CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY BOARD
PRE-RULEMAKING STAKEHOLDER SESSION - SACRAMENTO
AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED PUBLIC MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024
LENGTH: 2:44:51
AFTERNOON SESSION
Transcribed by:
iDepo Reporters 898 North Pacific Coast Highway
Suite 475 El Segundo, California 90245
(323) 393-3768 www.ideporeporters.com



1	APPEARANCES:		
2	Present:	JENNIFER M. URBAN, Chairperson of the Board	
3		PHILIP LAIRD, Meeting Counsel	
4		ASHKAN SOLTANI, Executive Director	
5		SERENA MARZION, Moderator	
6		MARINA FEEHAN, Attorney for CPPA	
7		DREW LIEBERT, Board Member	
8		MEGAN WHITE, Deputy Director for Public and External Affairs	
9		UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER 1, on behalf of	
10		Gig Workers Rising and Power Switch Action	
11		MR. JASON, Lyft rideshare driver	
12		ALEX TORRES, ESQ., Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP	
13		EDWIN LOMBARD, ELM Strategies	
14 15		SAMANTHA GORDON, Chief Program Officer at Tech Equity Collaborative	
16		MAGGIE OATES, Consumer Reports	
17		CARMEN COMSTI, Lead Regulatory Policy Specialist with California Nurse Assoc.	
18		THOMAS YATES, Professional Illustrator	
19		KELLY JONES, Professional Illustrator	
20		·	
21		ANNE FLANAGAN, Vice President for A.I. at The Future of Privacy Forum	
22		UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER 2, business owner	
23		TASIA KEEFER, LA County Business Federation	
24		JULIAN CANETE, California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce	
25		OI COMMETCE	



1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	CAM THING Charrhaard artich
3	SAM TUNG, Storyboard artist
4	ALESSANDRA MANASCO, California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
5	MATT SCHERER, Center for Democracy and technology
6	BRYNNE O'NEAL, National Nurses United
7	IAN MALONEY, Senior Vice President and
8	Head of Policy and Regulatory Affairs at the American FinTech Council
9	ALLISON ADEY, Personal Insurance Federation
10	
11	RICK ARNEY, Vice Chair of Californians for Consumer Privacy
12	TIANA AURELIA, Professional Illustrator
13	PETER LEROE MUNOZ, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
14	YADI, Oakland Privacy
15	BERNADETTE KING, Research Analyst at SEIU,
16	United Healthcare Workers West
17	NATALIE BAST, California Business Roundtable
18	BARBARA LAWLER, President of the Information Accountability Foundation
19	IAN MCPHERSON
20	
21	ISABELLA ROJAS, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
22	CARLA ORTIZ, Artist
23	ROCIO BABAESA, Business Owner
24	DINA, Concept Art Association
25	SIRSHA GRACE, Oakland Privacy



CHAIR URBAN: Good afternoon, well warm welcome to all of you from myself. I'm the Chair of the Board of the California Privacy Protection Agency, and all of us at the Agency. We really appreciate you taking time out from your busy schedules to join us for the stakeholder session this afternoon. Really pleased to welcome folks here in person in Sacramento, and also everyone who's joining us via Zoom.

Thank you so much for coming. I'm joined here today by members of the CPPA team to discuss important issues that affect all Californians. Privacy and the use of personal information in Automated Decision Making Technology, which we refer to as ADMT for short. Although we try to keep the acronyms to a minimum. So first I'll say a little bit about the Agency and the plan for today's session.

The CPPA team will provide an overview of the Agency's history and our responsibilities under the law. That will be brief, and I'll leave that overview to their very capable hands. But in the briefest little pressy, we are a new state Agency. We were established by initiative, a statute of vote by the voters directly in 2020 and got going in 2021. So we are really new.

We're governed by a five member Board. And I'm incredibly honored to serve as the chair of the Board. I



was appointed by Governor Gavin Newsom in March of 2021 when the Board was established. And in my day job, I'm a Clinical Professor of law at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law and the Director of Policy Initiatives at the Samuelson Law Technology & Public Policy Clinic. But that's just color. You don't need that for today.

