1	CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY BOARD
2	
3	TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED PUBLIC MEETING
4	
5	January 12, 2024
6	
7	
8	Present: JENNIFER URBAN, Chairperson
9	LYDIA DE LA TORRE, Board Member
10	VINHCENT LE, Board Member
11	ALASTAIR MACTAGGART, Board Member
12	JEFFREY WORTHE, Board Member
13	KEVIN SABO, Moderator
14	ASHKAN SOLTANI, Executive Director
15	PHILIP LAIRD, General Counsel
16	TIFFANY GARCIA, Chief Deputy Director
17	VON CHITAMBIRA, Deputy Director of Administration
18	MAUREEN MAHONEY, Deputy Director of Policy and
19	Legislation
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	Transcribed by: FOCUS INTERPRETING

CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY TRANSCRIBED RECORDED PUBLIC MEETING January 12, 2024

4

5

6

10

11

13

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

MS. JENNIFER URBAN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the January 2024 meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. It's January 12, 2024, at 10:09am. Thanks to everyone for your patience while we manage the complexities of the hybrid meeting format. I'm Jennifer Urban, I'm the Chairperson of the Board, and I'm pleased to be here in person with the board members in Oakland and some members of the public, and to welcome any of you via Zoom as well. As ever, before we get started with the substance of the meeting, I have some logistical announcements. First, I'd like to ask everyone -- this sounds very echoey to me. Is it alright on a-- okay, if everybody in the room can take it as ||long as it's picking up alright for the folks online. Sure. Yeah. It's still-- it's quite far from my mouse, but it's-- I feel like the voice of a deity of some sort. Oscar may have the solution. Well, it's still a bit loud. I'm going to go ahead and continue, but please interrupt me if it gets too frustrating. So, ironically, first, I would like to check that everybody else have their microphone muted when they are not speaking. Second, I'd like to ask everyone who is here in person to turn off or silence your cell phone to avoid interruption. Thank you for doing that. And third, importantly, this meeting is being recorded. We do encourage everyone to wear masks if you're attending in person. We are in the \parallel midst of another COVID surge, and we do want to avoid exposing vulnerable members of the community or inadvertently making our

public meetings inaccessible to them. As you know, our temporary ability to meet remotely and still comply with Bagley-Keene has changed quite a bit and is much more limited than it was. Therefore, this meeting is in a hybrid format. My fellow board members and members of the CPPA staff are here in person, and I know most members of the public are joining remotely. As you noticed already, the hybrid format creates some technical complexities so if we have any technical kinks, we'll ask that you please bear with us. We'll pause the meeting and address the issue. Thank you in advance if anything happens for your patience. Let me now go over the logistics of meeting participation. Today's meeting will be run according to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act as required by law. We will proceed through the agenda, which is available as a handout here in Oakland and also on our website. Materials for the meeting are also available as handouts here and on the website. You may notice board members accessing their laptops, phones, or other devices during the meeting. They are using the devices solely to access materials for the board meeting. After each agenda item, there will be an opportunity for questions and discussion by board members. I will also ask for public comment on each agenda item. Each speaker for public comment will be limited to three minutes per agenda item. We also, for the public, have a designated item on the agenda for general public comment. That's number six today. If you are attending via Zoom and you wish to speak on an item, please wait until I call for public comment and allow staff to prepare for Zoom public comment. Then please use your 'Raise the Hand' function, which is in the reaction feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen. If you wish to speak on an item and

6

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 | you're joining by phone, please press star nine on the phone to show the moderator that you are raising your hand. Our moderator will call your name when it's 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 can press star six to unmute. When your comment is completed, the moderator will mute you. Please note, for those of you joining remotely, that the board will only be able to hear you and not see you. So it is helpful if you identify yourself that this is entirely voluntary, and you may input a pseudonym when you log into the meeting if you're using the webinar. If you're participating in person and wish to speak on an item, please wait for me to call for public \parallel comment and then move toward the podium or move toward-- yes, move toward the podium to my right and form a line. When you are called to speak, you will have three minutes at the podium. As with Zoom 16 | attendees, it's always helpful if you identify yourself, but again, this is entirely voluntary and you are free to remain anonymous or refer to yourself with a pseudonym. Please do speak into the microphone, so everyone participating remotely can hear you and your remarks can be recorded in a meeting record. The hybrid meeting format, as I mentioned, is somewhat complex. And, so, I'd especially like to thank the team managing the technical aspects of the meeting today, Ms. Trini Hurtado and Mr. Oscar Estrella. Second, I would like to explain what to do if those attending remotely experience an issue with the remote meeting. For example, the audio dropping. If something happens, please email our Info email address. That's "info@cppa.ca.gov." That is 'i' 'India,' 'n' 'November,' 'f' 'Foxtrot,' 'o' 'Oscar,' '@cppa' (our initials),

6

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 | 'ca' for 'california.gov.' This will be monitored throughout the meeting. If there is an issue that affects the remote meeting, we will pause the meeting to let our technical staff work on fixing the issue. As a reminder, the board always welcomes public comment on the agenda, and it is our intent to ask for public comment before we vote on any agenda item. If, for some reason, I forget to ask for public comment and you wish to speak on that item, please raise your hand. The moderator will alert me and we will recognize you. Once again, each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item, relatedly I'd like to remind everyone of some of the other rules of the road under Bagley-Keene. Both board members and members of the public may discuss agendized items only, and if you're speaking on an agenda item, both board members and members of the public must contain their comments to that agenda item. There are two additional options under Bagley-Keene, however. First, the public specifically can bring up additional topics when the board brings up that agenda item. That is number six today. However, board members cannot respond. We can only listen. In addition, agenda items the items not on the agenda can be suggested for future board meetings when we take up the agenda item designated for that purpose (number seven today). We'll take breaks as needed, including for lunch, and shorter breaks as needed. I'll announce each break and when we plan to return approximately so that members of the public can leave and come back if they wish to do so. Please note that agenda item number eight today is a closed session item. The board will leave the room for the closed session and return after it's completed its closed session discussion. During the closed session time, the Zoom session will remain open

6

11

12

13

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and members of the public can come and go as you like. My thanks to all my fellow board members for their service and everyone working to make the meeting possible. I would like to thank all the conference experts who helped out in addition to our technical staff, Mr. Philip Laird, who's acting as our meeting counsel today, Mr. Ashkan Soltani, here in our capacity as executive director, and our moderator, Mr. Kevin Sabo, who I'd like to thank and welcome and ask him to please go ahead and conduct the roll call.

MR. KEVIN SABO: Yes, the roll call for attendance. Board member de la Torre?

MS. LYDIA DE LA TORRE: Present.

MR. SABO: Present. Board member Le?

MR. VINCHENT LE: Present.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

MR. SABO: Le present. Board member Mactaggart?

MR. ALASTAIR MACTAGGART: Present.

MR. SABO: Mactaggart Present. Board Member Worthe?

MR. JEFFERY WORTHE: Present.

MR. SABO: Worthe present. Chair Urban?

MS. URBAN: Present.

MR. SABO: Urban present. Madam Chair, you have five presents and no noes-- no absences.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. The board has established a quorum. As usual, I would like to let board members know we'll take a roll call vote on any action items. With that, we'll move to agenda item number two, which is an update from our executive director, Mr. Ashkan Soltani. Thank you so much Mr. Soltani for briefing us today. Whenever you're ready, please go ahead.

MR. ASHKAN SOLTANI: Great, thank you, Chair Urban and members of the board. I'm pleased to present our annual update from the ED. First, I'll provide you with a few updates since our last meeting, and then I'll give a quick look-ahead at some highlights as we kick off the year. So, starting with the agency's-- 2023 was a big year for us. I'm pleased to share that since our last hiring update to the board in September, we've added seven new full-time employees and one student in intern across the various divisions. In addition, three of our team members have received promotions within the agency. Since we're a small agency and new, these hires are essential to meeting our mission, and I'd like to thank the Admin team for their incredible effort in helping us grow. I'm also proud to share that our agency participated in CalHR's Superior Accomplishments Awards Program for the first time last year. This program recognizes state employees who have made an exceptional contribution to the state, and nominees must be given-- must have worked at the agency for at least a year. I'm thrilled to share that we had five employees recognized for their service. A few names will be familiar with you: Kristen Anderson, Neelofer Shaikh, Maureen Mahoney. In addition, Julie Hall on our Enforcement team, who also handles our complaints, and Koi Saelee, who's on our Admin team. They were all recognized. Next, I'll move on to the data broker registry. Speaking of an outstanding achievement, I'm pleased to announce that the data broker registry is up and running. As you know, Senate Bill 362 transferred the data broker registry from the Department of Justice to our agency. The Department of Justice had an existing IT portal in place for operating the registry and collecting payments, but unexpectedly,

1

6

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 they were unwilling to maintain the system, even temporarily to receive registration payments for Jan 1 to Jan 31, which is the current registration window. As a result, we scrambled to implement a basic registration system using our very limited IT resources. This effort was truly a testament to the dedication and flexibility of our staff, particularly our Admin team, and Elizabeth Allen, who was recently promoted to our legal department and is handling a lot of the day-to-day on the data broker registry. In accordance with the law, we launched the registry on Jan 1, and we'll continue to maintain the portal until the end of the month. We've received a good number of registrations and are actively monitoring overall compliance as compared to past years and with other states. We will then publish a list of paid registrants on our website after the payments are processed, likely in March, and we'll continue to implement the registry in future years. Next onto rulemaking: as you know, SB 362 also required us to set fees in regulation, which the board approved last meeting. We successfully completed the necessary rulemaking for the data broker registry fee, and the approval documents are in the process of being uploaded to our website. In addition, staff are diligently working on preparing materials for the agency's next rulemaking package on cybersecurity, risk assessments, ADMT, as well as updates to the existing CCPA regulations. This process includes receiving individual input from board members on ADMT and risk assessments that were proposed in our December meeting. I believe we've now received feedback from nearly all the board members, and we're in the process of incorporating that feedback to present to the board at our next meeting. In addition, we're also undertaking the

6

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

economic analysis necessary to support that rulemaking, although we ultimately need to finalize the proposed text before we can complete that work. Next onto enforcement: our Enforcement Division has been very active. You'll recall that the Enforcement Division had Mike Macko announced an inquiry into connected vehicles in July, the same month that we received our enforcement authority. We have many investigations underway, not just in connected vehicles, but many other general areas that Mr. Macko proposed to the board. We will be addressing enforcement in more detail at our annual update in the spring, but for now, I wanted to point out that Enforcement Division has grown by 400 percent in the last three months, and we plan to grow even more in the near future. The division's next hire will be the assistant chief counsel for Enforcement and that recruitment's underway along with additional attorney recruitments. Please share those with your networks if you have suggestions or folks you think might be interested. Recruiting is very difficult in this area, as you know. In the meantime, the division is active -- the Enforcement Division is actively pursuing investigations and regularly reviewing consumer complaints, which have also been a useful way for us to understand what consumers are experiencing in the marketplace. Next, onto business guidance: our CPPA website-- on the CPPA website, you'll now find a resources 23 | page, which includes information for businesses. Currently on that page, we have guidance on four topics, one on which businesses need to comply with the CCPA, another on information about opt-out notices or about notices in general, I'm sorry, another on ||information on opt-out preference signals and how businesses have to respond to those, and then another helpful resource on personal

