can press \*9 on your phone to show the moderator that you are raising your hand. Our moderator will call your name when 27 | it is your turn and request that you unmute yourself for comment at 28 | that time.

Those using the webinar can use the unmute feature, and those dialing in by phone can press \*6 to unmute. When your comment is completed, the moderator will mute you. Now, I mentioned that the moderator would call you by name. It is helpful if you identify yourself, but this is entirely voluntary, and you can input a pseudonym when you log into the meeting.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

27

The board welcomes public comments on all items on the agenda, and it is the board's intent to ask for public comment prior to the board voting on any agenda item. If, for some reason, I forget to ask for public comment on any agenda item and you wish to speak on the item, please let us know by using the 'raise your hand' functions, and the moderator will recognize you. Once again, please do be aware that each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item for public comments.

Relatedly, I would like to remind everyone of the rules of the road under Bagley-Keene. Both board members and members of the public may only discuss items on the agenda for today when those items are up for discussion. So, if you were speaking on an agenda item, both board members and members of the public must contain their comments to that agenda item.

We will take breaks as needed. And if we take a break and you have walked away from the webinar, you'll see that we've put up a little sign to let you know that. And if we are able to predict, we'll say when we'll be back.

My many thanks to all of the board members for their service today, and to everyone working to make the meeting possible. I'd especially like to thank the team supporting us today: Mr. Philip 28 | Laird, the agency's general counsel, who is our meeting counsel,

1 and will be presenting on a couple of items today; Mr. Ashkan Soltani, who is here in his capacity as our Executive Director; and Ms. Lisa Kim, who's our brand-new senior privacy counsel and advisor for the CPPA, and I'll say a little bit more about that later. I would also like to thank and welcome our moderator, Mr. Kevin Sabo, and ask him now to please conduct the roll call.

MR. SABO: Okay, Board Member de la Torre?

MS. LYDIA DE LA TORRE: Present.

MR. SABO: de la Torre, present. Board Member Le?

MR. VINHCENT LE: Present.

MR. SABO: Le, present. Board Member Mactaggart?

MR. ALASTAIR MACTAGGART: Here.

MR. SABO: Mactaggart, present. And Chair Urban?

MS. URBAN: Present.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

24

27

28

MR. SABO: Urban, present. You have four present and no absences.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. The board has established a quorum.

I would like to let the board members know that we will be taking a roll call vote on any action items. Now, for everyone's ability to follow what we're doing today: if you look at your agenda, we're going to take agenda item #3, consideration of a resolution to recognize the service of our former board member Chris Thompson, next. We'll circle back to agenda item #2 after that.

Mr. Thompson, it's wonderful to see you today, and we will now move to agenda item #3, which is this resolution to recognize his distinguished service, and that is in your meeting materials packet today.

I just like to say briefly how fortunate we've been to have

 $1 \parallel Mr$ . Thompson's expertise on the board as one of the founding members of the board who was with us until December. We've moved through some startup development stages, and now we're in the building stage. And I personally have especially valued Mr. Thompson's expertise in organizations and his focus on building the agency with a strong culture and a strong organizational foundation with special attention to our values and how those are transmitted throughout the organization.

5

6

8

9

11

13

17

18

20

21

22

27

28

As I said in December, but I'm just sort of bummed about it, I was really looking forward to Mr. Thompson to your insight as we move into our strategic planning. And oh well, it's too bad that we won't get your insight, but I think that you've given us some very good thought to work with as we move into that. And I've really valued his even-handedness and his thoughtfulness in our rulemaking 15 and other work. So, as you go off and continue your work for Los 16 | Angelenos as the chief of staff for Mayor Bass, my deepest thanks to you on behalf of Californians and on the agency. And today I'm pleased to present for the board's consideration a draft resolution honoring and expressing our appreciation to Mr. Thompson for his contributions.

If you will please turn your attention to the draft resolution under agenda item #3, I will read it out so that we can deliberate, resolution in recognition and appreciation of distinguished service by J. Christopher Thompson. Whereas Mr. J. Christopher Thompson, as a founding member of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board, played a key role in creating the first agency vested with full administrative authority to implement and enforce the California Consumer Privacy Act; and

Whereas Mr. Thompson's work to establish the California

Privacy Protection Agency with a strong organizational foundation
has helped ensure the agency will be proactive, nimble, and
steadfast in protecting Californians' consumer privacy rights for
many years to come; and

23 ||

Whereas Mr. Thompson provided invaluable strategic assistance guidance to fellow board members and agency staff, as the agency entered its first rulemaking process to implement California's flagship consumer privacy law; and

Whereas Mr. Thompson helped lead the agency's initial work to promote public awareness and understanding of the risks, rules, responsibilities, safeguards, and rights in relation to the collection, use, sale, and disclosure of personal information; and

Whereas Mr. Thompson's colleagues have deeply appreciated his informed and measured approach, his strategic mind, his strong work ethic, and the humor and professionalism he demonstrated as a member of the agency board; and

Whereas Mr. Thompson recently departed the agency board to dedicate himself fully to his new role as chief of staff for Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass; and

Whereas Mr. Thompson's colleagues on the agency board are confident that Mr. Thompson will continue to benefit California through his commitment to public service and to the state.

Therefore, be it resolved that we, his colleagues on the agency board, extend our deepest appreciation for Mr. J. Christopher

Thompson's service to the state and to the protection of

Californians' consumer privacy. We look forward to continuing to work with Mr. Thompson and benefiting from his insight and guidance for

years to come.

1 ||

So, thank you, Chris, and are there any questions or comments from Board members? Ms. de la Torre and then Mr. Le.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I just want to quickly echo the words of the Chairperson Urban. The humor, professionalism, experience that Mr. Thompson brought to his role with the agency. We're deeply appreciated by everybody, especially by me. I had the opportunity to serve with him in a subcommittee and get to know him a little better. And I have many, many opportunities to learn, really learn, from his deep experience in government. So, we very much appreciate what you have done for Californians, and I personally very much appreciate how I have been able to learn from my interactions with you. I wish you the best on your new role. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Yeah, I'd like to echo what Ms. de la Torre said. I've learned quite a bit from you, Mr. Thompson. Appreciate your counsel and your guidance as part of our outreach campaigns, your strategic insights, and how we responded to different challenges at the agency. Thank you most of all, for the humor that you brought to our conversations. And yeah, I wish you the best of luck in your new role. Los Angeles is lucky to have you.

MS. URBAN: Thanks so much, Mr. Le. Mr. Mactaggart?

MR. MACTAGGART: Thank you. You know you and I had limited interactions because I joined the board recently. But I just want to say again how a grateful I am for your service to the people of California, not just in this role, but in your next role. How lucky the people of Los Angeles are and, as I said before, I'm personally excited because I think you will bring to the highest levels of the

government of what is, by all intent, a city-state effectively, the importance of privacy, and I look forward to having that entity allied with this cause as well. So, thank you for your work.