I served with four other appointees another person appointed by the governor even closer. Okay, sure. Oh, yes. Now, I can hear it picking up. This is a very -- this is not a sensitive mic. This is -- this is a very thin -- thick skinned mic. One person appointed by the governor, one person appointed by the Attorney General, one person appointed by the assembly, the Speaker of the Assembly, and one person appointed by the Senate Speaker Pro Temp.

And I'm thrilled that the Senate's appointee, Mr. Drew Liebert. Is it okay that I point you out? Mr. Liebert is able to join us from the Board today as well. And I'd like to spend just a moment introducing him because he is our newest appointee and only joined us in April. He brings exceptional California legislative experience to the Board and to the Agency. He served over two decades in various staff, legislative positions in the California legislature.

I'm sure many of you who are joining us from Sacramento will know Mr. Liebert and may have worked with

him in the past when he was Chief of Staff for the Senate Majority Leader and for 18 years Chief counsel for the Assembly Judiciary Committee, which saw a lot of technology — sees a lot of technology measures, and saw them when Mr. Liebert was there. So, it's a real pleasure to welcome him to the Board, and I'm grateful to you, Mr. Liebert, for taking the time to join us today.

I'm so worried about the program. If you haven't had a chance yet, please feel free to take an agenda. And the handouts located on the check-in table. They're also available on our website, which is cppa dot ca dot gov on the meetings and events page.

The agenda will give you a sense of the flow of today's pre-rulemaking stakeholder session. And the fact sheets, which are available in English and Spanish, provide helpful overviews of the topics we will discuss here today. As you'll see from the agenda, the CPPA team will give a presentation that'll take about an hour or so. And we've devoted the rest of the time to hearing from stakeholders, to hearing from you.

We look very -- we look forward to hearing your important feedback. And we may be able to answer questions, but this is where I want to just pause and explain that these are draft rules. They're not yet even informal rulemaking. The Agency hasn't taken an official position

and can only do that through the Board. And so that means that we often -- or we, staff, often won't be able to answer questions yet.

And Mr. Liebert and I aren't able to give, take any positions because the Board as a whole, as a body has not. So that means the staff will go through the proposed draft and none of us will ultimately be -- say what we decided at this point, which of course is one reason why it's so crucial to have your feedback. And we are in listening mode.

So, today we're focusing on the draft rulemaking to implement the law. That's one of our important responsibilities. We've been working on pre-rulemaking on the ADMT related topics for quite a while almost since we started. So in fall 2021, we started thinking about it and doing some pre-rulemaking questionnaires and asking for feedback. And today is an important next step. Now, that we have draft rules getting this input in advance of putting the rules into formal rulemaking process by which they could become enforceable regulations. This is a key time right now.

So in addition to not being able to often answer questions, and we do not mean not to be responsive, we are listening hard. We can't give legal advice. And what that means is if you have a question that relates to your own

specific situation, we are not able to respond to that because it would be legal advice outside of what is allowed in a lawyer client relationship.

So for next steps we are going to take all this feedback. Staff is going to put it all together. And once the Board has a chance to consider, we would move to the formal rulemaking process, at which point the public has an opportunity to provide formal comments, and there will be a formal hearing at a minimum. Sometimes there are more than one round of that.

So I don't want to take away from the staff's presentation. I will stop there. But I would like to introduce them. I'm joining us today are Philip Laird. Philip Laird on my right, general counsel for the Agency, Marina Feehan, Attorney for the Agency and Megan White, our Deputy Director of Public and External Affairs.

So, Ms. White is going to go over some housekeeping topics, including how to provide comment today. Please note that public comment will be five minutes per person. And she'll explain how to do it here and on the Zoom link. So thank you very much, Deputy Director White, and I will turn it over to you.

MS. WHITE: Thank you so much, Chair Urban, and for all of you who have joined us here today in person and also online. Some of the things I'm going to be taking care of

right now are just some general housekeeping, so it probably applies more to the people in this room than the people who are joining us online.