6

11

13

18

19

20

21

1 | information and those definitions. All of this guidance is informational and not legal advice. Primarily, these pull together different portions of our laws and regulations into a concise reference on these topics. As appropriate, we'll continue to provide these guidance on additional topics, but we think that's a good start for our agency. In addition to business guidance, we've also added a table of motions to our website, which is a summary of all the past action the board have taken and voted on. Like the meeting transcripts, this chart will hopefully serve as a reference for past board activity for the board and the public. Now, looking ahead, January 21-27 is Data Privacy Week and leading up to Data Privacy Day on Sunday, January 28. We are once again partnering with Senator Dodd, Senator Dodd's office on outreach efforts, and we'll also take on another social media campaign informing the general public on what they can do to keep their information safe. I'm also proud to share that in conjunction with Data Privacy Week, we're launching a brand new privacy information resource for the state, a new privacy website at privacy.ca.gov. In alignment with our mission to promote public awareness and understanding of privacy, we've created an entirely new website, which sits separate from the agency's website, to provide information and resources related to privacy to the public. While our agency is responsible for the website, we think it's important to use this as a resource for privacy protections across the state, including links to other laws-- privacy laws, agencies, and complaint systems. This launch is just to start. We plan to add more information and resources as part of our larger public awareness effort and education campaign this year. And just to note, our website, cppa.ca.gov, isn't going

6

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 away. That will still host the information as it has now, including regulations, board meeting information, and additional guidance. Our Public Affairs Division will update you on important outreach efforts and do a deeper dive on this website as part of our regular updates. And then a side note, as part of launching this website, we had an opportunity to work with the State Center for-- CDT, Department of Technology, to configure analytics in a more privacy preserving way for the state. And what that will do is raise not just protections on our website, but hopefully protections for consumers accessing any website of the California state government so that was a nice little side bonus. And so with that, that concludes my update. I'm pretty excited how far we've come just in the last year, both in terms of size as well as various efforts on public awareness, enforcement, complaints. I'm happy to take any questions or address any ambiguities. Thank you.

6

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Soltani. It's pretty exciting that five out of our small staff got statewide awards. That has to be a really impressive proportion of our staff to receive these statewide awards. And this is all really exciting. I'll be looking up and down to see if anybody has questions or comments. I wanted -- oh, yes, Mr. Mactaggart, please.

MR. MACTAGGART: Hi there. I was just wondering: do you happen to have any data on the consumer complaints? Like, are there 10? Are there, you know, a hundred? What sort of numbers and what are we typically getting back to them? Just sort of saying 'thank you' and, you know, then did we ever close the case and say, 'sorry, we ||looked into it; we don't think you have a complaint' or what's the process there?

MR. SOLTANI: Happy to get into that at a high level. So certainly it's more than 10. It's about 10 times that, we actively have Mr. Macko will provide some details in his regular enforcement update, including on the complaint system. We have a flow for both sworn and un-sworn complaints where we typically respond to each complaint that comes into our system. Some of those will be kind of just referrals to other agencies or responses that the complaints are not within our peer purview. For the ones that we, that are on our peer purview, particularly sworn complaints in our purview, we typically respond with any action or non-action that we've taken on that matter, as well as refer it wrongly monitoring or enforcement. And in fact, a number of the enforcement matters that I referenced were the result of complaints.

MS. URBAN: Thank you. Other questions or comments? I'm excited to hear about the privacy.ca.gov website. I confess I'm a little, I'm having a little bit of trouble visualizing how it connects to our existing web materials, and I'm assuming there'll be a link from our website to privacy.gov and then other state agencies might link to it and might also put content on it. Did I understand you correctly?

MR. SOLTANI: Certainly we'll link to it from our website and certainly we have linked to other agencies and included content from other agencies. Previously, the Department of Justice had additional information on what other kind of agencies handle privacy. We do hope to engage our kind of through our intergovernmental affairs additional kind of opportunities for people to add information about their laws. As you know, there's also a lot of collaboration that we undertake with either joint

enforcement or referrals. And so we wanted -- we saw, and this is partly to Mr. Mactaggart's question as well. We saw in our complaint system a lot of confusion as to, for example, what our agency's purview are, when people have concerns about government surveillance, for example, that's not necessarily our purview. And so this helps us both achieve our mission as well as refer people to the important resources that they need in an event that we can't help them or we can't service them. But in terms of your question as to the difference, I see our ccpa.ca.gov website really being for the board and for the agency's kind of government-facing activities. And I see kind of the privacy portal as being really a consumer resource to help inform Californians when they think privacy. And we have a couple of these in the state. We have cannabis, we have apportion, we have other kind of theme-oriented sites. And so we were really encouraged to be able to, this was not an easy process, I'll just say. We were really encouraged to be able to get this resource and really help use this resource to promote privacy across the state. As you know, that's one of the three pillars of our mission.

MS. URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you so much. Yes, Ms. de la Torre.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. We talked about the consumer side.

MS. URBAN: Maybe a little closer.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Can you hear me now?

MS. URBAN: Yeah.

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. We talked a little bit about the consumer side. You also mentioned guidance provided to the regulated community and some developments in terms of the information that has been posted on our site. Are there any plans

to develop further guidance? Can you give us details on that? As
you will know, is very typical of privacy agencies to develop
robust guidance for the regulated community, ideally before
enforcement, so that we can ensure that they have a chance to get
the compliance before there's a need for enforcement. Thank you.

MR. SOLTANI: That's a great question. Indeed, we do have the business guidance and business resources on this website, and we'll continue to update that. One thing that informs a lot of what business guidance we provide is also questions to our Info box. We have a few frequently asked questions, and we essentially, when we see certain topics that seem to cause confusion or people have questions about, we do provide additional kind of this business guidance. As you know, we are limited in effectively what we can say beyond our rulemaking, but the business guidance takes what we have said in our rulemaking or in our regulations, in our laws, and provides a kind of a concise resource. And then lastly, I don't want to get ahead of our Enforcement Division, but I do expect we'll be providing additional compliance direction to the regulated community as well. I'll let Mr. Macko speak to that at the appropriate time.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Soltani, for the update. Yeah, no questions. I think I just wanted to appreciate all the progress that we've made on a lot of different things since our last update. You know, the website, I know probably building that data broker, taking that data broker registry over, you know, last minute probably was a huge lift and a good call-out for them, need to grow

1 our own, IT expertise in the agency. So yeah, be congratulations of being able to build that on short notice. And the growth of enforcement, 400 percent. I think a lot of folks are eager to see the enforcement, the progress of the Enforcement Division so we'll be listening to Mr. Macko's presentation with bated breath. And again, the partnership with the Legislature, Senator Dodd, on this data privacy awareness. So yeah, good work. Thank you.

MR. SOLTANI: Thank you.

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

MS. URBAN: Alright. I seeing no additional hands from board members, I will simply add my congratulations and gratitude for some incredible development and successes over the past year and since your last update. Are there any comments from the public, Mr. Sabo?

MR. SABO: Yes. We have one hand raised, massar@alum. We're going to unmute you and you're going to have three minutes to speak. Go ahead and unmute yourself using star six. So you've been unmuted. You can go ahead. You have three minutes.

MX. MASSAR@ALUM: Hi, can you hear me?

MS. URBAN: Yes, thank you.

MX. MASSAR@ALUM: Hi, I just tuned in, but the speaker mentioned the website, privacy.ca.gov, and I just went to it and all I get is a weird site that requires me to log in and with a warning about unauthorized access so I'm not sure what's going on there. I just thought I'd mentioned that.

MS. URBAN: Thank you so much. So it's launching on Privacy Week, is that right, Mr. Soltani?

MR. SOLTANI: That is correct. That is correct.

MS. URBAN: Maybe say that again so everybody understands

1 because it makes sense to be confused.

is that right?

MR. SOLTANI: Yeah, sorry. It's currently password protected.

It's in kind of where we're finalizing some of the content, and it will launch as part of Data Privacy Week, which is next week.

MS. URBAN: Do you have a date by which it will be launched?

MR. SOLTANI: I believe we're going to launch that on the 17th,

MS. URBAN: So January 17, the public can go to privacy.ca.gov and be able to see the resources you described.

MR. SOLTANI: Indeed. And if you follow us on social media, on Twitter or on LinkedIn, we'll have announcements to that effect as well.

MS. URBAN: Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you very much to the speaker for flagging that for us. Is there further public comment, Mr. Sabo?

MR. SABO: Yes, next we have Edwin and Glenda. I will unmute you now, and then you can go ahead and speak. You have three minutes to make your comments.

MX. EDWIN LOMBARD: Good morning. My name's Edwin Lombard. Good morning members of the CPA-- CPPA. As we enter 2024, we would like to take this opportunity to respectfully urge CPPA to honor the need for a 2024 transparent regulatory process on the following items. First, CPPA regulatory timeline. It is well talked about that this is the year of AI as everyone from government, business, and individuals anticipate addressing these issues. The small businesses I work with are eager to be a part of this process. So we asked today, when will CPPA share its regulatory AI timeline with us? Can any of you please provide an answer to this question

1 | today? Second, working with small businesses. Will CPPA take the time to address that our resources are limited. and that CPPA overregulation could cripple or in the existence of many small businesses from retail theft, inflation, and excessive CPPA regulation, small businesses simply cannot survive. There is no doubt that all of you and staff or qualified to handle the AI regulations, but with respect, it is doubtful that anyone at CPPA has operated a small business or has experienced what we need to stay open. We urge an empathetic and responsible 2024 regulatory approach. Let me close with this. To be clear, we are not saying do not do anything. We expect CPPA to do something, but it will be helpful to have a balanced approach so that small businesses can continue to be part of the California economy. Thank you, and we look forward to working with you in 2024.

6

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MR. SABO: Yes. Julian, I have unmuted you. You can go ahead and begin your three minutes when you're ready. Julian Cañete, I've unmuted you. You can go ahead and speak whenever you're ready. Julian Cañete, you've been unmuted. You can go ahead and speak whenever you're ready. I see your hand raised. Madam Chair, I don't see any other hands other than Julian Cañete's.

MS. URBAN: Alright, well, if Mr. Cañete's hand goes up again maybe we can circle back in case he had a mic issue or something. Thanks very much to members of the public who did comment, the board members, and especially to Mr. Soltani for that exciting update. We'll now move to agenda item number three, which is an update on budget and priorities for spring 2024. As a reminder,

1 | this is part of our regularized -- annualized, excuse me, our regular annualized calendar and is our opportunity for an update after the publication of the governor's budget, which I think was a couple of days ago. So please turn to those materials for this agenda item in your packet for today. This item will be presented by our Deputy Director of Administration Von Chitambira. Thank you so much, Deputy Director Chitambira, for being with us today. Could you please let us know when you're going to advance the slide since we are facing the opposite direction so we can follow along? And please go ahead.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. VON CHITAMBIRA: Good morning and thank you, Chairperson Urban, board members. For this item, I'll be presenting the budget update and planning as well as priorities. Advance to the next slide. So the agenda shows that I'll be starting by looking back at fiscal year 2022-23, which is this past year. Then we'll get into our current year expenditures and the proposed budget for '24-25 and priorities. Next slide. And starting with '22-23, prior year budget and expenditures. Next slide. Our budget for '22-23 was \$10,852,000 as reflected on the bottom line of the slide. And this amount is comprised of the \$10 million appropriation per statute. Is that okay? Okay. In addition to the \$10 million, we had \$616,000 from fiscal year '21, 2021, the initial appropriation for the agency. That was a non-budget item. So, we're able to bring this forward, in additional \$236,000 in baseline adjustments. And baseline adjustments are employee compensation and benefits, and this is what brought us to the \$10.8 million. Next, I will discuss the budget summary. Next slide. So, with that \$10.8 million, this is how we'd planned to spend those dollars in fiscal year '22-23.