3

4

5

6

7

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

27

MS. URBAN: Thank you so much, Mr. Mactaggart. Mr. Thompson, we really appreciate all your service. Is there anything you'd like to say before we take public comment?

MR. CHRIS THOMPSON: I just want to say thank you. I'm really honored and humbled that you all are doing this. It was an honor to serve with you all. The opportunity to start up this agency was pretty unique and had challenges, but I feel like we collectively rose to the occasion to move this agency forward and get it established and promulgate rules while building the culture and directions and strategic direction of the agency.

I love public service. I've worked in government for a long time, obviously working in government again. And working with these  $16 \parallel \text{people}$  on this board and the incredibly dedicated staff renews my faith in in public service. For people to understand how much dedication and hard work is put into this effort by unpaid board members and the public servants on the staff who are dedicated to this mission... I wish people could see what we saw of the work that went into the work and care and diligence of that has gone into standing up this agency and starting to implement the statute through these regulations. It really is an encouraging piece of public service by dedicated public servants. So, thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you so much, Mr. Thompson. With that I'm going to ask for a motion on the table so the public knows what we are thinking about when I ask them for public comment. May I have a motion to adopt the resolution and recognition and appreciation of

distinguished service by J. Christopher Thompson? MS. DE LA TORRE: I so move. 2 MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. May I have a second? 3 MR. LE: I second. 4 5 MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. With that we have a motion on the table. Mr. Sabo, could you please let us know if there's public 6 comment? 7 MR. SABO: Yes, we are on agenda #3, resolution to recognize 8 distinguished service by former board member J. Christopher Thompson. If you would like to make a comment, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 if you're joining us 11 12 by phone today. Your name will be called when it's your turn, and you'll be invited to unmute yourself. Those dialing in by phone can press \*6 to unmute. You will have three minutes to make your comment.  $15 \parallel \text{This}$  is for agenda item 3, the resolution recognizing service by 16 | former board member Thompson. Again, use your 'raise hand' feature on Zoom or press \*9 if you're joining by phone. Madam chair, I'm 17 18 not seeing any hands raised at this time. 19 MS. URBAN: All right. Thank you very much. In that case, Mr. Sabo, will you please perform the roll call vote? 20 21 MR. SABO: Yes, the motion is to adopt the resolution as stated by the chair. Board member de la Torre? 22 23 MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye. MR. SABO: de la Torre, aye. Board member Le? 24 25 MR. LE: Aye. 26 MR. SABO: Le, aye. Board Member Mactaggart? 27 MR. MACTAGGART: Aye.

MR. SABO: Mactaggart, aye. Chair Urban?

28

MS. URBAN: Aye.

MR. SABO: Urban, aye. There are four ayes and no noes.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, members of the board. The resolution is adopted unanimously. Mr. Thompson, that is basically the compensation we can give you, and it is very heartfelt, I will say that. Thank you very much for your service. We miss you. We will continue to miss you, but we look forward to future interactions and really appreciate everything that you've given to the board.

And with that, everyone, we will circle back to agenda item #2, which is the chairperson's update.

So, once again, welcome everybody to this meeting. I have just a couple of updates. First, as we always attendees who haven't attended every meeting, I will briefly situate today's meeting within the board's current work so that it's clear what our purpose is today and what's coming up.

Our overall focus continues to have two main components: the work necessary to build out the agency and completing our first substantial rulemaking package. We've been spending the bulk of some meetings on rulemaking and others on discussions of the administrative and structural tasks. Today's meeting is closely focused on the rulemaking. We've adopted a streamlined agenda for today to facilitate our discussion of two key rulemaking issues: considering for approval the rulemaking package the agency has been developing with public input and considering a preliminary request for comment in preparation for some additional rulemaking.

I anticipate that our next meeting will focus more on building tasks, including some administrative policy and oversight matters following from our discussions in our December public meeting and

previous meetings. So, for example, we will likely take up discussions on the agency budget, strategic planning process, and some processes and procedures for board and agency work.

So, I just have a couple of updates before we move into our rulemaking discussion for today.

3

4

5

6

10

11

13

17

18

19

20

21

22 |

25

26

27

28

First, as I alluded to when I was opening the meeting, I am thrilled to announce that Ms. Lisa Kim has joined the CPPA as our senior privacy counsel and advisor. Ms. Kim comes to us from the California Department of Justice, where she was a deputy attorney general focused on consumer privacy. We have been very fortunate already to have her service as one of the DOJ counsel who supported the CPPA as we grow and especially fortunate for her work on the rulemaking and we are discussing today. Now we are exceptionally fortunate to have her join the legal team here at the CPPA. We welcome you to the agency, Ms. Kim, and we are so happy to have you become 16 part of our team.

Secondly, I would also like to draw everyone's attention to a couple of new job postings for senior staff. The agency this week posted positions for an assistant chief counsel and for a deputy director of enforcement. The deputy director of enforcement will lead and manage enforcement activities and will oversee the enforcement division of the agency. Please check out these positions and apply or forward them to promising candidates. You can find the postings, along with postings for other open positions, on our website under career opportunities. So, if you go to www.cppa.ca.gov and look for the career opportunities link, you can check out the career opportunities page.

Finally, I will offer my periodic reminder to everyone about

1 | our email lists. If you're interested in the board's and agency's work, you can sign up to receive announcements of Board meetings. You can also sign up specifically to receive communications about the rulemaking process. So, to do that again, go to www.cppa.ca.gov and you can click on 'join our mailing list' on the front page, which will take you to a page with instructions and information about those lists. Those are my updates. Any questions or comments from board members? Great. Oh, sorry, Mr. Le?

5

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

MR. LE: I want to congratulate the agency for being able to hire on Ms. Lisa Kim. I'm very happy to have her on staff and excited.

MS. URBAN: Agreed. Thank you, Mr. Le. All right. If there aren't other board comments or questions at this time, Mr. Sabo, would you mind letting us know if there's any public comments on this agenda item. You're on mute, Mr. Sabo.

MR. SABO: Rookie mistake, I apologize. We are on agenda item 2, chairperson's update. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone if you're joining us by phone this morning. Again, this is agenda item 2, chairperson's update. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raised hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any hands raised at this time.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. Once again, delighted to welcome you officially, Ms. Kim. And with that we will now move to agenda item #4.

Agenda item #4 is titled "Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed Regulations, Sections 7000-7304, To Implement, Interpret, and Make Specific the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018, as Amended by the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020, Including Possible Adoption or Modification of the Text."

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

Today, the board will be discussing staff's proposed final rulemaking package for section 7000 to 7304, and we'll be considering finally approving the text for submission to the Office of Administrative Law.

This is a potentially big day, and I'm quite excited. The rulemaking process in California is robust, lengthy, and favors public participation and transparency, especially when it's combined with the board's involvement under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. To locate today's discussion in the board's work in previous meetings, I will remind everyone of how this works and the steps taken in the rulemaking process up to this point.