But as Chair Urban mentioned, my name's Megan White. I'm the Deputy Director of Public and External Affairs for the Agency. Just a reminder, this is a hybrid meeting, so if you all are here in this room, you're welcome to stay. Of course, if we have more people come in, we have an overflow room that they'll be welcome to join us from. And of course, all of our online viewers today.

If you have any issues online, technical issues, please feel free to e-mail info at cppa dot ca dot gov. That's info at cppa dot ca dot gov. We're monitoring that e-mail address and we will make sure to address any issues if there are any. For the people here in this room emergency exits.

If there is an emergency, we're going to head basically right out back by where you came. The staircase is close to the elevators, we'll be taking that down and heading right out the room. I'm sure we'll be fine, but it's always good to know.

Another really important tip, bathrooms. You're going to head out again towards the elevator where you were before, right past the elevator, and you'll find a men's and women's restroom on your right hand side. For people who

are here, just a gentle reminder, you're welcome to grab handouts. We have them available in English and Spanish along with our agenda.

For people joining us online, just go to the events tab on cppa dot ca dot gov. There you can find all the handouts along with the agenda. And for public comment, we are going to keep it to three minutes today simply because we have so many people joining us online as well.

So once we go to public comment, we're going to take public comment from everybody here in the room first. We'll also take from the overflow room if we happen to go —to get that large in person. After that, we'll be taking it from online. You'll be using the raised hand feature for those on Zoom, or also if you're joining us by phone, you'll press star six.

I will mention this information again as soon as we're done with the presentation. So if you're not sure exactly, don't worry. I'm going to be mentioning it before we go into the public comment portion. I believe that's it for me. So now I'm going to hand it over to the team.

They're going to go through their presentation approximately 45 minutes, and then we'll be jumping into public comment as chair mention -- Chair Urban mentioned. We are listening deeply to public comment and we're so grateful for so many of you who showed up today in person

and also online. Now, over to the team.

MR. LAIRD: Hi there. Good afternoon, everybody. All want to make sure everybody can hear me all right, I think so. Excellent. So, again, from Marina and me at least, welcome to the third of three pre-rulemaking stakeholder sessions we've been holding throughout the state. Last week we were in Los Angeles in Fresno. We're happy to be here in Sacramento today.

And we really are looking forward to hearing the feedback today after today's presentation. I know you've heard that again, but truly that is a major purpose for these stakeholder sessions is to hear from the stakeholders. Next slide please. And I'll wait a moment for our slides to catch up.

Perfect, thank you. Well, as the attorney in the room, I can't help myself, but give a good disclaimer here. So before we get started, I do want to be clear the California Consumer Privacy Act, CCPA requires us to issue regulations on Automated Decision-making Technology, Risk Assessments, and Cybersecurity Audits.

For ease, Marina and I will often be referring to Automated Decision-making Technology as ADMT to save us all a few minutes today. But as we talk about these, I want to be clear, I know the chair mentioned this, and we will say this a few times. These are only draft regulations and we

are not yet in the formal rulemaking process yet.

Rulemaking process in California actually has many steps involved, including additional opportunities for public comment. And we'll talk more about that at the end of the presentation. Our presentation today is designed to explain the draft regulations in their current form so that you can better understand them and then to participate in the rulemaking process when it does kick off. So, again, one more time, I'll just be clear, these draft regulations are not in effect and are subject to change based on direction of our Agency's Board.

Finally, in addition to the disclaimer language you see on the slide I'll note that any opinions we express today if we happen to are our own and not necessarily those of the Agency, its Board or individual Board members. And as we've described already in some part Board — the Board is the decision makers for our Agency, and therefore it will be the Board who collectively decides on how and whether to implement these regulations moving forward.

So, next slide please. To give you just a brief agenda of how we -- what we plan to cover today. We'll start with just a little bit of background on our law and our Agency and the activity we're discussing today. Then we're going to walk through our draft regulations on ADMT, risk assessments and cybersecurity audits in that order.

And then finally, we will conclude with information about how you can participate in the formal rulemaking process when that kicks off. And then afterwards, as Megan has described, is when we will have the opportunity for public comment. Next slide, please. Okay. So kicking off background on the CCPA and current activity. Next slide please.