1 This is the first year that we received our 34 authorized positions $2 \parallel$ for the agency. And as part of that funding for the 34 positions, we expected to spend 39 percent towards salaries, 23 percent in benefits, general expenses at 10 percent. And these general expenses are typically resources needed for staff to continue with their duties. That includes resources for supporting our legal team, filing Form 700, equipment, IT, everything was included in that. We also had contracts, internal and external contracts, and media and outreach at 7 percent. And that is how we plan to spend the \$10.8 million. I'll move on to how those funds were actually spent. The budget summary -- expenditure summary. At the end of 2223, our actual expenditures were spent as follows: 20 percent was spent towards the salaries and 9 percent towards benefits, general expenses landed at 2 percent, interdepartmental contracts at 10 percent. Again, these for interdepartmental contracts, these are contracts with our agencies that have been supporting us with admin functions, including IT, HR, as well as procurement. External contracts were at 2 percent, and media and outreach was at 57 percent. We had some contracting delays for media and outreach, and so that will continue. You'll see that in the next slide as well. And contracting for media and outreach was necessary with the cost savings as this is part of the mission for the agency, the three prong of education and outreach, it made sense to have a three-year contract set aside to fund that mission. In future years, we can expect contracting costs to go down as we will be able to build capacity in-house. Next slide. Now moving on to the current year '23-24. In '23-24, our budget was \$12.625 million. To arrive to this amount, we had our setting appropriation of \$11.458 million.

6

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Now, our starting appropriation is no longer the \$10 million because we now have the COLA included in that. Available from 2021, which was brought forward, was \$318,000. We had a one-time cost of living true-up of \$602,000. And this is from the fiscal year 2021-22. We had baseline adjustments for \$247,000. And because the media and outreach contract was not finalized in the prior year, you see those dollars showing up again this year because this is when we're able to finally execute the contract. Moving on to the next slide, the budget summary for 2023-24. At this point, we now have 48 positions in the agency, and so we expect more funding to go towards our salaries and benefits. And then we have contracting again at 11 percent for the interdepartmental contracts and external contracts only at 9 percent, general expense at 4 percent. And general expense has remained low because we're continuing to focus on a hybrid work environment, which is resulting in cost savings. Next slide, '23-24 year-to-date expenditures. At this point, when we were preparing the financial information for the board meeting, we had financial information up to November of 2023, which is only five months into the fiscal year. And so, at that 20 point, only 33 percent of our budget had been used. Of that 33 percent, 29 percent of the available funds-- so the 33 percent is about \$4.1 million from the \$12 million that we have available. From that \$4 million, 29 percent has been spent on salaries and 14 percent on benefits so, again, personnel costs continue to be the highest expense. Contracting costs are 22 percent and 28 percent, and then general expense appears to be at 7 percent. We expect salaries to continue to grow and take more of that space on the pie, and so the contracting costs will be decreasing as the

11

12

13

16

18

19

21

22

1 salaries continue to grow in the benefits. Next slide. For fiscal year '24-25, this is our proposed budget. Our beginning appropriation is \$11.4 million. Our cost-of-living adjustments is \$777,000. Baseline adjustments are at \$263, and our total budget that we are proposing is \$11,898,000. Next slide. So, the governor's budget was presented on January 10. Included in that budget was our COLA adjustment for 3.6 percent and budget bill language for the COLA adjustment. The advantage in having our COLA budget bill-- in the budget bill language is that it'll streamline the process for us to receive our COLA adjustment. Prior to the budget bill language being included, we had to prepare a BCP, and that was a more cumbersome process for the COLA adjustment. And now it'll be more streamlined, however, we'll still have to submit a BCP for any new positions that we need. With our COLA adjustment for this year, we are requesting a graduate legal assistant, and $16 \parallel \text{this position will be assisting in the Legal Division with the}$ lower-level work that is coming in. And moving on to the next slide. For future BCP considerations, they include SB 362, a grant program and administrative staff. The data broker registry was transferred to the agency January 1, 2024, from the DOJ. And the DOJ had a remaining budget of about \$180,000 in the current fiscal year. Since DOJ is no longer responsible for the data broker registry, those funds will be transferred to the agency. And so they are currently temporarily funding an attorney position that is working on that, SB 362. This position was administratively established, which means it is a temporary position. The funding will end in January-- in June 30, 2024. And so because the funding will end, we'll need to submit a BCP to secure permanent funding

6

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1 | for SB 362 positions. In addition to that, the agency is required to have a grant program per statute, and the agency is currently assessing resources to set up and run the grant program. It is possible that a BCP may be required to secure positions for that grant program. From the time the agency was created, it was always the intent to bring in administrative services in-house, however, they're currently contracted out. And so as the agency grows, the focus is now on bringing in administrative resources in-house for us to have more streamlined operations. We are currently in the process of hiring a retired annuitant to help us assess our needs for human resources. And once that assessment is done, we'll be able to build HR in-house. We also plan to bring in contracting services. Procurement has been a struggle for us, and so hopefully bringing in contracting in-house will also help streamline our contracts. And we're also in the process of assessing the need for \parallel IT services and transferring them from Department of Consumer Affairs. And that concludes my presentation.

6

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Chitambira. Questions or comments from board members. Mr. Worthe and Ms. de la Torre, Mr. Le and okay, let's go down the road. Mr. Worthe, please go ahead.

MR. WORTHE: Thank you for that presentation. You don't have to answer all this now, but if it's easy for you to go back, but I'm trying to follow the page. Some are numbered, some weren't, but I think I have them. So page two, I just would love to see the headcount for the past years and the proposed, just to try to track the budget for the staff. You mentioned the baseline budget adjustments. It's a different number each year, but you said it was related to employee compensation. What exactly does that mean?

Because I figured the main budget obviously covers employee
compensation. So, what does the baseline adjustment do and what's
that process, I guess?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: So the benefits do change each year. And so, when CalHR does the increase, maybe 3 percent, then we have to calculate how much that will be based on the positions that we have as an agency. That information is sent to Department of Finance, and they provide funding for that change.

MR. WORTHE: So that's above and beyond the cost-of-living adjustment?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: It is tied to that.

MR. WORTHE: It is? The baseline adjustment is?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Yes, but not the CPI, which is our COLA adjustment. Yes.

MR. WORTHE: Right. I was curious on page six, which was the pie chart for the '22-23 expenditures, I thought the media buy got pushed forward, but it shows being spent that year. You brought it back into the following year, the \$6 million, right?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Yes, so to explain that, so the \$6 million in '22-23 is when we had cost savings because we didn't have as many employees hired at the time. And with that funding, that \$6 million, it shows in the next fiscal year, '23-24, but it's actually tied to the '22-23 budget so it was--

MR. WORTHE: We kind of booked it in '22 but spent it in '23-24?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Yes, so we encumber -- and we'll continue to spend it in future years, and we're encumbering a portion of that each year, but it decide to '22-23 budget.

MR. WORTHE: How many years will that cover us for the media portion of the budget? Like when does that come back? When we have to have an outlay again like that?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: We expect to spend that funding by June 2024. So we decide for three years.

MR. WORTHE: And we should expect that kind of number again?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: No, we do not expect that kind of number in the future. So, we needed to have that at the beginning because we didn't have a team in our public affairs team. But now we do have employees and we are hiring more so that funding has been tied to the media buys. But that more work to do with media— with outreach and public affairs will be done in-house, and we don't expect to have that much spending.

MR. WORTHE: Okay. And listen, I think this next one, page 11, I think this is a hard question because there's so much change and so much added responsibility, right that the agency's taken on. But I just looked from '22-23 to '24-25, the budget's up about a million dollars, which is about 9 percent so for a 4.5 percent per year. Do you think that's kind of— does that feel normal or is that unusual because of all the changes in the growth and there, is this too hard to try to extrapolate those increases going forward because of all the change and the growth and the new responsibilities? Or is that kind of representative? I'm just trying to get a sense long-term.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Long-term, it's a little tricky to assess. However, from where we started, the changes have been tied to the cost-of-living adjustments so the CPI, consumer price index, so with the \$10 million, each time, we are adjusting for CPI. So if

1 | it's lower in the future years, we can expect less funding. However, if there's a need within the agency, suppose we're able to justify a need for additional enforcement resources, if we're able to justify that and indicate through the governor's budget that there's a need for this. We'll be able to get more funding outside of the CPI.

MR. WORTHE: Right. Which--

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHITAMBIRA: So, it's possible we can continue to grow. I would think we are going to continue to grow.

MR. WORTHE: Okay, on 13, SB 362 is creating new positions, whether now or later, but just how many positions are we having to add to take on that responsibility? I was just curious.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: We are still evaluating, but we understand that there's a need for at least an attorney. We have a need for IT resources as well as for regular administrative staff so at minimum, maybe three--

MR. WORTHE: Oh, that's it? Okay.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: --but we are evaluating the needs.

MR. WORTHE: Okay. And then on the IT and human resources, the idea of bringing those in house, would we get a chance to look at the cost benefit of those--

MS. CHITAMBIRA: We have.

MR. WORTHE: --once you, you already have or--

MS. CHITAMBIRA: We are, so we understand there's a need for sure because of some of the difficulties we've had working with other agencies. Because we're outside, we are always, sometimes not always the priority. I would want to say that it is important for us to have these in-house. But for HR purposes, we are bringing in

someone in-house to do this assessment for us as it makes sense for us to bring this in-house, and, if it does, how much are we going to save? Because right now we have dedicated resources with DGS. It has been helpful, but we think that it could be better if we had it in-house. And so, this resource that we are bringing in a retired annuitant with the state can help us better assess that. We'll be able to make it a better determination.

MR. WORTHE: What about IT? Would you do the same thing?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: The same is true for IT, absolutely.

MR. WORTHE: Okay.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. CHITAMBIRA: I think Executive Director Soltani can speak more to IT.

MR. SOLTANI: --kind of these proposals to the board at the time when we make the request from Department of Finance as part of the BCP process. So as we've done that analysis and make a recommendation, we'll make a recommendation to the board that this is what we'd like to do. And then that will be part of the regular budget process when we do both this time of year as well as after July when we start doing planning.

MR. WORTHE: I think it's helpful because I was only thinking just in the math of it all, but you just brought up the point that I wouldn't be privy to. Explain when you do that— the troubles you've had, right? Because it's not a cost benefit only.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Right.

MR. WORTHE: Right. Thanks. That's all I had. Thank you so much.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Ms. de la Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you so much for the presentation. I have two questions. The first one is my understanding is that we are facing a situation in the budget overall in the state of California that is leading to cuts. I also am aware of the fact that we have certain protections because of the fact that our statute quarantees funding. But I was wondering if you could speak as to how that situation can affect us this year and in the near future as my understanding is that that shortfall is not going to change in the near future. Hopefully it will eventually change, but I think that we are facing two, three, four years where that might be the case constantly.