Now, I know that some of you are familiar with this and have heard it before. But for those of you who are already familiar with  $16\parallel$ it, please bear with me for those who are not as familiar because the process does diverge from a lot of people's common understanding of rulemaking, and it can be confusing otherwise.

So, rulemaking in California agencies follows the California Administrative Procedure Act and, for agencies run by boards like ours, also the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. And we follow this basic process. So, I'll just sketch out how we got here.

First, the board with counsel and staff as they were hired-and thanks again to everyone who helped us out while we were mostly just a board-created a structure for developing the regulations in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

The Regulations Subcommittee, which was Ms. de la Torre and 28 myself, prepared a preliminary initial invitation for comments to gather information, to support our understanding in advance of the rulemaking, and develop some rulemaking subcommittees, which we proposed to the board and were accepted. These included the Updated CCPA Rules Subcommittee, which I was a member of along with Ms. Angela Sierra, who has since left the board, and the New CPRA Rules Subcommittee, which is comprised of Ms. de la Torre and Mr. Le.

5

6

7

10

11

12

16 ||

17

18

19

20

21

22

27

This allowed the board to work on substance more than a board would normally need to do in order to make progress on the process and gather information while we were building the staff. We also had a rulemaking process subcommittee with Ms. de la Torre and Mr. Thompson to advise on that.

So, we worked as the board with some counsel from OAG and others as we hired staff, and we put out that preliminary request for initial invitation for comments in October of 2021 and then held informational sessions with experts and stakeholder sessions, a total of five days of those in March and early April of 2022.

So, that gave us a strong background and understanding-those preliminary activities—and with that background in place, the agency put together an initial proposed rulemaking package. At this point, the formal rulemaking process under California law began.

When an agency in California writes regulations to implement a statute, it must follow the California APA, which requires a formal process to ensure that the public has input. Once a rulemaking package is ready, it is published with a Notice of Proposed Action and some explanatory materials, most notably the Initial Statement of Reasons, or ISOR, which gives background and the agency's reasoning. This went out on July 8, 2022. Then there is a period of 28 at least 45 days during which the public can submit written

comments to the agency on the proposed rulemaking package. We received written comments during the period ending August 23, 2022. There's usually a hearing, which we did hold. We held hearings on August 24 and 25.

3

5

6

11

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

27

The agency then considers all the comments and whether to make modifications in response to those comments. If it makes any substantial changes in response, then there will be another time period for written comments of at least 15 days. In our case, staff considered public comments and put together proposed modifications to the regulations which the board considered on October 28 and 29 of 2022, and in that meeting, the board decided on some additional changes, approved most of the staff's changes, and approved the package for the 15-day comment period. Staff implemented the additional changes and gathered further public comment in November. Then staff considered all the comments, prepared the final 16 | rulemaking package (including responses to each comment), and has now published a lot of those materials or those materials for the meeting today.

Should the board approve the package today, then it will go to the Office of Administrative Law for review and approval. There is a little bit of extra process because of how Bagley-Keene interacts with the APA process. And I should say staff has prepared an FAQ on our website under 'Regulations' to help everyone understand this if they get confused. Compared to, for example, the federal rulemaking process, which is often more familiar, many agencies in California have this additional layer of process.

The California Privacy Protection Agency is governed by this 28 | board. Under our implementing statute, the board holds the agency's rulemaking authority. So, we must approve commencing the formal rulemaking process, any suggested modifications, and the final rules. The board, in turn, is governed by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, which requires that all of our discussions are considered in public meetings, noticed at least 10 calendar days in advance, and that any materials distributed to the Board for the meeting are also available to the public. In practice, that means the public gets to see draft regulations, suggested modifications and proposed final package, and as well gets to listen to, and comment on, our discussions in advance of those steps being taken under the APA.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

17

18

20

21

22

25

27

So, this is different from what many regulatory advocates are familiar with, especially for federal rulemaking, but also for rulemaking in California by agencies not governed by boards. In most situations, the first time the public sees rules or 15 ||  $16 \parallel \mathsf{modifications}$  is when they're published to begin the formal rulemaking process or to continue it. In our case, however, for example, the initial package was ready in May of 2022, but it couldn't be released for public comment until the board was able to discuss and approve it in June. So, it was out for the public to be able to look at in May and then the board had to discuss it in public, and it was released in July. Same with the modifications: the board had to first discuss any of those and approve them before it could go through the next stage of the formal process.

Today, we are discussing agency staff counsel's recommendations to the board to adopt the final rulemaking package and approve it for submission to OAL. Again, all those materials are available; they've been available on our website. So,

accordingly, when you put these two together—the APA and Bagley-Keene—the process takes longer, but it provides additional transparency and lots of opportunity for public input. So, that's where we are. That's how it works.

And I believe that the plan is for Mr. Laird and Ms. Kim to explain a little bit about the process going forward and introduce the materials in the package. And then the board will discuss the package, and we will discuss our proposed next step that we want to take with regards to the package. So, with that, I will hand things over to Mr. Laird and Ms. Kim. I'd really like to thank them and their team for taking so much care to consider the comments and for preparing these materials for the Board and the public.

They do support our discussion, of course, but they also provide that extra measure of transparency and notice for the public, and anyone who looks at them can see that it was an extraordinary amount of care, thought, and work that went into it. So, thank you very much for this, and I will hand it over to you.

MR. PHILIP LAIRD: Thank you, Chair Urban, and good morning to the members of the board. Before I turn things over to Ms. Kim, I'd like to take a moment to go over a few points about where we are with this package and then the next steps that will occur. As Chair Urban described in her summary, we are now at the point in the rulemaking process where the board may vote to formally approve the proposed regulations for submission to the Office of Administrative Law, which I may refer to as OAL just to shorten that a little bit. And staff is, in fact, recommending that the Board do so today. The text of the rules is substantively unchanged from the version the board reviewed during the October 28-29 meeting. As a reminder,

1 | in that meeting, board members raised, and staff did note, some additional topics and proposed guidance on future changes. As discussed, staff intends to bring those proposals back before the Board for consideration once the current package is finalized and in effect. And I'll note that this really is common practice for all state agencies since there are often some issues, particularly in a complex rulemaking, that require additional analysis as well as items that arise over time. And this really is the nature of  $9 \parallel \text{rulemaking if we, as regulators, are staying attentive and nimble}$ to an evolving industry, practices, and consumer protections. So, in any event, we look forward to revisiting those topics at a future meeting.

3

5

6

11

12

13

15 l

18

19

20

21

24

25

27

28 ||

Now, in terms of next steps with this package, if the board approves these proposed regulations today, staff will work quickly to finalize and print all required documentation and anticipates  $16\parallel ext{filing}$  the final package with the Office of Administrative Law within about two weeks. That would then kick off OAL's review 17 || period, which is 30 business days, which—I say "business days,"—I mean that it usually averages out to about 45 calendar days during which they have to complete their review of the package. Towards the end of their review, the Office of Administrative Law will notify us if they intend to approve or disapprove the rulemaking 22 || 23 || package for any reason.