So, the California Consumer Privacy Act, or the CCPA passed in 2018 and went into effect in 2020. It was the first comprehensive consumer privacy law in the nation, and it gave consumers rights over their personal information that businesses collect about them. It requires businesses to inform consumers about how they collect, use, disclose, and retain personal information. Then in November, 2020, California voters approved Proposition 24, the California Privacy Rights Act or CPRA, which amended the CCPA.

That's a lot of acronyms, I promise I'm not going to keep coming at you quite in that regard. I'll just be referring to the law we are implementing as the CCPA moving forward. So those amendments went into effect in 2023, such now that the CPPA also provides privacy protections to employees, independent contractors and job applicants, which is relatively rare among consumer privacy laws in the US. And it also includes new rights for consumers, including the right to correct personal information that a business has

about them, the right to limit a business's use and disclosure of your sensitive personal information.

And we'll be discussing today the right to access information about and to opt out of business' use of ADMT, including profiling. It'll define what profiling means in just a little bit. The amendments also created our Agency, the California Privacy Protection Agency. So our Agency is tasked with implementing and encouraging -- enforcing apologies, the CCPA, and that includes issuing regulations to implement our requirements. And we are here today because the CCPA requires the Agency to issue these regulations on these three topics. Next slide, please.

So when you really boil down a lot of the functions of our Agency, one way we like to summarize it is these three primary functions, these key roles. First, we have a rulemaking rule, and that rulemaking rule is to issue rules that implement, define, and further explain the CCPA's statutory requirements. We also have a role of promoting public awareness by providing information and guidance to both consumers and businesses about the CCPA.

And finally, we have an auditing and enforcement function. We can audit for compliance, and we can also initiate investigations which may lead to enforcement actions when violations are detected. Next slide, please. So today we are leaning really into our first two functions,

rulemaking, and public awareness. As we've been saying, we were talking about draft regulations that are not in effect. I'll say it probably a few more times today. And we haven't started formal rulemaking.

So right now we are really in the preliminary rulemaking stage. And during this time, we really do find stakeholder engagement to be important component of the development of these regulations. We are seeking your feedback, your thoughts, your concerns, and further suggestions. And we invite you to share your thoughts after today's presentation. Next slide, please. All right. And now I am going to stop talking for a little bit and turn it over to my colleague Marina Feehan.

MS. FEEHAN: I have to push the button. Can you guys hear me? Okay? Thank you so much, Phil. So today I'll be talking about ADMT or for long Automated Decision-making Technology. The CCPA directs the Agency to issue regulations about access and opt-out rights relating to business' use of ADMT. So today we'll spend some time talking about what ADMT is, what it includes and what it doesn't include.

We'll also talk about when a business would need to comply with the proposed regulations for ADMT. But one thing to note is that these requirements don't apply to all uses of ADMT, just certain uses that we'll explain today.

Lastly, we'll talk about what the proposed requirements are for those specific uses of ADMT that fall under these proposed regulations. Next slide, please.

So, what is Automated Decision-making technology or ADMT? When we talk about ADMT, it's helpful to break it down into four parts. It's technology that collects, uses, retains or discloses personal information. It's technology that uses computation and most importantly, it replaces or substantially facilitates human decision making. So substantially facilitating. What we mean is using ADMT to generate a score about a consumer that a human reviewer would use as a primary factor to make a significant decision about them.

So examples of ADMT would include things like resume screening tools that a business would use to decide whether or not to interview an applicant. And ADMT also includes profiling. And we'll go into what profiling means in the next slide. But one thing to note is that ADMT generally does not include routinely used technologies such as spreadsheets or spell check. Next slide please.

So what is profiling generally profiling? Ooh, excuse me. Talking too loud. Profiling generally refers to evaluating a consumer with automated processing, such as using technology to analyze a consumer's personality, their interests, their behavior, or their movements. Profiling

technologies are considered Automated Decision-making Technology or ADMT. Next slide please.

So who would need to comply with ADMT requirements? First, you must be a business that falls under the CCPA. Generally, the CCPA does not apply to nonprofit organizations or government agencies. To be a business under the CCPA, you have to be a for-profit entity that meets certain additional thresholds. For example, making over 28 million in annual gross revenue would subject you to the CCPA.