1

6

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Sure, we do have the \$10 million appropriation per statute, so we'll continue to receive that. However, in response to the expenditure freeze, the team-- the leadership team has worked with the executive team to communicate the need for us $16 \parallel$ to be prudent in everything that we are purchasing. And we have a process in-house where we need to justify why we need something before it is procured. And part of that process is ensuring that whatever we're purchasing is mission critical, aligned with the mission of the agency, and our goals. And if it is necessary, we have to continue to procure what we need as a growing agency, we have to maintain operations. And so, we are being mindful in our spending, understanding that we do have this appropriation per statute, so we do have finding available to us, but also being good stewards, continuing to be mindful of our spending.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you so much for that answer. My second question is around the reference to the grant program. I think that's the last slide. Could you elaborate on what that grant

program is and what covers? It might be that information was provided to the board, but it's not fresh in my mind. What's the grant program?

4

6

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHITAMBIRA: I do want to field this question over to Phil, our general counsel. He is much more informed about what the grant program is exactly and how it's supposed to operate. I do understand the resources necessary from an admin perspective, but I'll let him speak from a legal perspective.

MR. PHILIP LAIRD: Good morning, board members. Yes, so actually in our law, there is a provision that was added about a grant program that exists based on funding that'll come in through penalties and fines assessed by DOJ and by our agency. As that pool grows, the law basically provides that 9 percent annually of the total funds that come into the Consumer Privacy Fund go to a grant program. There's three components of the grant program, one that would support -- go to nonprofits that are trying to promote privacy in California. The second one is to nonprofits and governmental entities that are promoting privacy awareness for youths. And so contemplated could be even school boards or things of that nature that could apply for that grant. And the third component is a grant for law enforcement entities in California to partner with international authorities on data breach investigations. So this is a grant program that, again, is built in the statute and is one of our sort of core functions directions to the agency to implement and administer. But to date the consumer privacy fund historically didn't have anything in it. But as we start to see enforcement from both the attorney general's office and our agency underway, those funds will be coming in and then it'll be incumbent on the agency

1 to administer those programs annually.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I have a couple of follow-up questions. I was aware of the provision on the statute, but I really appreciate you linking it to this: the fund is going to receive revenue based on enforcement. Both enforcement of the AG and enforcement by the agency will kind of feed into that fund. Is that a correct assumption?

MR. LAIRD: That's correct.

MS. DE LA TORRE: But the agency will make the determination on where the grants go?

MR. LAIRD: The agency solely administers the grant program. Yes, absolutely.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Okay, got it. In terms of the vision for that, and I understand that that's still being worked out, what will be the expectation from the board perspective? Are those decisions going to be made aware? Is there going to be options and we will get to kind of approve the final? How is it going to look like from the board perspective?

MR. LAIRD: Yeah. Great, great questions. And we won't get too far afield of the budget necessarily right now, but I can preview we're thinking a lot about those processes. Actually, I can say Ms. Garcia and I come from an agency that did quite a bit of grant administration in our previously roles so we're familiar with the options here. But at its core, we will need to define either through regulations or statutory amendments further details and sort of mechanics of these grant programs. So those are things that the board will likely have an opportunity to weigh in on, and then those mechanics could go a number of ways. As the board could sort

of delegate a final decision-making authority process to staff. At the same time, we could engage in a process where staff proposes certain grantee awards and the board approves them. So there's a number of opportunities, but this is a program as we think through and develop, we will bring a proposal to the board to kind of really to sort of approve sort of the structure of that grant program, but as it stands, it's pretty wide open, which is in my mind a good thing because it allows us to build a really dynamic grant program that'll be most effective for this space.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you for your answers.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Mr. Worthe actually asked my main question, which was around the transition to in-house. But I guess just to set expectations, I was seeing it more as you said, streamlining is you get more priority, you get more control, but not necessarily cost savings. Is that the right way to expect this? Or is there going to be expected cost savings from moving things in-house?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: It depends. So, with some of the functions, we could have cost savings. I expect that procurement, we could use a smaller team, and we may have cost savings there. With HR, it's hard to say. And I think with IT, we could potentially have cost savings as well depending on how— which way we choose depending on the results of those assessments on our needs. I don't know if you want to speak to that.

MR. LE: Thanks.

MS. URBAN: Mr. Mactaggart.

MR. MACTAGGART: Thank you. Just quick question, and you may have said it, I may have dismissed it, but for the SB 362

positions, those requests would be in addition to our quaranteed funding, it's not asking to spend our funding, okay?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: That's correct.

2

3

4

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

MR. MACTAGGART: And then the only other thing is could we, at some point, get a report on the -- I wasn't aware that we were, had spent as much of the \$6 million for the outreach as possible. I mean, as we have, and it's going to be spent by next June, I'd love to see a report about where it went, how much went on radio, TV. Do we measure any effectiveness? Did we do anything like that? And maybe if I've already seen one this come, I apologize then.

MR. SOLTANI: Yeah, I can speak to that. The Public Affairs Division will be providing an update as part of the annual calendar on a public affairs efforts will, which include and we've done in the past when we did our past public awareness in 2022, I believe, that there was a subcommittee that Mr. Le and Mr. Thompson were on. $16 \parallel \text{We}$ presented kind of what outreach we did, radio, what the ROI was, what kind of engagement we got. And so we'll do that. I just want to also clarify that the-- we essentially have two public affairs contracts underway. One was for the media buy, and that's the one that we'll conclude at the end of this year. And then the \$6 million ongoing is for kind of both media and production. And that will be a separate kind of related-- they're basically two components. One is for the kind of the buy side, and the other is for the production side. And so those two pots will be used in conjunction, but we will report back out to the board. And my understanding is that second part, that \$6 million can go beyond 2024 actually, it can go--

MS. CHITAMBIRA: The second one. Yes.

MR. SOLTANI: That can actually go beyond that. I think that ends 2025 with an option to 2026, right? So, that \$6 million can extend us to 2026 for media production, development, including outreach and including some stakeholder engagement. The prior encumbrance from fiscal year '21-22 that ends at the end of this fiscal year, and that will be part of the public affairs presentation that Ms. White will present, I think, in the spring.

MR. MACTAGGART: Okay, thanks. It'd be great just to get a sense of both contracts and how much we're spending on production versus outreach and all the rest of it, absolutely.

MS. URBAN: And the timing because I understand that it's \$6 million overall, it's all encumbered, so from a prior year. But it sounds like some of it has to be spent by the end of this fiscal year, but other, there's still additional funding for the production and other efforts that could go on.

MR. SOLTANI: Correct.

MS. URBAN: And it's all out of the \$6 million?

MR. SOLTANI: No.

MS. URBAN: Oh, okay.

MR. SOLTANI: So, there was an \$8 million procurement in '21-22-- one of the first years when I was like the only employee, and we had a lot of cost savings, and we didn't have a public affairs team. And so we encumbered those funds. And that's that original, I think it was the \$8 million-- \$7- or \$8-million contract that Mr. Le and Mr. Thompson both oversaw. We still have funds remaining in that. I think we have about \$6 million remaining of those funds. And those need to get spent by the end of this fiscal year. And it's going to be part of our kind of major push in conjunction with

1 | the privacy website. We're engaging in a really large public affairs effort to really now drive not only awareness of the agency and the privacy rights, but also drive additional engagement on our rulemaking and to drive additional engagement on just general complaints and enforcement. So that is going to be the media buy plan and a public affairs effort that will basically be undertaken before July 1 of this year. We are looking at media channels that are more evergreen. So things that can extend slightly beyond that point. So online video, billboards, some sort of out-of-home presence. And that will be all as part of the presentation that Ms. White will present. That is separate but related to this \$6 million encumbrance of this current year. That was from the past fiscal year in fact, the \$6 million that can take us three years on media production and other kind of stakeholder engagement and other aspects. And so those are the two pots that work together. So, in tandem over the course of those, the three years and onto, say, 2025, we will have about \$14 million in public affairs broken into at least two pots. And we'd be happy to present on how we have spent and we'll spend those funds.

6

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. URBAN: Thank you. Yes. I think that would be very helpful. I had somehow inflated the eight and the six, and I only had eight in my mind instead of 14. And yes. Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you very much. Mr. Le, did you have something on this exactly before we go to--

MR. LE: On this point? Yeah. Yeah, it was Mr. Thompson and I on the subcommittee there, and we've since dissolved that subcommittee, but we were tracking impressions where, which markets that they were going to was like mostly a radio buy in advance of

the comment period. So yeah, I expect that we'll see that in future presentations on our public affairs work.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. Mr. Mactaggart?

3

4

6

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MACTAGGART: Sorry. So just so I'm clear, so we have roughly \$12ish million, six of it needs to get spent. Does it need to be actually spent by July 31? And to be even more granular, you pay an agency to put ads up, do the ads all have to be I guess finished by July 31? Or you could say, I'm going to pay you to run ads for the rest of 2020-- calendar 2024. Can you?

MR. SOLTANI: That's right. So those are the evergreen. So two questions. Yes, you're correct. Two pots, roughly \$12 million left. One pot for media buy needs to be spent. And the media buy the \$6 \parallel million pot has a tiny bit of production budget in that pot as well that we will spend. But we also have the second \$6 million pot, which is the production budget. So the first pot, the media buy 16 | pot, which is primarily for media purchasing, will need to get basically paid out. It's encumbered, but we'll need to get paid out by July 1 or end of June, basically. And so we will need to have paid those invoices. But certainly if the vendor, and we are exploring options, supports evergreen options where we could buy like say a billboard ad that stays on for six months, we are certainly looking at how to maximize our dollars in that sense so that it's not just a media blast just for the two months. We're |also certainly looking at what fit is right for our agency in terms of things like social media and web ads and these types of things, balancing our privacy interests with reaching the community. We want to reach in different demographics across the state. So previously we did radio, which was pretty straightforward. But we

1 | are exploring other opportunities, and we'll present that in our spring meeting with kind of the direction we're undertaking. And then lastly certainly I think there'll be ongoing past this fiscal year and future, both with media production, but also our own agency, a question of what and how much we want to do in this space. Some of the evergreen options I'm interested in personally are things like informative animations and illustrations that help consumers that don't understand these complex topics understand how to invoke their rights, invoke opt-out preference signals, what rights they have, et cetera. So that's kind of my goal is to use this to both, raise awareness, drive engagement, but also have some like learning resources that then we can host on the privacy.ca.gov website or on various social media channels that we're comfortable with that help consumers understand their rights. Lastly we just concluded as part of this budget a polling that we'll also present ||a bit of information on about what consumers know about their rights, what they expect, what are their priorities in terms of what things they care about with respect to privacy and what pieces of data they're most concerned about. We'll provide some insights about that. We're also using that to track KPIs over time where we will, and then this is going to feed into the strategic plan, but know how effective were public awareness efforts in 2024 and/or in '5, right? So we can see if people understand that they have these rights. Currently, not a lot of people do understand that they have protections, or they misunderstand that they have protections that they don't. They think like companies need to ask consent when in fact they don't, exactly.

6

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. URBAN: Thank you. Mr. Soltani. Go ahead.

MR. MACTAGGART: So, just on this topic, Madam Chair, I'd love it if we could ensure that maybe at the March meeting.

MS. URBAN: We have already the public affairs annual report and the March meeting, and I think I've gathered quite a bit of information about some of the detail that people would like to see.

MR. MACTAGGART: Yeah, it's super, super exciting for to have this kind of opportunity to spend that kind of money to get the word out.

MS. URBAN: I agree.