While I know our team has done an outstanding job preparing a rulemaking file that meets every requirement under the Administrative Procedure Act, the truth is nearly all rulemaking files, and especially those that are as large and complex as ours, will have some issues that OAL identifies as needing revision.

Sometimes these issues arise in supporting documentation, such as the Final Statement of Reasons, and can be revised by staff during that 30-business day review window that OAL has. Other issues, however, such as those existing in the text of the regulation can only be revised with an additional notice of modified text and 15day public comment period, which, in our case, would also need to be authorized and directed by the board members.

5

6

8

10

11

13

17

18

20

21

22

25

27

For these reasons, we request today that if making a motion to approve the regulations, the board authorize staff to do the following: to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking process, including filing of the final package with OAL; to allow staff to amend any documents within the rulemaking package, other than the text, as necessary to ensure clarity and accuracy and to address any issues that OAL might raise to our attention; also, we would request that the executive director and staff be given the  $16 \parallel$  authority to make any non-substantive changes, such as for grammar or misspelled terms to the proposed regulations themselves; and finally, we would ask that the board authorize staff to withdraw the rulemaking file, in part or in whole, from consideration by OAL if we determine the legal risks associated with disapproval by OAL would warrant further consideration of the board.

Now, to be clear, under that final authorization I just described, one possible scenario is that OAL could identify a handful of regulations within the package requiring revision. And in that case, OAL could permit us to withdraw only those regulations while allowing the remainder of the package to proceed to approval. So, given the board's interest in completing these regulations as soon as possible, we think it is important for staff 1 to maintain that level of flexibility just so that we can maximize our ability to complete the rulemaking quickly.

3

5

6

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

27

28

Now, I know I just covered a lot, so I'll be happy to answer any questions from board members about the process I just described in a moment. However, first, I would like to turn the floor to Ms. Kim, who I'd like to kind of echo the sentiments shared earlier. I am absolutely thrilled as part of our legal division team as well. 8 And I'll turn to Ms. Kim to summarize all that's occurred since our October 2022 meeting and to explain the supporting materials that were provided today in connection with this agenda item. So, Ms. Kim?

MS. LISA KIM: Thank you, Mr. Laird, and I just also want to say thank you for the warm welcome. I am very honored to be part of the agency, and I look forward to working with the board as well as the entire agency staff to make this the best agency out there. So,  $16 \parallel$  as Mr. Laird stated, the final proposed regulations before the board have not substantively changed since the board's meeting on October 28 and 29 when the board approved the modifications for an additional 15-day comment period.

During the 15-day comment period, we received around 50 comment letters comprising up around 450 pages, and staff carefully considered all the comments received and determined that no further changes to the proposed regulations were necessary at this time in light of the board's previous direction. To note, many of the comments reiterated previous comments that were submitted during the 45-day comment period and/or they supported the regulations themselves. Accordingly, we began preparing materials necessary for OAL to review the package, and drafts of the substantive documents

were included in the meeting materials for today to assist the board in making its final determination regarding the regulations and to explain what has been included.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

27

28 ||

So, first, the Final Text of Regulations has been added to the meeting and materials. Now, this is the text of the proposed regulations that the board would be submitting to OAL if they so approve today. They are compared to the current regulations existing and in effect now. So, blue reflects additions, and red reflects the strikeouts for deletions. Please note that it's only two colors instead of the rainbow version that showed the different changes made throughout the entire rulemaking process. This is the one that just compares to what's existing and what we want the final product to look like.

What we've also included was the draft Final Statement of Reasons. Now, the Final Statement of Reasons-or we call it FSOR for 16 || short—is the part of the rulemaking package that provides a narrative explanation of any changes made from the original version of the regulations that were submitted at the start of the rulemaking process. It updates the Initial Statement of Reasons, which explains the initial version of the regulations. So together, the ISOR and the FSOR explain the purpose and benefit for each regulation, including why the regulation is necessary.

Now, what was also included were the draft FSOR Appendices A and C. Now, these are the draft summaries and responses to all the comments that we received during the 45-day and the 15-day comment period. The two appendices are pretty lengthy; together they comprise about 500 pages. But this is reflective of the fact that we received a total of around 150 comment letters comprising of

1 over 1,500 pages during the 45-day and 15-day comment periods combined. As well, they include the two days of public hearings. And so, you'll see in the 45-day chart, or Appendix A, that there are notations identifying the specific comment as well as the specific speaker during the public hearings. These charts summarize and respond to all the substantive comments raised. We consolidated the comments where possible, and, in accordance with the APA, whenever we did not accept the comment, we explained why we did not accept the comment in the response.

5

6

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

27

28

Finally, we also included the Form 399 and its addendum. This is basically the economic analysis of the impact of the regulations. 12 | Revisions were made to it because some of the proposed regulations were deleted, and so the necessary changes had to have been made. And these two documents were prepared by the economists that we had 15 | hired to assist us in doing the economic analysis. So those were the  $16 \parallel$  materials included, and, as Mr. Laird mentioned earlier, we are both here and happy to answer any questions about these materials or next steps in the process.

MS. URBAN: Thank you so much, Ms. Kim. I have some thoughts, but I will wait to see if there are any comments or questions from other members of the board. We could all be slightly glazed from reviewing all of your amazing work. So, Ms. De La Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: I'm not sure if there was an explanation as to the Form 399, and the find is in that form. Maybe there was, and I missed it. Could we get a little bit of understanding of that form, how it was prepared ...?

MS. URBAN: I think the narrative is in the materials for today. So, beyond the form, there's a narrative from the economists explaining their reasoning for today.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

24

MS. DE LA TORRE: No, no, I understand. I'm just saying a reference to the fact that the document is there and why it's there?

MS. URBAN: Oh, I see, sorry. Yep, Ms. Kim?

MS. KIM: Sure, the Form 399 is a required form that is required by the APA and basically is an analysis of the economic impact that the proposed regulations have. Our economists helped us prepare that form. And we also included something called the Addendum to the Form 399, and that just goes into a greater explanation of the conclusions that were made and included in the Form 399. They detail the specific different regulations that we identified as having an economic impact.

And I wanted to just clarify because I think there's been some confusion reflected, especially in the comments, regarding the 16 || economic analysis. The requirement for us is to look at the economic impact specifically of the regulation itself and not of the law. So, there are many economic impacts that the CCPA or the CPRA amendments to the CCPA had with regard to how it would affect a business and how much it would cost. But that is not what is required of us when we propose the regulations. What we are looking at is what, in addition to the basic baseline, would be the 22 || 23 || cost of the regulations.

And so that baseline is basically what is currently existing in law is already a cost that we don't have to take into consideration. What is required by statute is a cost that we do not have to take into consideration with the regulation. What we do is whatever is directly related to the cost that the regulation in

1 | itself would have on businesses as well as consumers. That is what the Form 399, as well as its addendum, explains. And so that seems to be a little bit of a point of confusion among the public, but I hope that especially our responses to the economic analysis comments that we have included in the 45-day and the 15-day comment charts or the appendices will help explain.