We have a fact sheet available online that can help you assess whether or not your business needs to comply with the CCPA. Secondly, assuming that you're a business under the CCPA, you'll have to use ADMT in any of the three ways to make significant decisions. Conduct extensive profiling or to train ADMT. Next slide please.

So first, a business must use ADMT for a significant decision concerning a consumer to comply with the ADMT requirements. And what do we mean about a significant decision? It's a decision that has important consequences for consumers, for instance, using ADMT to result in providing or denying and consumer financial services, housing, educational employment opportunities, healthcare services or essential goods and services such as medicine.

So as an example, if a business is using video screening technology that is part of a job interview, analyzes the applicant's body movements, facial expressions, and gestures to determine whether or not they would make a good employee and should be hired. This would be the use of ADMT for a significant decision about a consumer. Next slide, please.

Second, a business using ADMT for extensive profiling would have to comply with the ADMT requirements. As you recall, profiling generally refers to a consumer using -- I'm sorry, generally refers to evaluating a consumer using automated processing such as technology to analyze a consumer's personality, interests, behavioral movements. When we talk about extensive profiling, we're generally talking about three types of profiling.

Work or educational profiling. That means profiling a consumer who's acting in their capacity as an applicant, a student and employee or independent contractor through systematic observation, for example, that would be using product -- sorry, productivity monitoring software to monitor how quickly factory workers are packaging up goods.

The second is public profiling. This means profiling a consumer in public through systematic observation in a publicly accessible place. For example, deploying facial recognition technology in a stadium or a

mall. And lastly, for those ADMT uses for behavioral advertising. This would be profiling a consumer to target advertising to them by tracking what the consumer buys or what they read in order to send targeted ads. Next slide, please.

Closer, further away. Okay, thank you. Lastly, a business would be subject to ADMT requirements for training uses of ADMT. Training uses of ADMT generally means that the business is using consumer's personal information to train an ADMT technology for certain purposes, such as to make significant decisions, to identify people, to use physiological or biological identification or profiling, or to generate deepfakes. And deepfakes would be using ADMT to generate fake images or voices of real people and then passing them off as truthful or authentic. And I think at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Laird to continue the discussion on ADMT.

MR. LAIRD: So now that we've covered which uses of ADMT are covered by our draft regulations, what would a business have to do if it actually used ADMT in one of those three ways? So only if a business uses ADMT for a significant decision, extensive profiling or training uses, would it have to comply with the proposed requirements we're discussing today.

Specifically, the business would have to; first,

provide a pre-use notice to the consumers whose information it wants to process using the ADMT. There we go. Second, it would have to give consumers an easy way to opt out of its use of ADMT. And third, it would have to give consumers an easy way to access information about how the ADMT was used with respect to them, which the consumer can exercise later if they proceed with the business' use of that ADMT.

And so now I'm going to unpack each of those requirements just a little further. Next slide please. So before a business can use ADMT in any of the ways we've discussed, it would have to provide a pre-use notice to the consumer so that the consumer can decide whether to opt out or to proceed. And whether to access more information about the business' use of ADMT. So when a a pre-use notice was -- would be generated, it would have to include the following.

Why the business wants to use the ADMT. That means they would have to explain the specific purpose and not use something generic like to improve our services when describing the use. It would also have to explain how ADMT would work and include things like the logic used in the ADMT, including the key parameters that affect the ADMT's output, the intended output of the ADMT, for example, does it create a score about a consumer or does it place them into a specific profile or segment?

And then finally, how the business plans to use the output, including the role of human involvement. For example, if a business plans to use the output score that a resume screening tool generates to determine who will be offered an interview, the business would need to disclose. That's how it plans to use the tool and the role the human interviewers will have in that process.

The business would also have to provide a description of the consumer's right to opt out and how they can exercise that right. Alternatively, if the business is relying upon the human appeal exception that we'll discuss in a little bit the business would instead describe the consumer's ability to appeal the decision and how they can submit that appeal. A description of the consumer's right to access info about the business uses the ADMT with respect to the consumer and how the consumer can submit their access request.