MR. MACTAGGART: As you say, the average California has no idea that there is a privacy law. And so it's really exciting. I'd love to have all of our eyes on that in March. And then my last question for Von is just, I find this, this may be how the state has to have it done, and the number that 2024-25 budget is the 8, 11.9 is, it tracks with all the inflation, all the rest of it. But what's the difference between the cost of living and the baseline budget? Because when you look at the statute, it just says cost of living. And so why did they break it down, these two?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Right. So the cost of living adjustment line that you see for us is the one tied to the CPI, which is specific only to CPPA. We're the only ones receiving that well, and then the baseline adjustments, all the other state agencies are also receiving that, which are the employee compensation adjustments. So the first one is tied to our appropriation, and then we are receiving the CPI, customer price index adjustment to increase our appropriation. And then in addition to that, we are receiving the baseline adjustments with the employee compensation, which is just for employee benefits. I don't know if you want to speak more on

that.

MS. TIFFANY GARCIA: Good morning. Just to twist it a little bit, so our statute does authorize a COLA adjustment, and as the presentation laid out, it is 3.6 percent. And so what that equates to is \$440,000. But in conversations with the Department of Finance, because we have civil servant employees that do receive employee compensation and retirement adjustments, and it's handled through a separate budgetary process, they build those in. And that's that \$263. And then we have that \$177 that to get to the four total—\$440 total, which is our COLA that we have to go through the budget change proposal process that we did submit. And so with that \$177,000, we plan to fund one graduate legal assistant position. So technically our COLA, again, is \$440,000 broken up into those two buckets, just given how the Department of Finance builds our budget that we work with them on and collaborate.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Garcia. And also, I hope Mr. Laird will shut me down if I can't, if this is too far outside. But I would like to introduce Ms. Tiffany Garcia to the board and to the public. She's our Deputy Executive Director, and we are very pleased to welcome her from the Department of Consumer Affairs where, well, and the Business— oh, gosh, I'm not going to get it all— BCSH Agency where she has been a star for many years. So we're very glad to have been able to tempt her over here. Welcome. Other questions about the budget? I would like this for my own benefit, but I dare to expect maybe for others. Ms. Chitambira, if you could just give us, or whoever is the appropriate person, just give us a quick timeline summary of where we are in the budget process, whether our budget change proposal and everything has at

1 this point been approved, at what level and sort of where it goes 2 from here, just so we have a sense of the status of our funding.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Sure, so the full BCP was submitted in the fall, and it was included in the governor's budget on January 10 so that was the COLA and the graduate legal assistant. We are expecting to submit another BCP in the spring so that would be June and February, and that'll include positions for SB 362. So that'll be for the May Revise.

MS. URBAN: Thank you. And then the Legislature considers all of it and makes its decision in the sort of May, June, July timeframe?

MS. CHITAMBIRA: That's correct.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Thank you.

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. URBAN: Alright. Other questions or comments from the board? Mr. Sabo, is there any public comment?

MR. SABO: Yes. Edwin and Glenda, I'm going to unmute you, and then you will have three minutes to make your comment whenever you're ready.

MX. LOMBARD: Thank you very much. Again, this is Edwin

Lombard, and on the topic of outreach and the media budget.

Normally, with government entities, the majority of the money is spent with mainstream media. I would simply suggest that a significant portion of this outreach budget be spent with ethnic media, because in the Black community specifically the majority of the information that we receive of this type that will reach the entities that you're trying to reach, is done through ethnic media. Where on mainstream media, we kind of gloss over these things, and

1 we're looking for the big ticket items to read. But in ethnic media, when something like this is put into the fray, we pay close attention to it and we actually receive the information. So I would just simply suggest or recommend spending with the ethnic media, some of this budget in the Black community, I would suggest to California Black Media Association as an entity that you can go to. Thank you very much.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Lombard.

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. SABO: Again, this is for agenda item three, Budget Update and Priorities for Spring 2024. If you'd like to make a comment at this time, please go ahead and raise your hand. Again, this is for agenda item three, Budget Update and Priorities for Spring 2024. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any additional hands.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much Mr. Sabo, and to Mr. Lombard for the comment and to the board for the good questions, and especially Deputy Director Chitambira for putting this together for us informing us so effectively, thank you very much.

MS. CHITAMBIRA: Thank you.

MS. URBAN: With that, we will move to agenda item number four, which is a strategic plan review and next steps from Sorello Solutions. If you recall we last saw a presentation from the folks at Sorello Solutions in September, which was a high level interim report on the strategic plan process. And I believe they have a draft plan ready for us to discuss today. Please turn to the materials for this agenda item in your packet, which consists of a presentation and a one-page or two-page strategic plan. I did want to ask before we get started, Mr. Worthe, did you have an opportunity to weigh in on this process?

MR. WORTHE: No, not be, for lack of their effort, I just felt like it was hard for me to apply on a strategic plan for something that I just started.

MS. URBAN: Okay, perfect. Alright.

MR. WORTHE: So I think the timing now is great. But they definitely made efforts. Yeah, so this is on me, not on you.

MS. URBAN: Well, I think, and it's a very logical and reasonable point that you might want to have a little bit more experience with the agency as well. So I just wanted to check though before.

MR. WORTHE: No, no, I appreciate it.

MS. URBAN: Before we moved into it. With that welcome back. Thank you for being here. As I asked Ms. Chitambira, if you wouldn't mind letting us know when you advance the slide so we can flip our papers and I can look at my screen. Thank you.

MS. EILEEN JACOBOWITZ: Sure, will do. Oh, good morning board members. My name is Eileen Jacobowitz with Sorello Solutions, my colleague Jeannie Benoit is here. And I realized that I should have brought my step-tool and my gloves to this meeting, but I'll proceed.

MS. URBAN: I have to say that podium is for a giant.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: It's exceptionally tall.

MS. URBAN: And wide, and wide. I think it makes everyone look small.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Yes. Yeah, I was thinking maybe I could get on someone's shoulders and do this presentation, but I'll do my best. So thanks for inviting us back. And I want to say that in addition to all of the amazing work that the agency has completed, that the

executive director highlighted, they also reached a really important milestone, and that is the completion of their first strategic plan. And we're back today to talk a little bit about the process to share with you the draft strategic plan, and then get your feedback on it. So if you go to the next slide, please. So hopefully you're familiar with our approach. You remember our approach. We started in May with a discovery process, and here we are on phase three, where we're going to share with you the preliminary strategic plan. And I'll talk about each of the phases in a little more detail as we go forward. So why don't we go to the next slide. So, phase one that we started in May, as you recall, we spent the first bit of time just gathering information, understanding the current environment. So we spoke to most of you individually. We gathered information from you about the landscape, your priorities, et cetera. We also conducted individual interviews $16 \parallel \text{with each of the executive staff. And then we also administered a}$ survey to line staff, to agency staff. And we took all that information and we analyzed it, and we summarized the feedback. Next slide. Next, we took that information and we shared the findings with the executive team. We worked closely with them to identify goals and objectives, and we also crafted or identified core values that were based on both staff survey feedback and also the executive team. So that completed phase two. And now we're here to next slide. Oh, just a reminder of what we asked about. We asked you, and we asked the team about -- we asked for feedback on the mission statement. We asked for feedback on the current culture on agency strengths, opportunities for improvement. What you see is what's ahead for the organization and then the landscape, and then

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 | top priorities for the next three years. Next slide. Here's the 2 mission. We asked for feedback on the mission. People said, this is pretty much what we do and why we exist. Next slide. And as you'll recall, when we shared in September, we shared that the feedback from both the executive team and staff was really positive about the agency. So they talked about the strengths being both, the caliber and the commitment of team. There's, you have an extraordinary staff here, and people see it and recognize it and value all the skills that you have. Agency nimbleness, because you're a new agency, you're not mired in your bureaucracy of being a legacy agency. The authorities that you have within the statute, people see that you can do a lot of important things. You have a \parallel lot of political support and open lines of communication, both with your sibling organizations or like organizations, and also internally. Next slide. And then folks, of course, pointed to opportunities for improvement. One area was roles and responsibilities as a new organization. I think there people said, well, you need to be clear about what our lanes are, both at the board level with the executive director, et cetera. And people 20 pointed to a need for additional staff. And you heard that a lot of work has already been done to hire and fill vacancies. And some of the things that came up had to do with bringing other functions inhouse so you don't have to outsource them. And you're seeing that they're working on analysis around that now. Maturing the organizational processes, procedures as a new organization, I think that it's, what we heard was that there still was plenty of work in terms of clarifying procedures for processes, how people do their jobs, and documenting those kind of things. Improve communication

6

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

while it was solid. We also heard from some folks that there's opportunities for improvement there. As a startup kind of culture, we heard that people are working really hard and a lot, and some people pointed to the need to make sure that folks also have worklife balance. There were some folks pointing to a need for building more relationships with external organizations and then establishing criteria for supporting legislative bills. So that's what we heard. Let's see, do we hear more? Next slide. Okay. We also heard about trends. So we asked what do people see things that are in on the horizon that are important for the agency to be addressing, mitigating, anticipating. And you'll see there are four high level trends and know that there was a lot of alignment with everyone on the trends. In fact, there's a lot of alignment on most of these things across hearing from you all, hearing from executive staff and hearing from staff. So trends on the horizon changes at the federal level that could impact your authority. Increased awareness of privacy issues. We know that privacy is on people's minds, especially around children's privacy. The dynamic nature of just the field, both AI and other advances and regulations around that. And interest from the state legislature, we heard that that's a big deal. That might mean that there'll be more work or more opportunities for the agency. And then next slide. Top priorities for the next three years. This is where folks said it's important to focus, and you'll see that this directly feeds into the strategic plan, finalizing the regulations, successful enforcement, public awareness and guidance, and building organizational capacity. Next slide, please. So here we are today, and the executive team and staff worked really spent a lot of time

6

11

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

1 digesting this information and being very thoughtful in their deliberations. And as they developed the preliminary strategic plan. So we developed something, we gathered, we put everything together, we developed a pretty strategic plan for them. We gather feedback from the executive team, and here we are today to gather your feedback and public feedback. So with that, what I'd like to do is direct you to this document you have here. This is the draft strategic plan. And what I'd like to do is, I think where we make sense to spend the most time is around the goals and objectives. But I do want to share with you that, I think we do have the vision on the slide before that. Yeah. So the vision is new. That's on one side of your page there. The vision was newly developed. The mission statement is the existing mission statement that you had before. And then if you scroll up there--

MS. URBAN: Actually, so I understood you're going to ask us to go through or to have comment, if we have comments if on each piece?

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Sure. Yeah. We'll go through, let's go through, I'll go through the vision, mission, and values, and then we'll go back. Is that reasonable?

MS. URBAN: Sure.

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Okay. Well, let's do it now. If you have comments about the vision or mission, let's do that now. Sure.

MS. URBAN: I have a very picky comment on the mission statement "businesses and consumers are well informed about their rights and obligations." The order of "businesses and consumers" and "rights and obligations" is not in agreement. Generally speaking, businesses have obligations and consumers have rights.

1 And so if we could swap "obligations" and "rights," that would add clarity. I told you it was nitpicky.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Duly noted. We have Jeannie taking notes right here. Thanks for that.

MS. URBAN: Sure.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MS. DE LA TORRE: I also have a small comment. If we could--

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Could you turn on your mic?

MS. DE LA TORRE: It's on? Okay. If we could avoid using the term "business" and refer to the regulated community, just because "business" is a defined term in our statute, and it could be read to exclude potentially some of the organizations that could be indirectly, perhaps regulated by us. If it fits in the drafting, I think it will be better to avoid that confusion. Regulated community or some other term that's a little bit more... that cannot be read as referring to the specific definition of business that we 16 | have in the statute, perhaps.