5

6

7

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Kim. And I thank you for that good explanation and Ms. de la Torre for asking the question as well because I do think, if one is just looking from the outside, it can sometimes be a little bit difficult to tell. Another feature I noticed in the comments when I was going through them is that fairly regularly someone would express an argument for us to change something that's actually in the statute, which, of course, we cannot do. I say "of course" but that may not be necessarily intuitive, and it's totally understandable. But just like we cannot change the statute, we need to isolate the cost of the regulations themselves away from the statute itself. So, I think it's just really helpful to everyone to have a little bit of that explanation set out.

Ms. de la Torre, does that answer your question? Was there more? MS. DE LA TORRE: No, that's exactly what I was asking for. Thank you so much, Ms. Kim.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Mr. Mactaggart? MR. MACTAGGART: Thanks. So, a couple of things. First of all, I just want to congratulate the team on an extraordinary amount of work. I mean, reading this thing I can just imagine late nights getting this ready for this board meeting. And Ms. Kim, I'm so personally gratified you joined the agency. You've been doing

1 these regulations since the beginning of CCPA. And so, it's wonderful to have the continuity and to have your expertise and wisdom as you go out and write these regulations for the first time. It's quite something to see an agency do this because most other agencies already have the regulations, and they're kind of tweaking them here and there, and you guys are creating them from scratch. It's an extraordinary amount of work, and I'm excited to hopefully adopt these today and move on. And so, I just want to say thank you for the work-all of you. I know it's been just a mountain. Thank you.

5

6

10

11

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

27

28

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Mactaggart. Any further comments from the board? Yes, Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Yeah, again, echo the thanks to staff. Reading these 167 pages of comments on top of the actual comments themselves must have taken quite a bit of time. Mr. Laird mentioned that we'd 16 be bringing up future items for rulemaking, and-I'm just curious-do we as a board need to highlight any of those that we pulled out from those comments, or is it already all in a list that you all are tracking?

MR. LAIRD: Great question, Mr. Le. We did take careful notes of all the board's suggestions and ideas and topics that they'd like to bring up for future items. And so, we will be prepared to discuss those when this rulemaking is complete.

MR. LE: Okay, and I meant also from the ones in the summaries and responses to the 15-day comments and the 45-day comments. There were other items that the board members didn't mention. I was just curious if there is like a running list of whenever you said "future analysis on this issue is required..." I meant there's a lot

of questions around like employee benefits and whether things are disruptive screens or dark patterns. So, I was just curious: is that also in the list, or is it just like the board-mentioned items?

MR. LAIRD: I think our plan was to certainly prioritize the board-mentioned items, but I think we have cataloged all the feedback we've received, and especially those items that we've indicated will require sort of further analysis. Ms. Kim, if you have anything to add on top of that, but I think it's fair to say staff's taking quite careful note of all of those comments.

MS. KIM: Yes.

3

4

6

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. URBAN: I would just say that items that we brought up in the October meeting, I know were catalogued carefully, and we read them back out so they're in the transcript and in the notes and everything for staff to be able to easily pick those up.

MS. KIM: Yes, I just wanted to say we do have a running list, and the two that you mentioned just now are already included in that list. So, it's a long list. That being said, we will get back to you all.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Kim. Mr. Mactaggart?

MR. MACTAGGART: Thank you. Just on this topic, I'm just kind of wondering as we evolve and move forward, is it appropriate, Madam Chair, to have an agenda item just at every meeting-I guess 23 | it could be with other business-where any board member or member of the public could bring up a request to put another rule in the queue to be examined or another issue to be examined? Because I just think that the nature of this is that this is the first. This ||is the major piece of it but inevitably they're going to be things where we have different ways of thinking about it. So, I kind of

1 think this is going to be a long work in progress. So that's just my question.

3

5

6

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

25

26

27

MS. URBAN: Great, thank you, Mr. Mactaggart. And I'll just amplify what you were saying at the end about it being a work in progress, which doesn't mean that these rules aren't completed themselves. But the nature of rulemaking is to be responsive to the public's needs and to businesses' needs, and our statute explicitly exhorts us to do that. So, by the very nature of the agency's work and our work as a board, we will be regularly considering items for potential rulemaking or considering rulemaking so I really appreciate that you highlighted that. That's another thing that's just important for us to keep front of mind and for everybody to understand as we're meeting.

In terms of your process question, with your indulgence, I would like to discuss with Mr. Laird in between meetings what all 16 the different sort of possibilities just so I don't misspeak here in the meeting and so we have time to think it through. Certainly, board members can contact staff at any time and let them know that something has occurred to them, that they're thinking of something in terms of bringing up things in board meetings, as I think you were alluding to Mr. Mactaggart, and why you were asking. Of course, we have to stick to the properly-noticed public agenda so that we are not bringing up some topic that is important to someone in the public without the public knowing that that is what we were going to discuss.

There is certainly the opportunity for agendas that have an agenda item for collecting future agenda items, which is most 28 meetings. We don't have one today because we're very focused on the 1 | rulemaking items. That would be is an opportunity to bring something up for discussion in a future board meeting, for example, and there may be other options, maybe something along the lines of what you suggested. I just want to be sure that Mr. Laird and I can fully talk about it so that I can give you the best answer when we come back for our next meeting if that makes sense. And then, in the interim, board members can always reach out to staff with topics that have come up. Ms. de la Torre?

5

6

9

10

11

13

17

18

20

21

22

25

28 ||

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I just wanted to take a moment to remind everybody that we created a process subcommittee, and one of the things that we asked from that subcommittee was to identify and propose to the board ways to do rulemaking moving forward. So, I think some of this conversation actually should happen within the context of that subcommittee because it was created for that purpose and is currently inactive. But I know  $16\parallel$  that we have it in our future agenda items the idea of appointing a new member so that we can reactivate that subcommittee. So, so long as the subcommittee is still standing, I think that is the right forum for the conversation, and then this subcommittee should bring proposals to the board on how to better do this moving forward. So, that was one thing that I wanted to mention.

I also want to echo the words of Mr. Mactaggart, Mr. Le, and Chair Urban in terms of just appreciating the work that the staff has put into these regulations. I have been working in privacy education for many years. Before I joined the board, I thought I was familiar with the APA process, and lo and behold, that was not the case. It's just amazing. And so, it's I think underappreciated sometimes by outsiders, and we might be perceived as being slow,

| | but I do not believe that there is another agency in California-I  $2 \parallel$  mean, I don't have the data here—but I will very much doubt that there is another agency out there in California that has put the package that we have put forward within the time limits that we have done it and with the staff constraints that we had. So that really goes to just highlight the professionalism and the dedication of everybody in the staff that has dedicated time to this.