And finally, they -- the business would have to convey in this pre-use notice that the business is prohibited from retaliating against consumers for exercising their CCPA rights so that a consumer is aware of this fact.

Next slide please.

Now, if a consumer opts out at the pre-use notice stage, that is before the business uses the ADMT, the business is not allowed to start processing their personal

information using that ADMT. If the consumer went ahead with the business' use of ADMT and decides to opt out later, the business has to immediately stop processing their personal information using the ADMT and inform anyone else that may have involved in that ADMT, for instance, its contractors or vendors that they need to stop the use as well. Now, there are exceptions to when a business must provide an opt out, and we will go over those in a few slides. And one thing to note here is that there is no exception for profiling for behavioral advertising or training uses of ADMT. A business would always have to provide an opt-out for those uses of ADMT. Next slide, please.

So when we talk about these exceptions to that rule I just laid out, they -- the first one is this. And that is an exception for security, fraud prevention, and safety. It applies when a business wants to use ADMT for profiling in the workplace or educational settings or in public. And in these cases, a business is not required to provide the ability to opt out if it's using ADMT only for security, fraud prevention, and safety. But to rely on this exception, the business cannot use the ADMT for any other purpose except for that security, fraud prevention or safety purpose. Next slide, please.

So the next exception is one I referenced earlier,

the human appeal exception. This applies when a business wants to use ADMT to make a significant decision about a consumer. That business would not be required to provide the opt-out if it provides the consumer with the ability to appeal to a human decision maker. And to qualify for this exception, the business generally would have to do the following.

It would have to provide the consumer with a method to appeal the decision to a qualified human reviewer who has authority to overturn the decision of the ADMT and clearly describe to the consumer how they can submit their appeal and enable them to provide information for the reviewer to consider when submitting such an appeal. Next slide, please.

and the third exception to that rule I stated earlier is for an evaluation. And this applies when a business uses ADMT explicitly for admissions acceptance or hiring decisions, allocation and assignment of work and compensation decisions or for work or educational profiling. Now, the business would not be required to provide the opt-out if the business has one, evaluated the ADMT to ensure it works as intended for the business' purposes and does not discriminate based on protected classes. And two, has also implemented accuracy and non-discrimination safeguards when deploying that technology. Next slide

please.

Now finally, what would a business have to provide if a consumer requested access for additional information about how the ADMT was used? If the consumer has proceeded with the use of that ADMT, which is processing their personal information, they can request access for more information about how exactly it was used in their case. So if a consumer requests that access, the business' response to the consumer would have to include the following.

First, why the business used the ADMT. That's the specific purpose with respect -- with respect to the consumer. And again, not using generic terms such as to improve our services. Secondly, they would have to explain how the ADMT worked for that consumer. This would mean providing the consumer with output of the ADMT with respect to that consumer. For instance, if a technology generates a score for the consumers, the business must tell the consumer what their personal score was.

Secondly, how their -- how the business used the output with respect to the consumer. So if to make a decision -- significant decision concerning a consumer, the role of that output and human involvement in making that decision. And also for example, it to engage in extensive profiling of the consumer, the role of the output in evaluating a consumer.

And finally, the logic of the ADMT, the key parameters that affected the output and how they applied to the the consumer. And then finally, the business is prohibited from retaliating against consumers for exercising their CCPA rights and instructions for how the consumer can exercise their other CCPA rights such as the right to correct. So a quick note though a business using personal information to train ADMT is not required to provide an access response to the consumer. And also a business that makes an adverse significant decision using ADMT has additional notice requirements.

An adverse significant decision, as you can imagine, would be things like being demoted or terminated from a job and being denied housing or essential goods or services. An additional notice would be necessary in those instances to make sure consumers know that a significant decision has been made about them using ADMT.

And because there may be of a long time between the time the consumer got that pre-use notice and made that decision to proceed with the ADMT, and when a significant decision is actually made about them, the consumer may not remember that they have these rights available to them. And so this would be an obligation to provide a different -- additional notice that they're informed of their choices and can exercise their rights. Next slide please.