MS. URBAN: So I hear that and I see the reason I, I'm not sure we don't want to stick with the statute, and if we don't stick with it for businesses or regulated community, then I think we probably need to consider consumers. Yes, Mr. Mactaggart?

MR. MACTAGGART: You know, while I hear what Madam de la Torre is saying from a, she's right, from a privacy expert's point of view, I just worry a little bit if the average consumer is reading this, they understand business, they're going to be like, what's a regulated community? So I think maybe for clarity, I don't, I totally hear what you're saying and you're correct. As you know, one of my dreams is that it's not just businesses that are regulated, the nonprofits follow and government agencies and all

1 the rest. So I can see going both ways anyway.

MS. URBAN: And I think part of Ms. de la Torre's point was probably that businesses is also a subset of businesses within California. But I tend to agree that even though it connects with the statute in a way that I think Ms. de la Torre is right, in some context, could be confusing. This simpler language maybe overall easier for folks to digest. I think Mr. Le and then Mr. Worth.

MS. DE LA TORRE: And I'm not particularly strong on just trying to offer feedback.

MS. URBAN: Yes.

2

6

8

10

11

13

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

MR. LE: Yeah. Same thing. One's more accurate, but one reads better. And I would prefer the one that reads better at least for the mission statement, which no one's referring to that as their legal basis for a lot of different things. These businesses aren't.

MS. URBAN: I will say, I like the way that this mission statement boils down and extracts all of the preambular language in our law, which is, I think one of the things that is most beneficial and well done about our law is that it is very clear about our mission, frankly, and what it is that we are supposed to do. And so I kind of like echoing some of that. Mr. Worthe.

MR. WORTHE: Yeah, I think we're good. I just was going to point out that in the goals we do have regulated community. So it does come up there.

MS. URBAN: Fair enough.

MR. WORTHE: So I think at least the fact that is, it is used, but maybe just not in a mission statement.

MS. DE LA TORRE: One more thing, and I'm not completely strong on it, but consumers is also limiting, maybe we should say

residents of California so that everybody understands because there's protections in the law for individuals who will not read themselves as included if we use the term consumers to just consider using Californians, for example.

MS. URBAN: I like Californians.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 |

24

26

28

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Okay, there's two votes for Californians. We'll capture that. Thank you. Other comments on the mission statement?

MR. SOLTANI: The only thought is businesses are Californians too, right? So Californian businesses. So it's a little bit, we can certainly think of another term that's not consumers, "citizens" maybe or something.

MS. DE LA TORRE: No, I would avoid "citizens."

MS. URBAN: Not everybody's a citizen.

MR. SOLTANI: Yeah, right.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Residents could be and definitely have the ability to play with whatever works best.

MR. SOLTANI: Yeah, I'm trying to think.

MS. URBAN: I think, I mean, for my own part, I think yes, as a fictitious legal matter businesses or Californians as well, but as a generalized kind of common understanding matter I think Californians would be understood to P-people. I don't feel strongly about consumers in this context, just because it's parallel with businesses and reflects our statute. But I'm not sure as in terms of process, what is our best way forward here.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: So we're be capturing your feedback and then we'll bring it back to the executive team. And make some recommendations. I will say that we work with a lot of state

agencies and departments and we can actually look at some of their mission statements to see what they're using in terms of Californians versus residents, et cetera. So we can make recommendations around that.

MS. URBAN: Okay. So I understand that we have on the table consumers as a possibility. Ms. de la Torre pointed out that that is also limiting in its way and people may be engaging in various activities that they don't think of themselves as being consumers, but as being what the statute calls natural persons. And she suggested residents of California, possibly Californians, you heard some of the challenges with Californians. So if you have the information you need.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Yeah. Very helpful. Thank you. We captured that.

MS. URBAN: Okay.

23 |

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Alright. If there are no other comments, I'll move to values. And as you know, organizational values are used, are about how people show up every day and treat each other and treat the people they interact with outside the organization, and they help guide decision making. So these are the four values that were developed based on input from staff and blessed by the executive team, crafted and blessed by the executive team. I'll give you a moment to take a look at those.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I just wanted to point out that innovation also has a reference to Californians. So yeah, it's, you could kind of match that too.

MS. URBAN: True. I had a more kind of general question about the values. The mission statement is appropriate, a broad statement

of our goal external to the agency, what the agency's purpose is. These values seem very internal to me. And as a personal matter or as a personal opinion, I would generally like to include some values that relate to our external mission. So transparency, for example a fairness seems to apply beyond the internal workings of the organization, but I recognize that this may be a bucket for the internal workings of the organization. So I wanted to ask if that was the case and if it has more flexibility then it seems to me that we could have some, we could also incorporate values that are about how we interact as an agency with a regulated community, with Californians and generally.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Yeah, our intent was these are external and internal facing, right? So--

MS. URBAN: So it might be possible to do something to just make that a little bit more clear. So for example, under communication it says we foster an environment of honesty and openness that you, it just felt like the internal environment to me. But of course, just to say that literally we communicate with purpose and clarity, that second part could be extended a little bit to say we communicate with purpose and clarity, both internally and with the public or something like that.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: So, I here to try to add some language that's feels external as well, right?

MR. LE: Yeah. I would second that I reading it, I could see that I think it was written to apply both ways. Maybe changing the order of things or just adding a little bit more context. But yeah, it does read at least for some of these, internal.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Okay. Thank you for that. Shall I move on?

MS. URBAN: I think so.

1

2

3

6

8

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Okay. If you turn over your, this single sheet, we're now on the goals and you'll see that there are four goals. The first one is strengthen public education, outreach, and engagement. And I'll just give you a moment to take a look at the goal and the objectives and let us know if there's any substantial significant feedback you have on those.

MS. DE LA TORRE: So, again, I don't feel strongly about this, but on five, when we say educate the privacy community about the agency's efforts, I think our education objective goes beyond the privacy community. So maybe if we could use a term that's more | inclusive than the privacy community. And just to point out, we see again here consumer business and then a reference to California's privacy rights. So if we could find consistency on the terminology that, I think will be also, so that people don't think, oh, it's 16 | this the same or is it different?

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Right. So if we change it in one place, change it in another place.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Right. Like if we choose Californians, or maybe there's a better term just across the document, the same terms. Same thing with business. If we end up deciding that business is the right term, maybe use it across the board for all references or regulated community, or maybe there's a better term that we cannot come up with, but your team with the support of the agency might identify.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Thank you for that. Next goal.

MS. URBAN: Looks like it.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Okay. Second goal, vigorously enforce privacy

laws. I'll give you a moment there.

MS. URBAN: I will say I'm not terribly bothered by a difference in the mission statement and those goals saying regulated community because it is so directed at people.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: It's very specific, right.

MS. URBAN: People who would understand that term. Yeah.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I don't have any comment other than maybe we should have started with saying that this is a really good effort, we're just giving the, trying to be helpful, but I just in general think it's very well put together.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: The executive team worked very hard, spent a lot of time and had very thoughtful deliberation to create something that is an amazing roadmap for the next few years.

MS. DE LA TORRE: It shows.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Yeah. But then I'm going to move us to the third goal. Strengthen Californian's privacy rights. We had recommended Idahoans, but they rejected that out of hand.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I have a question on two of that. I'm not completely sure If you could elaborate on what that means. The standardized coordination monitoring assessment of state and national legislation engagement and implementation to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements. Is it who's complying with the requirements? Like state agencies, I mean a little what convey?

MS. JACOBOWITZ: I want to defer to staff on that. Just, I don't want to misspeak here. So this is number two on the third goal.

MS. URBAN: Yeah.

MR. SOLTANI: Certainly that can be more clearly worded, but this is to reflect our kind of harmonization mission.

MS. URBAN: Oh, okay.

1

2

3

4

6

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. DE LA TORRE: Maybe harmonization is a word that we might want to...

MS. URBAN: Maybe to promote harmonization. I read it as Ms. de la Torre did. I thought this was about the statutory requirements that have applied to us.

MR. LE: I read it as harmonization, but I think we could probably--

MS. URBAN: I think if you just said to promote harmonization instead of to ensure compliance with statutory requirements. That would probably--

MR. SOLTANI: We have that in four, the harmonization, but we can wordsmith it a bit.

MS. URBAN: Okay.

MS. DE LA TORRE: So, but harmonization is on Four, right?

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Right.

MS. URBAN: Oh, of course.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Is number two not, is that not about tracking state and national legislation around the issues that you care about?

MR. SOLTANI: Yeah, I think, it's not, it's partially processes, but partially the kind of this Mahoney's portfolio. And we can certainly look at combining two to four to be more kind of concise. But as you know, under our direction of, in the statute, we regularly engage with the legislature both here and elsewhere as they look to implement these protections. And we want to promote

kind of, we track those developments and then we try to promote harmonization.

MR. LE: Yeah. And I also kind of read it as one of the goals was to have a standardized process for evaluating like what Maureen's job is. Like, what do we support, what we don't? So I also kind of saw it as partially, so yeah, maybe. I don't know if you need a separate. Yeah. I mean, how to best do--

MR. SOLTANI: We'll try to capture both. Yeah.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Just make it a little bit more intuitive from the perspective of somebody who didn't hear all of the conversations that I'm sure we're in went into developing.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Alright, move on to the fourth goal, operational excellence. I'll give you a moment to take a look at that. And the associated objectives.

MS. URBAN: I do not feel strongly about this, and I almost hesitate to say it because it sounds very corporate and I don't intend it that way. And I do not mean to also characterize what Mr. Le said in maybe the September meeting, that way either. But I remember, I believe Mr. Le saying something about having a goal of the agency growing with a positive culture, which is in here, and not developing, and this was not his word, the sort of cruft that a large organization can develop so that they become sclerotic and overly bureaucratic. And I wonder if there is room to have this idea of remaining nimble. This is where I started to sound very corporate. Let's be nimble, let's pivot.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Agile. Don't forget agile.

MS. URBAN: Agile, that's the word looking for. But I do think those of course, important things for organizations to be able to

accomplish, whether or not there's some fashionable word about for it at the moment. And I think it would be a good portion of this goal for us to have, because we do have the opportunity as such a new organization to develop processes that allow us to perhaps not become too sclerotic

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Sustain the agility that you have now.

MS. URBAN: Sure. Thank you.

MR. LE: Yes. I was fine with your organization. I agree with that point. And I have no issue about the operational excellence. I would maybe after we talk about this, like, to go back to number one, the first goal that the whole.

MS. URBAN: Okay. Are we ready to go back? Alright. Can we flip back to goal number one, Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Yeah. So one thing, number four on goal one is facilitate compliance through supplemental business guidance. And one thing that I raised during the calls, I don't want to just facilitate compliance. I think the agency would do well to simplify, right? And we see that in other jurisdictions, the canilar has put out a lot of tools to make it easy to do a risk assessment. So if we can capture simplifying compliance for businesses, Mr. Lombard's point has raised a lot, you know, want to make it easy for small businesses as well as large ones to comply to the extent they actually are covered. You know, \$25 million, I want to argue if that's a small business. But yeah, make it easy for them, but also for consumers. And I think we are doing a great job with consumers making it easy to opt out and things like that, global privacy controls. But yeah, just to see it reflected in these goals.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: I recall that there was a lot of conversation for number four on what that verb should be. Facilitate. And you're suggesting--

MR. LE: Simplify.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Simplify. So we'll take that back.