5

6

8

11

17

18

20

21

22

23

27

28

That said, I wanted to remind the board that, in our prior meeting, I talked about my preference in terms of approving this package, which will have been to pull out one of the rules that has 12 | received a lot of comments; that's 7002. I'm not going to go over  $\parallel$ my prior comments on why that would be my preferred position. I understand that there is no support from the rest of the board to do so, and I'm ready to move this package forward as I see that 16 | there's an advantage to get it approved, and we're talking about the idea of bringing things back to the board to improve on or adopt more to have a more robust conversation among ourselves. I think we are prioritizing timing, and that that's the right thing to prioritize right now. But I look forward to having that conversation with the board.

There is a number of topics that might not have been in the list-that maybe we will have in our minds or might come up, and we should think about how we can better work with the agency to bring those. As much as I appreciate the idea of bringing things back, particularly, I have this one provision that I had more comments around. I also have awareness of the work that goes into implementing these rules for the organizations that have to

implement them. And when we touch it or we change the role, we should be mindful of that work. So, I think that we have to balance the discussions which might be something that we want to have happened, as Mr. Mactaggart was mentioning, in every board meeting we have to decide that and then the process of how that gets enacted. How many packages are we going to put out? That's a burden on our staff and that's a burden on the organizations that have to implement and it is also potentially for consumers confusing if we change our rules.

5

6

10

11

16 ||

17

18

20

21

22

25

27

So, my final thought is that for 7002, the only thing that I want to highlight here is we're setting up a secondary-use test. That is a little different from other tests that have been enacted in Colorado, in Europe, etc. I brought that to the prior meeting. And I'm confident that we can rethink those in future meetings. We're also bringing forward a secondary use—a rule or test—that doesn't have carveouts, clear carveouts for journalistic research, archiving, and statistical uses of data. All of those four users of data tend to be secondary users of data. Europe has carveouts for them. I don't think that we want to be more restrictive than Europe. So that's something that I'm hoping that we will be able to look into in the future, and in terms of enforcement we should consider while the rules are the way they are proposed right now. Research shouldn't be an afterthought when we think about regulations. And there's a lot of different challenges that we are facing from global warming to gun control to COVID that require vast amounts of data to be used to solve for. And with California being a state that prides itself in innovation, I hope that this 28 | board-when we go back and reconsider the rules-has awareness and

considers those uses that are in the public interest and to ensure that we continue to be the engine of innovation that we have always been. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. de la Torre. Any other comments or questions from other board members? Okay.

3

4

5

6

10

11

13

17

18

20

21

22

25

26

27

28

In that case, I just had a few thoughts in line with what other board members have said. I wanted to-before I suggest a motion-to pause for a moment and somewhat formally acknowledge and express gratitude for the tremendous work that has gone into this rulemaking package by everyone involved.

Proposition 24 created the agency at the end of 2020. My fellow board members and I were appointed in March of 2021 and began our work with our first meeting in June of 2021. From the very beginning, we had the benefit of guidance and support from a 15 | number of other state agencies, for example Business, Consumer 16 | Services, and Housing Agency; the Department of Consumer Affairs; and the Office of the Attorney General. Mr. Laird, for example, served as our first meeting counsel and provided crucial information about board process and rulemaking before he joined us from another agency. The tech team at the Department of Consumer Affairs created our website and our mailing lists, which maybe sounds quotidian, but it provided a way for us to release our preliminary request for comment and to receive comments from the public in return. And, of course, the expert attorneys at the Office of the Attorney General, including Ms. Kim, providing the counsel to put the package together.

Fortunately, in October of 2021, the board hired our executive director, Ashkan Soltani, who has overseen the building of an

exceptional in-house legal team and support staff. And it's their incredibly hard work, long hours, and thoughtful attention to our statute and public comment that you can see partially-and I'm just going to say partially-Mr. Mactaggart mentioned the long nights. I don't know that all those nights actually ended-really exceptionally, committed work on the part of the team. And this sort of broader team and our growing internal legal team, they have 8 | just been tireless in considering all the information we've gathered, working with the board subcommittees, working with other agency staff to carefully craft that draft regulatory text, and then to carefully consider all the public comments on that text. They're peerless in their expertise. They have experience with consumer law, privacy law, and, specifically, the California Consumer Privacy Act, and the existing regulations, as well as California administrative law.

3

5

6

10

11

13

15 l

16

17

18

20

21

22 l

25

26

27

28 ||

We've mentioned Ms. Kim's expertise, but it's worth mentioning again also Supervising Deputy Attorney General Stacy Schesser at the AG's office and the rest of the team there. Mr. Soltani; our own agency counsel, including Mr. Laird; our Acting General Counsel Brian Soublet; staff counsel, including Neelofer Shaikh, Kristen Anderson, Nelson Richards, and others, so many others, and many other people at the agency. This was really all hands. Mr. Sabo's team and others helped produce all of these materials so that we could be fully informed and fully transparent. They're exceptional, and I want to thank them.

I'd also like to take a moment to thank my fellow board members, including our prior colleagues on the board, Angela Sierra and Chris Thompson. This board is both intrepid and dedicated. It's 1 | not everyone-as Mr. Thompson suggested earlier-who would be willing to volunteer to build an agency that was brand new and had substantial and important responsibilities for the people of California and for businesses who serve the people in California. Without staff yet in place, the board still found a way to make substantial progress on this rulemaking, to engage the public actively, and to work in subcommittees to get started on and support staff in developing the substance of what is a really complex rulemaking package. This is well beyond the call of duty for members of boards usually, and it is incredibly appreciated.

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

27

And last, but very much not least, I want to thank the public for its attention to the board's work and its thoughtful and robust participation in the rulemaking process. Those 1,500 pages of comments were exceptionally important to the staff and the board's understanding of the rules and how they might affect all different 16 affected parties and what people needed and what they were asking for and, of course, just really critical to the endeavor and I know a lot of work on the part of everyone who has participated so far. So, I really want to thank everyone who has participated in our meetings, who's written comments, who joined hearings, what have you. Every comment has been valuable so thank you to everyone.

The board will next consider public comments. And as is usually my practice, I will suggest a motion to put on the table so everyone is informed as to what we're thinking of. If they would like to take that into account in their public comment. I will ask for a motion to approve and adopt the regulations as modified; to direct staff to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking 28 process, including the filing of the final rulemaking package with

 $1 \parallel$  the Office of Administrative Law, the amendment of any documents within the rulemaking package, other than the text of the rules, as necessary to ensure clarity, accuracy, and compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act; to authorize the executive director to make any non-substantive changes to the proposed regulations, and finally, as Mr. Laird explained earlier, to further authorize 6 || staff to withdraw the rulemaking file, in whole or in part, from consideration by the Office of Administrative Law at any time if,  $9 \parallel$  in their opinion, the legal risks associated with disapproval of these regulations would warrant further consideration from the board.

5

11

12

14

15

18

20

21

25

26

27

28

So, I believe those are the sort of components of what we need to decide today. And with that I will ask Mr. Sabo to request public comment.