So lastly, if a business is using physical or biological profiling for significant decisions or extensive profiling, they would have additional requirements. Now, when we talk about this type of profiling, it generally refers to evaluating people using ADMT with information about their physical or biological characteristics. So some examples you can imagine are facial recognition technology that analyzes your face to identify you or emotion assessment tools that evaluate your eye or other facial movements or gestures to analyze or infer your emotions or behavior.

Now, a business that uses physical or biological identification or profiling for a significant decision or for extensive profiling must do two things. It must first evaluate to ensure it works as intended for the business' proposed use and doesn't discriminate on the basis of a protected class. And also implement accuracy and non-discrimination safeguards to make sure it's acting as it's supposed to. So with that, that concludes our presentation and overview of the ADMT portion of the regulations. And now we're going to switch modes to the risk assessments portion of the regulations. And I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Feehan once again.

MS. FEEHAN: Thank you, Mr. Laird. So I'll be talking about the Risk Assessments. The goal of a risk

assessment is to ensure that businesses don't do things with a consumer's personal information when the risk to consumer's privacy outweighs the benefits of the activity. A risk assessment generally involves the identification of risk to consumers' privacy for a given activity and the mitigation of those risks.

Next slide, please. So who would need to conduct a risk assessment? A business under the CCPA would need to conduct a risk assessment before doing any of the four things on this slide because each of them poses significant risk to the consumer's privacy.

The first is selling or sharing personal information. Because the risk basically undermines consumer's control over their personal information could perpetuate discrimination and enable stalking and harassment. The second is the collecting, using, disclosing, retaining, or otherwise processing of sensitive information. Sensitive information includes things like social security numbers, financial information, precise geolocation, health information, and will include children's personal information. That is the personal information of consumers that the business had actual knowledge were less than 16 years of age.

And the third is using ADMT for significant decisions or extensive profiling. And lastly, the use of

ADMT or AI in certain ways, such as for a significant decision to establish individual identity, for physical or biological identification or profiling or to generate deepfakes. Next slide, please.

So what else would a risk assessment need to include? At a high level it would have to include why the business needs to do the activity, what is the purpose of it. Second, it would have to include the types of personal information the business would process, what they want to collect, use, disclose, retain, or otherwise process in a — in order to do the activity, including whether it includes sensitive personal information.

Third, the risk assessment would have to explain how the business plans to do the activity. This would include things like how many consumers would be affected by the activity, what the business would tell consumers about the use of their personal information, who else might be involved in the activity, and whether the technology -- and what technology the business plans to use in order to do the activity.

Next slide, please. Note that for certain uses of ADMT, such as to make significant decisions concerning a consumer or for extensive profiling, the business would also have to include information about how the ADMT would work or how the ADMT would use -- how the business would use ADMT to

make those decisions.

Fifth, the business would also have to include in the risk assessment the benefits and consequences to consumers associated with doing the activity and any relevant protections that the business plans to put in place. Lastly, the business would have to include whether the business will actually do the activity and details about who in the business contributed to, reviewed, and approved the risk assessment.

Finally, note that a business would not be allowed to start an activity if the risk to consumers' privacy outweighed the benefits of the activity. This lines up with the goal of conducting a risk assessment in the first place, making sure that businesses don't do things with consumers' personal information when the risk to consumers' privacy outweighs the benefits of the activity. Next slide, please.

So in terms of when a business would have to conduct or update a risk assessment, a business would have to conduct a risk assessment before it starts the activity. They would also have to review and update as necessary its risk assessment at least once every three years to make sure that they remain accurate. Also, if something important changed about how the business did the activity, for instance, it started collecting more sensitive personal information, then the business would have to immediately

update its risk assessment. Next slide, please.

What would a business have to submit to the Agency and when? A business would need to submit a certification of compliance to the Agency and an abridged risk assessment. What is an abridged risk assessment? This shorter form of risk assessment would include the relevant activity, the purpose of that activity, the categories of personal information used for the activity, and the protections that the businesses put into place. The business would have 24 months to submit its first certification and the abridged risk assessments to the Agency, and then it would need to submit them annually thereafter.