MR. LE: Yeah. I don't want--

MS. URBAN: Facilitate and simplify.

MR. SOLTANI: I saw almost say rightsize or something.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Corporate. That corporate.

MS. URBAN: Let's make sure we agilely right size.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Nimbalise this guidance.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I really wanted to speak in support of what Mr. Le mentioned. We have potentially broad number of small businesses, medium businesses, so simplify and thinking about them, it's, I think, very important. I just wanted to go back to your comment and you mentioned simplify compliance and through supplemental, we talk about guidance here, but some of the things that you refer to, like the canilar tools is not just guidance. So perhaps it's both guidance and potentially building tools for them to make compliance simple. And I know that it, I personally don't mean to kind of edit this on the spot, so feel free to take our comments back and work through what's the best way to express \parallel those. It might be that tools are built by the agency. It might be that the agency supports tools that are being built by others. I think that's very clear the case in some of the areas where the agencies placing a lot of attention, like the tools for opt out, which are in part developed externally. So I don't want, I don't mean to force the agency to make a commitment to put resources

towards tools, but perhaps make a reference to tools that make sense just beyond quidance. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: I agree with that. We of course, always have to be aware that in California, under the California Administrative Procedures Act, we don't have as much flexibility as a lot of other jurisdictions do to create these things. And so I just want staff and everybody to be aware that we're aware of that and this is an aspiration. Also, the executive director mentioned his update, additional resources for businesses on the website, which I poked around on while you were talking. And I think some of these, I mean, they're very straightforward charts and PDFs that just translate some of the statutory language into simple language for people to be able to digest easily. And I think this is great. And should be really helpful. So maybe more of that in this goal would be great. Is what I would say.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: Alright. I appreciate your feedback. I appreciate you fought the tendency that we all have to do some serious wordsmithing. So thank you for sharing your thoughts in such a thoughtful way. I want to go to the next slide. So it's separate, a separate file, then the PowerPoint slide. I just want to talk about next steps, a couple slides ahead, the last slide. That's okay. So next steps, we'll synthesize your feedback, we'll make recommendations to the executive team once it's blessed by the executive team. It'll be published on the website and shared with staff. And then implementation happens. I wonder if we need to stop for public comment.

MS. URBAN: We will. Yes. I was waiting.

MS. JACOBOWITZ: I won't leave.

MS. URBAN: Okay. So is that--

MS. JACOBOWITZ: That's all that's I have.

MS. URBAN: Alright. Thank you very much and thank you for all of the effort that has gone into this over the last month and for everybody within the agency and the board for all their work on it as well. If there aren't other comments from the board, then I would like to ask for public comment. Mr. Sabo?

MR. SABO: Yes, we have one member of the public. Chris, at this time, I'm going to unmute you and you'll have three minutes to make your comment. So go ahead whenever you're ready. You've been unmute. Chris, you have three minutes to make your comment. If you'd like to unmute yourself at this time. I've unmuted you. This is the last call. Chris, I see your hand raised. You've been unmuted if you'd like to speak. Madam Chair, I don't see any other hands other than Chris.

MS. URBAN: Alright. Thank you very much Mr. Sabo. And again, we can keep an eye out to see if Chris reappears perhaps under the item for general public comments. With that, we will move to agenda item number five with a slight caveat that I will look at Ms.

Mahoney. And my understanding just from reading the agenda is that this is probably a fairly short item. So why don't we go ahead and do it before lunch if you're ready. So agenda item number five is an update on the agency legislative proposal to require browser vendors and other platforms and devices as defined by regulation to include a feature that allows California users to exercise their privacy rights through opt-out preference signals. I'm sure the board will remember, because it was just a month ago, we discussed and approved this and I believe Ms. Mahoney has a briefing for us.

1 Thank you very much for briefing us today. Please go ahead.

2

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

MS. MAUREEN MAHONEY: Thank you Chairperson Urban, members of the board for this opportunity to provide a brief legislative update specifically with respect to the legislative proposal that the agency advanced at the December board meeting. At that meeting, consistent with the process approved in 2022 for taking positions on bills and adopting legislative proposals, the board voted to advance a legislative proposal to require browser vendors that include a feature that allows users to exercise their California privacy rights through opt-out preference signals. The board also asked for progress updates on the proposal. So since that meeting staff have begun working on draft language, we've had initial consultations with legislative council and we're having conversations with potential authors which have been incredibly positive. We've also undertaken additional legal analysis as requested by board members and are confident in our approach. Based on this initial work and our experience with SB 362, the California Delete Act, we're confident that we have adequate resources to effectively sponsor the bill. Additionally, we have new staff joining the legislative team later this month, which will further expand our resources. And thank you, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Mahoney. Questions? Comments? Mr. Worthe?

MS. DE LA TORRE: Question that is short. You mentioned that additional legal analysis?

MS. MAHONEY: Okay. Yeah, we, let's all back up, Ms. de la Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: No, I just quickly, you mentioned additional legal analysis has been completed. Was that already shared with the board through a memo? I might have not read it, but perhaps it has been shared or maybe there are plans to share it in the future.

MS. MAHONEY: I'm going to refer to Mr. Phil.

MR. LAIRD: Good morning again. Good afternoon, almost. Yes, a memo has been issued to the board although it was earlier this week, so.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I apologize. I'll make sure to thank you for all that.

MS. URBAN: Alright, there if no other comments or questions from the board. Mr. Sabo, is there any public comments?

MR. SABO: This is for agenda item five, Update on Agency
Legislative Proposal. If you'd like to speak on this item at this
time under public comment, please go ahead and raise your hand
using Zoom's 'Raise Hand' feature or by pressing star 6 for joining
by phone. Again, this is for agenda item five, Update on Agency
Legislative Proposal. This is the last call for public comment on
agenda item five. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any hands.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo. Thank you again, Ms. Mahoney. And we'll look forward to additional updates as they arise. I suggest that we go ahead and break for lunch in part because it might be warmer where we're going, and I could use a little time in a warmer room if that's amenable to everybody. I would like to inform the public and the board that we will take out of item— out of order from the agenda item number eight during the time that we're eating lunch, which will be the closed session item pursuant to Government Code section 111— excuse me, 26(e)(1), and

(2) (A). The board will be meeting and closed session to confer and 2 | receive advice from legal counsel regarding the following matters, California Chamber of Commerce v. California Privacy Protection Agency, et al. and California Privacy Protection Agency, et al. v. the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Sacramento California Chamber of Commerce. In addition, during closed session, the board will be meeting pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1) to discuss the executive director's annual review. I will say that we will, for purposes of the members of the public, we will not be back before 1:00PM but we could arrive at any point after that. But please feel free to step away as you would like. We will keep the public meeting open on Zoom and we'll return when our session is complete. Yes, Mr. Mactaggart?

6

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. MACTAGGART: Sure. I don't know if its bill permissible, but I just think just for the ease of the public. If we took number seven now, we could essentially end the public portion and then you wouldn't have to wait around for us to get back.

MS. URBAN: We still have to do both the open item for public comment and the future agenda items, which is not terribly long, but it does have some --

MR. MACTAGGART: But we could, unless anybody has lots of agenda items, we could maybe do that and it would--

MS. URBAN: There are a few, but sure.

MR. MACTAGGART: I mean, it would just alleviate the public waiting around for us.

MS. URBAN: Okay. Let's move to agenda item number six, public comment on items not on the agenda. Before we proceed with this item, please note that the only action the board can take is to

1 | listen to comments and consider whether it will consider the topic | at a future meeting. We cannot take any other action on the item at this meeting. It may seem as though we are not being responsive that is not our intent. Following these guidelines is critical to ensure that the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act is followed and to avoid undermining either the commenter's goals or the board's mission. But again, for this item, agenda item number six, the public is welcome to comment on any topic that is not on the agenda for today, Mr. Sabo, do we have public comment?

MR. SABO: Yes. First we have Justin K. Justin, I'm going to unmute you at this time and you'll have three minutes to make your comment. This is for agenda item six, Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda.

MX. JUSTIN KLOCZKO: Hi, good afternoon. So Wall Street AI is coming. Banks are spending the most on AI across industries. Consumer watchdog recently issued a report which goes through patents filed by major investment banks, and basically every bank is going to have its own version of ChatGPT giving financial advice. It's definitely concerning. But we're glad the privacy agency has draft language regarding generative AI and training data. We noticed there are parts, there are options for board discussion, not totally clear on what that means for the finality of the language, but we hope these rules are passed. So Californians can know more about these language models and protect themselves accordingly. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much.

6

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. SABO: Next we have Andrea C. Andrea, I'm going to unmute you at this time. Okay. You have three minutes to make your

comment. Begin whenever you're ready.

2

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MX. ANDREA CAO: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair and members of the board. My name is Andrea Cao, and I'm the Director of Public Policy at the California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce. Representing the interest of the over 746,000 Asian American and Pacific Islander owned small businesses throughout California. We're here today to reiterate our concerns with the CPPA's 2024 approach to regulations. Last month, we joined a coalition of small businesses and sent a letter to the CPPA, raising our concerns about the CPPA's proposed artificial intelligence regulations related to automated decision making technology. In our view, a CPPA unilateral regulatory approach without collaboration with the legislature, will lead to multiple and conflicting laws in 2024, which could severely harm small businesses in California. In addition, it is crucial to expand engagement beyond formal meetings and comments and open up channels to collaborate with other key stakeholders. As the CPPA reviews, the economic impact of its 2024 regulations, we request that the CPPA keep in mind part of Governor Gavin Newsom's Small Business Proclamation and I quote, "California Small businesses account for over 99 percent of total businesses in the state and employ more than 7 million people, nearly half of the state's private sector workforce, our small businesses are global leaders and innovation and economic competitiveness, and embody the entrepreneurial spirit that drives the economy of the Golden State". End of quote. Also, as the CPPA develops its 2024 regulatory approach. Please keep in mind California's \$37.86 ||billion budget deficit. Small businesses help to contribute to California state revenues, and we need more of them to stay and

1 thrive in California and not shut down or move to another state due to overregulation. In some we appreciate the opportunity to be heard, and we hope that the CPPA 2024 regulatory approach is balanced and allows our small businesses to continue to prosper in California. Thank you for your time.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SABO: Yes. Next we have Julian C. Julian, I have unmuted you. Please go ahead whenever you're ready. You have three minutes.

MX. JULIAN CAÑETE: Thank you. You can hear me okay this time?

MS. URBAN: Yes. Yes. Thank you so much for coming back.

MX. CAÑETE: No, no. Thank you for the opportunity. Julian Cañete with the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce and good afternoon. The California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce is made up of over 125 Latino and diverse chambers, representing the over 815,000 Hispanic owned businesses across the state. Now, I have a couple of items that I would like to highlight as we enter 2024. Let me start with the race to regulate artificial intelligence, we expect that Governor Newsom, CPPA and the legislature is going to move on regulating AI. We expect the legislature will introduce 20 or more pieces of legislation on AI alone. So one of our primary questions for CPPA is what is CPPA doing to coordinate with the legislature? Has CPPA reached out to the legislature? If so, what has been the conversation like? If not, when will CPPA reach out? Let me paint a picture of what it looks like for more small business is standing. CPPA adopts regulation on opt out this April and expects compliance by October 2024. The legislature passes a bill on opt out conflicting with the CPPA in 2024, effective 2025. What happens then? We have a regulatory mess that is likely to

eliminate small businesses from California's economy because they do not have the resources to comply with multiple and potentially conflicting regulations. The bottom line, CPPA cannot regulate AI in a vacuum as it is likely to harm California's economy, particularly small businesses. Our suggestions on AI regulations are simple, collaborate with other branches of government and not operate in a silo except that CPPA cannot address AI in one swing. So a phase in approach may be appropriate approach, weight, evaluate and see if the regulation is working for consumers and businesses before adding more regulations. Constant amendment to regulations is unrealistic and can be catastrophic for our members. Again, thank you and we look forward to being part of the development of CPPA regulations in 2024. Thank you for the opportunity.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Sabo.