MR. SABO: We are on agenda item 4 in relation to the 16 | proposed regulations. If you'd like to make a comment at this time, 17 | please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone. Your name will be called when it's your turn, and you'll be invited to unmute yourself. Those dialing in by phone can press \*6 to unmute. You will have three minutes to make your comment, and I will let you know when your three minutes are up. So, at this time, if you'd like to speak on agenda item 4 in relation to the proposed regulations, again, please raise your hand at this time using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or pressing \*9 on your phone.

First, we have Ray Kiddy. I'm going to unmute you at this time.

RAY KIDDY: Thank you. I just wanted to say I would encourage

1 the agency and the board to consider ways in which their webpage can be a more substantive aid for the public to figure out a lot of these issues. As somebody who is not an owner of an information company and not on the legal staff of such a company, I found it difficult to add a substantive comment to the list. For example, you all mentioned the running list of issues. Can this be on the webpage for the public to view? Can there be a place for the public 8 to share concerns, those being, after some time and perhaps  $9 \parallel \text{redacted}$ , shared with the public so that this can be a resource, not just for the rulemaking process, but also a place where the public can find out how their privacy concerns are being addressed?  $12 \parallel \text{And}$  if it could be not quite a technically sophisticated  $\parallel$ method/application that would be great. A lot of people with some privacy concerns are not lawyers and aren't tied into this process as well as they could be, and so I ask if the agency could think on ways to provide information, provide help, and receive information from the public at-large oriented to the public at-large. Thank you.

5

6

11

13

17

18

20

21

22

23

27

28

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much for the comment. Mr. Sabo, is there further public comment?

MR. SABO: Yes, next we have Zach S. Zach S., whenever you're ready you can go ahead and unmute yourself and begin your three minutes.

ZACH S.: Hi, I was just wondering if it would be possible for the CPPA staff to provide just a list of the non-material changes that were made between the previous version of the proposed regulations released in November and the text that is either finalized here or as modified with the grammatical changes. Just from a practitioner's standpoint, it would be useful to see

whatever changes are actually there. Because as released—when you got rid of the rainbow, it made it really difficult for document comparison.

MR. LE: Chair Urban, you're on mute.

MS. URBAN: Oh, I was thanking the commenter for the comment. I'm fond of the rainbow myself. Is there further public comment?

MR. SABO: Again, we're on agenda item 4 with respect to the proposed final regulations. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone. This is for agenda item 4 with respect to the final regulations.

Bruce Wick, I will unmute you at this time and again you have three minutes. Please proceed when ready. Bruce Wick, you've been unmuted if you'd like to speak at this time.

BRUCE WICK: Okay, can you hear me?

MR. SABO: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

27

BRUCE WICK: Thank you. The regulations, as far as I understand it, will apply to some of employers brand new this year. Those who, for instance, contractors who work only with general contractors, have no consumer information, but have employee information, and these people are having to for the first time deal with the Privacy Act and all the requirements. And I appreciate all the work you've all done from the ground up on developing an agency and regulations. Will there be, as this goes forward, a practical set of guidelines, guidance, FAQs for those employers who are over \$25 million in revenue, don't have consumer information, but now have to deal with employee information that is not exempted going forward? That would 28 be really helpful to those employers if we could do something like

that. Thank you.

2

3

4

6

10

11

12

13

17

18

20

21

22

25

26

27

28

MS. URBAN: Thank you. Thank you very much for the comment, Bruce Wick. Is there further public comment, Mr. Sabo?

MR. SABO: If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your || hand using Zoom's `raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone. This is in regard to agenda item 4 with respect to the proposed final regulations. Again, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 on your phone. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing further hands this time.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Sabo, and thank you to all of the folks who offered comments just now.

The board having considered public comments to the proposed modifications that were noticed on November 3, 2022, may I now have the following motion: to adopt and approve the regulations as modified; to direct staff to take all steps necessary to complete  $16 \parallel$  the rulemaking process, including the filing of the final rulemaking package with the Office of Administrative Law, the amendment of any documents within the rulemaking package, other than the text of the rules, as necessary to ensure clarity, accuracy, and compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act; to authorize the executive director to make non-substantive changes to the proposed regulations and to further authorize staff to withdraw the rulemaking file, in whole or in part, from consideration by the Office of Administrative Law at any time if, in their opinion, the legal risks associated with disapproval of these regulations warrant further consideration by the board?

MR. LE: I so move.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. May I have a second?

MR. MACTAGGART: I second.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Mactaggart. I have a motion and a second. Mr. Sabo, would you please conduct the roll call vote?

MR. SABO: Yes, the motion is to approve as stated by the chair. Board member de la Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye.

MR. SABO: De la Torre, aye. Board member Le?

MR. LE: Aye.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

21

22

24

25

27

MR. SABO: Le, aye. Board member Mactaggart?

MR. MACTAGGART: Aye.

MR. SABO: Mactaggart, aye. Chair Urban?

MS. URBAN: Aye.

MR. SABO: Urban, aye. Madam Chair, you have four ayes and no noes.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo, and thank you very much to the board members, staff, and the public for everything that they've put into this rulemaking package. I'm very much looking forward to seeing it proceed through the Office of Administrative Law and appreciate that we have had a unanimous vote, and the motion is adopted. Mr. Laird, please follow the procedures necessary to implement the direction of the board today.

Very excited to reach this milestone in the Board's work and in the agency's work on behalf of California, and so thank you to everybody.

I want to use my little celebration icon on Zoom, but I'm just not sure it won't translate to the transcript so I'll speak my celebration instead, and we'll move now to agenda item #5 if everyone is all right to continue. But I do want to take a quick check to see

1 | if anybody needs a break. Nope, okay. Not seeing any for a break, let's move to agenda item #5. Agenda item #5 is titled "Preliminary Rulemaking Activities for New Rules on Risk Assessments, Cybersecurity Audits, and Automated Decision-making."

At its December 16, 2022 meeting, the board heard a presentation from the new CPRA Rules Advisory Subcommittee on its advice to begin preliminary information gathering on the set of potential rulemaking topics named in the agenda item today. These topics are new to the California Consumer Privacy Act with amendments from the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020, the ballot initiative.

5

10

11

12

17

18

21

25

The New CPRA subcommittee is Ms. de la Torre and Mr. Le. They advise putting out a preliminary invitation for comment to gather information on these topics in advance of the potential rulemaking on them. The board agreed with the subcommittee's 16 advice, and staff have now prepared a draft preliminary invitation for comment for the board to consider. This is in your materials under agenda item #5. If you would please turn your attention to that, I believe Mr. Laird is going to present it today. I will hand 20 | it over to Ms. de la Torre, Mr. Le, or whoever it should be. And before I do that though, I'd like to offer my many thanks again to Mr. Le and Ms. de la Torre for their work on this and to the staff for putting together the proposed preliminary invitation for comment. So, I believe it's Mr. Laird?