MR. SABO: Next we have PBwen, I'm going to unmute you at this time and you'll have three minutes to make your comment. Go ahead and begin whenever you're ready.

MX. PBWEN: Hi. Thank you for this opportunity representing my company here. And I know one thing that is a concern for us. It's going to be in terms of the privacy audit. So which is where my question is going to come from. I would love to know what the agency is planning in terms of privacy audit. When is that going to kick in place and what are the regulations in terms of budget and stuff like that. Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sabo.

MR. SABO: This is the last call for agenda item six, Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda. If you'd like to speak at this

time, please go ahead and raise your hand using Zoom's raised hand
feature or by pressing star nine. If you're joining by phone.

Michael Magee, I'm going to unmute you and you'll have three
minutes to make your comment. I've unmuted you. Please go ahead
whenever you're ready.

MX. MICHAEL MAGEE: Thanks. Very briefly, just wanted to thank the board for taking these ahead of lunch. I know it's a small thing, but it makes a big difference for the public's access and being able to fit this into the day. So appreciate you guys taking this time.

MS. URBAN: Oh, thank you Mr. Magee. We appreciate it.

MR. SABO: There any other public comments at this time? This is for agenda item six, Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any additional hands.

MS. URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much to everyone who commented. We'll go ahead and move to agenda item number seven. This is the item I mentioned at the top of the meeting that is available for a discussion of future agenda items. At this time, first, the board and then the public will have the opportunity to suggest agenda items for a future agenda. As a reminder, we can only discuss whether to place the items on a future agenda under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act similar to the previous agenda item, we cannot discuss any of the substance of these items because they have to be separately agendized and noticed, but we can do some planning for future meetings. So let me first go through the running list of items I have gathered from our recent, previous discussions and our regularized agenda along which will include some updates to that for 2024 from staff. And then we can find out

1 | if the board has additional items and whether the public does as well. So today we've covered our regularized meeting item for January, which is the governor's budget and our budget within an act. We know to expect regulation updates and requests for board feedback and votes on the regulatory package and packages that we've been discussing. As we discussed in our December meeting and previous, our regularized agenda for our March meeting also includes our annual item on public affairs which is the annual public awareness reports and priorities. And I know staff have heard, we've been very interested in this topic as we always are as a board. And there are a few things that we would love to hear about in that meeting. So I'm sure you will work on that and we'll look forward to it. I'll say a little bit more about the regularized calendar in a minute. Other items on my list are a report from the rulemaking process subcommittee, which is Ms. de la Torre and I, we'll be considering what we've learned from the rulemaking work we've done so far. The board handbook which we talked about in September that will come back when with staff's recommendations on both board feedback from the September meeting and any individual feedback that they have received. The chief privacy auditor position will come before us when we can, when Cal HR allows. And we have final stages of the strategic planning process. But we of course had a really good discussion about that today. Mr. Mactaggart has requested consideration of rulemaking that would implement the right to delete, to include partial deletion. And that is on the list I believe for when we're talking about regulations again. Oh, on the handbook discussion, I just wanted to be clear that for, because that's our governance

6

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 | handbook. I will make sure that's on the agenda for a meeting when we are all here. You've all been very diligent in attending meetings, so it hasn't been an issue, but I just wanted to be sure to be clear about that. We will all as we learned earlier today at some point here about the grant program sort of plans for that, updates and processes. So thank you to Ms. de la Torre for asking about that. Now let me say a little bit about the regularized items for 2024. Staff have recommended some minor movement and some items, so I just want to give everyone a heads up. So we have a picture of the year. So the regularized calendar for January is the January 10 budget and the BCP and the direction for spring budget changes and priorities, which we talked about today. For next year staff is recommending that we add the executive director's review to January instead of, we've put it over to January, but instead of having it at the last meeting of the year, that would give us a whole year worth of time to talk about it. And given everything else, I thought that was the better place for it. Regularized calendar for March, we have the annual public awareness report and priorities, that's no change there. We know we are going to hear about details on the executed and planned media expenditures, the six plus \$8 million. And of course, Mr. Lombard had a comment about some of the expenditures earlier, and so we'll look forward to hearing about all of that. Staff would also is planning to move the annual enforcement report and priorities item up to March from July to allow for board input earlier in the year. I'm pretty excited about this given we have obviously, again, a lot of interest on the | board about enforcement. So we'll look forward to hearing about that. And I think that responds to a request for a bit more

6

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

discussion about enforcement priorities that have come up. The regularized calendar for May is our first, our biannual regulations, proposals and priorities. Most of you'll recall our conversation last May. It's coming around again and we'll include items that we've brought up and staff have brought up over the year. The change here is to move the updates in initial board positions on pending legislation up to May from July. As you know, given the California legislative cycle, there's not really a perfect timing for this. They're very active sort of from April all the way through July. Ms. Mahoney recommends though that we start in May that will allow us to take some positions earlier in the cycle. The good news is it simplifies our July calendar a little bit, but everybody of course should be aware that we may still need to talk about leg. stuff in July because it can come back up again or new things can come up. It's a very dynamic cycle. But that $16 \parallel \text{would}$, so in that case, the regularized calendar for July includes the item that we had last year and we'll continue to include, which is the budget plan to the board for the upcoming BCP process. So that's the second of our planned budget discussions each year. This is the same as last year. And then the change here is since we have shifted the legislative conversation, we'll shift the annual hiring update, including diversity and inclusion metrics up from September. Now, the regularized calendar for September and the passive include the hiring update and the ED's delegation renewal. We handled the ED's delegation renewal in a more sort of long-term fashion, of course, and I want to remind the board, we can always \parallel revisit the delegation at any time. You just need to mention it during a request for future agenda items. But since we don't need

6

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1 to do that this year and we can move the hiring update that means 2 we do not necessarily have to have a regularized meeting in September. I would ask that you please do continue to hold the date in case we need it for regulation, for example. But we may be able ||not to have a meeting in September. And then for November, we have our second legislation, discussion, which we had in December of this year, and the second regulations discussion. Okay. So I apologize, that took a little bit of time. I just wanted to walk through it because a couple of things moved around so that we have a picture of the year before I request additional items, et cetera from other board members.

MS. DE LA TORRE: I don't have an item, but I do have a small personal announcement. Can I make it when we come back or should they make it now?

MS. URBAN: Mr. Laird, I think... can she make a personal announcement?

MR. LAIRD: It's fine.

MS. URBAN: Yes, of course. Please go ahead.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. My announcement is that I plan on stepping down from the board this year. The Senate has started a process to select a new board member, and it's just due to personalized circumstances and the need for attention elsewhere.

Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

MS. URBAN: Thank you Ms. de la Torre. Do you have a sense, will we have the benefit of your expertise for another meeting or two? It's okay if you don't know. I--

MS. DE LA TORRE: The goal will be to avoid an overlap where there's no board member representing the senate, but other than

1 that, I cannot give you further detail. We'll see how long it takes 2 for a new appointee to be selected.

MS. URBAN: Okay. Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. And I hope that we have this opportunity in a future board meeting, but we really value your expertise, your contributions, your dedication, and we'll be very sorry to see you go. Although very grateful for your service.

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

MS. URBAN: Any other future agendas? Yes, Mr. Le?

MR. LE: Yeah. I wanted to echo what you said about working with Ms. de la Torre is, it's been a pleasure and I'm definitely going to miss your expertise. And I guess the, and sorry to shift, I guess, did we mention the grant program in the list?

MS. URBAN: Yes.

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

MR. LE: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to--

MS. URBAN: It was a kind of a long list, so, but it is in there. Yes, Mr. Mactaggart.

MR. MACTAGGART: Sure. Thanks. Well, I just wanted to say to Ms. de la Torre how important she was to the entire process of the initiative. I think I said it before, but she was one of the privacy experts who first kind of gave me the time of day and was willing to help out along the way. Always gracious, true expert in her field, especially with really important for us was something who's expert in GDPR. Because that was our North Star to such an extent. And I just want to say thank you. I only got to serve with you for a short amount of time here, but I know how much work you did as all of you original board members did. Way more work than we are doing now originally. And I just want to say thank you for your

commitment to privacy. The state has been lucky to have you, and it's been a real honor working with you professionally.

2

3

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Mactaggart. I would like to point out that our initial regulatory package, which sounds minor because I said initial, but which is massive. Ms. de la Torre and I were the regulations subcommittee. And it is more than fair to say that her organization of how we thought about separating out the topics for that package and pursuing it was key to our ability to do such an ambitious and important thing with just ourselves and very little expert staff to begin with. So just on a personal note, it was a joy to work with you on that and to benefit from the expertise. Alright. Are there any agenda items from the public?

MR. SABO: This is for agenda item seven, future agenda items. If you'd like to make a comment on this agenda item, please go ahead and raise your hand using Zoom's raised hand feature. Again, this is for agenda item seven, future agenda items. Last call for future agenda items from the public. Go ahead and raise your hand if you'd like to speak at this time. Madam Chair, I'm not seeing any hands.

MS. URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Sabo. Thanks to all the members of the public for their time so far today. We will now go into actually in order closed session pursuant to government code section 1126E1, and then 2A. The board will meet in closed session to confirm, receive advice from legal counsel regarding two matters, California Chamber of Commerce versus California Privacy Protection Agency, et al and California Privacy Protection Agency $27 \parallel$ et al, versus the Superior Court of the state of California for the County of Sacramento, California Chamber of Commerce. And secondly

1 pursuant to government code section 11126A1 to discuss the ||executive director's annual review. We will not return before 01:15. Well actually we will not return before 1:00 PM as I said earlier, we could return any time after that, and we will keep the public meeting open, but we will be returning just to adjourn the meeting. So thank you to everyone who doesn't stick around for your participation in our process and in our meeting today. And thanks to the board members and we will retire to close session. Thank you. Welcome back everyone from the closed session, our final agenda, we'll move to our final agenda, item number nine, which is adjournment. I'd like to thank everyone, the board members, staff, especially those of you who've trekked here from other places and members of the public for all of your contributions to the meeting today and to the board's work overall. May I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MR. LE: Aye. So move.

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye.

MS. URBAN: Thank you Ms. de la Torre. I have a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Sabo, would you please conduct the roll call vote.

MR. SABO: Yes, Ms. de la Torre?

MS. DE LA TORRE: Aye.

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

MR. LE: Aye.

MR. SABO: Aye. Board member Mactaggart?

MR. MACTAGGART: Aye.

MR. SABO: Mactaggart aye. Board member Worthe? Board member--

Chair Urban? MS. URBAN: Aye. MR. SABO: Urban aye. Madam Chair, four ayes in favor. MS. URBAN: Thank you very much. The motion has been approved by a vote of four to nothing. This meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board is hereby stands adjourned. Thanks everyone. (end of recording)