MR. LAIRD: Yes, thank you, Chair, Urban. So, I'd like to take a moment. I know we've been doing a lot of gratitude, but I would like to take a moment to also thank the folks on our legal team, especially Ms. Neelofer Shaikh and Kristen Anderson for the tremendous work they've done to support this invitation for preliminary comments and to support the subcommittee. As Chair Urban described, the document that has been provided as part of today's meeting materials is an update to the draft questions presented by the New Rules Subcommittee at last December's meeting and incorporates a handful of revisions and additions suggested by board members since that meeting.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 ||

25

26

27

28 ||

Additionally, the draft invitation generally frames the request for comments in a manner that is consistent with the agency's first invitation for preliminary comments that was referred to earlier back in 2021.

At this point, staff is recommending that the board approved this draft invitation to be released to the public to open it up for comments. And but as a reminder though, I want to just 15 note that this will not actually commence a formal rulemaking  $16 \parallel \text{process}$  under the APA but instead will serve as an opportunity for preliminary stakeholder input and information-gathering to help inform the agency's development of draft regulations specifically on the subjects of cybersecurity audits, risk assessments, and automated decision-making

So generally at this point, I'm happy to answer any questions you may have about this draft of the document that's been prepared for today's meeting, but otherwise I'm happy to just turn it over to the board for any discussion you have about this but would would recommend we proceed with the preliminary rulemaking.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Laird. I think this is a wonderfully comprehensive and carefully put-together set of questions, and I really appreciate staff's additional work once they picked it up from  $1 \parallel$  the subcommittee in December and the framing that staff about it. So, I think this is a very helpful next step and support it. Any other comments from board members. Yes, Mr. Le?

3

4

6

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

27

MR. LE: Yeah, I also want to thank staff for preparing this this list of questions. For the public and those listening, I think these questions reflect the seriousness with which we're approaching this issue of automated decision-making, risk assessments, and cybersecurity audits, and, in particular, there's just so many different contexts in which these automated decision systems, for example, are used, and the board and our subcommittee really would like to understand how regulations should be shaped by these different contexts and different impacts. So we really appreciate and thank you in advance, to the public, for submitting comment. It'll be very helpful for us and in refining and into creating regulations that can work throughout different contexts and uses of these tools.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. Ms. de la Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: I just want to echo the words of Mr. Le. The comments from the public are extremely helpful in this process of rulemaking, and they are going to be particularly helpful for the section of the rules that deals with automatic decision-making, audits, adaptation impact assessments because we do not currently have those in any form in our rules, and they are not delineated in the statue. So, I encourage anybody that has an interest in this subject to bring their comments early to us and take advantage of this opportunity to share with us their thoughts about how we should ensure that Californians are adequately protected in the context of all of these regulations that we are considering. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Further comments or questions from board members? Mr. Sabo, would you please ask if there is any public comment?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

13

17

18

19

20

21

22 l

23

24

MR. SABO: Yes, members of the public, this is in regards to agenda item 5, the preliminary rulemaking item. If you would like to speak on this item, please use Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or press \*9 if you are joining us by phone today.

MS. URBAN: And thank you, Mr. Sabo, and I will ask the members of the public please do raise your hand if you think you might like to comment, but I realized that I didn't put together a potential motion just so everyone has the same information in case anyone wanted to react to it. So, the motion that I will request would be to direct Staff to release to the public an invitation for preliminary comments that's in substantially the form of the draft document reviewed today in connection with this agenda item and  $16\parallel$ invite the public to respond basically. So, I just wanted to be sure that I had that out there, and we'll look forward to any public comment.

MR. SABO: So again, this is in regards to agenda item 5, preliminary rulemaking item. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand using Zoom's 'raise hand' feature or by pressing \*9 if you're joining by phone. Madam Chair, I am not seeing any hands raised at this time.

MS. URBAN: All right, thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. In that case, may I have a motion to direct staff to release to the public an invitation for preliminary comments that is substantially ||in the form of the draft document reviewed today in connection with this agenda item and inviting the public to respond with

written comments within a 45-day period as soon as is technically feasible. 2 MS. DE LA TORRE: I so move. 3 MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. I have a motion. Do I 4 5 have a second? MR. MACTAGGART: Seconded. 6 MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Mactaggart. Mr. Sabo, I have a motion 7 and a second on this motion. Would you please conduct the roll call vote? 10 MR. SABO: Yes, the motion is that which was stated by the chair with regards to the preliminary rulemaking item. Board member de la Torre? 12 13 MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye. MR. SABO: de la Torre, aye. Board member Le? 14 MR. LE: Aye. 15 16 MR. SABO: Le, aye. Board member Mactaggart? MR. MACTAGGART: Aye. 17 18 MR. SABO: Mactaggart, aye. Chair Urban? 19 MS. URBAN: Aye. MR. SABO: Urban, aye. Madam Chair, you have four aye votes and 20 21 no no votes. MS. URBAN: Thank you very much. The motion passes with a 22 vote of 4 to 0. Thank you very much again to the subcommittee, to the staff, and to the board, and I think we will all look forward to public input through this process. Our final agenda item today is #6, adjournment. Before we move to that, I believe that our

MR. ASHKAN SOLTANI: Thank you, Chair Urban. And indeed, I just

executive director would like to say a word of thanks.

27

28

|| || want to thank the board for their careful consideration and support of these draft rules, and I also want to express my sincere gratitude for the tremendous effort that staff have put into getting this package ready for the board's consideration.

I know we've joked about long nights and overnighters, but in reality staff have consistently gone above and beyond to get these materials available to the board with enough time to review. And if  $8 \parallel$  you recall a year ago around this time, the agency had perhaps a handful of people and was entirely reliant on outside help to support our rulemaking and even these meetings. And so, I'm incredibly proud of the progress we've made and the service we've 12 been able to provide, really, thank you all and thank the board and staff for getting us to this important milestone.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Soltani. I can't think of a better way to finish off and move to our final item on the agenda,  $16 \parallel$  which is adjournment. Once again, thanks to everyone, board members, staff, and members of the public, for all of your contributions to the meeting today and to all the board's work. May I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. LE: I so move.

5

6

11

14

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. Is there a second?

MS. DE LA TORRE: I second.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Mr. Sabo, we have a motion and a second, and the board should now vote. Would you please perform the roll call vote?

MR. SABO: Yes, the motion is to adjourn. Board member de la ||Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye.

MR. SABO: De la Torre, aye. Board member Le? MR. LE: Aye. MR. SABO: Le, aye. Board member Mactaggart? MR. MACTAGGART: Aye. MR. SABO: Mactaggart aye, Chair Urban? MS. URBAN: Aye. MR. SABO: Urban, aye. Chair Urban, you have four aye votes and no no votes. MS. URBAN: Thank you very much. The motion has been approved by a vote of 4 to 0, and with that, this meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency board stands adjourned. Thank you very 12 much everyone. (End of recording) 

1	TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
4	)
5	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO )
6	
7	This is to certify that I transcribed the foregoing pages 1 to
8	45 to the best of my ability from an audio recording provided to
9	me. I have subscribed this certificate at Yuba City, California,
10	this <u>8<sup>th</sup></u> day of <u>February 2023.</u>
11	
12	
13	
14	By:
15	CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	