Also, if requested by the Agency or the attorney general, a business would have 10 business days to submit an unabridged. That would mean a full risk assessment to the Agency or the AG upon request. Note that if a business did not start the activity because it determined that the risk outweighed the potential benefits, it would not be required to submit anything to the Agency for that type of activity. And next slide, please.

The other thing to note is that we're not requiring duplicate risk assessments. A business would not be required to conduct one -- I'm sorry. This means a business could conduct one risk assessment for comparable or similar sets of activities. And it could also mean that a

business could use a risk assessment that it used to complete -- to comply with other laws in order to comply with the CCPA. So for instance, if the the business conducted a risk assessment for GDPR compliance or GLBA compliance, then they could use that same risk assessment in order to comply with the CCPA. However, if that risk assessment didn't include all of the requirements of the CCPA regulations, then the business would have to add those as needed for CCPA compliance. Next slide, please.

And lastly, we'll end this talk about risk assessments with some illustrative examples. So these examples don't cover potentially all applicable laws or enforcement circumstances. However, we think they may be useful for businesses seeking to understand how our draft regulations would apply under certain circumstances. Next slide, please.

Our first example is a retailer that wants to use facial recognition technology in its stores solely to identify shoplifters. What would the retailer need to do under the proposed regulations? First, the retailer would have to conduct a risk assessment. They would need to evaluate through -- the facial-recognition technology to ensure it works as intended for the retailer's use and does not discriminate.

Then it would have to implement accuracy and

non-discrimination protections and provide a pre-use notice to consumers. It must also provide consumers with the ability to access more information about the use of ADMT. Note that the retailer would not have to provide an opt-out from its use of ADMT so long as it uses the ADMT only for fraud protection and prevention. Fraud prevention means to resist malicious, deceptive, fraudulent or illegal actions directed at the business and to prosecute those responsible for those actions. Next slide, please.

Our second example is a business whose HR team wants to use a spreadsheet to input junior employee's performance evaluation scores from their managers and their colleagues. And then calculate each employee's final score so that the manager can use those to determine which of those employees will be promoted. What would a business be required to do under the proposed regulations for this type of use?

Based on this type of use, the business would not have to conduct a risk assessment at all because it would not be subject to ADMT requirements. This is because the business is using the spreadsheet only to organize human decision to make -- using human decisionmakers evaluations. And this would not be ADMT in the first place. Recall that ADMT requires that the business is using technology to replace or substantially facilitate human decision making.

1 Here they're merely using a spreadsheet to tally scores. 2 Next slide, please. And now I'm going to be turning it over 3 to Mr. Laird to talk about Cybersecurity Audits. MR. LAIRD: Thank you, Ms. Feehan. All right. 4 So the third leg of our regulations trio we're talking about 5 today is Cybersecurity Audits. So this would be another 6 separate requirement of businesses under this kind of joint 7 proposal. Now our proposed cybersecurity audit requirements 8 9 are designed to ensure that businesses meet certain 10 thresholds independently and thoroughly assess how they 11 protect consumers' personal information. Taken together, 12 the proposed requirements will help businesses identify and 13 remediate problems in their cybersecurity programs, 14 resulting in further protections for consumers' personal 15 information. 16 Now today we'll cover who will need to complete a 17 cybersecurity audit, what a business and a business's 18 auditor would have to do to complete that audit. And we'll 19 include things like how the business would complete a 20 cybersecurity audit, who the auditor could be and what they 21 would have to do, what the cybersecurity audit would 22 include, and when the business would have to complete its

We'll start with the who. So assuming you are a business under the CCPA, you'd have to be one or both of

cybersecurity audit by. So next slide, please.

23

24

25

these two thresholds to be subject to the cybersecurity audit requirements, meaning you'd need to conduct this annual cybersecurity audit.

The first threshold is a business that made more than half of its annual revenue in the prior year from selling or sharing consumer's personal information. The second threshold is that you're a business that made over \$28 million in gross revenues in the preceding year. And you also process the personal information of 250,000 or more consumers or households in the preceding calendar year, or you process the sensitive personal information of 50,000 or more consumers in the preceding calendar year.

As previously noted, sensitive personal information will include the personal information of consumers that the business has actual knowledge are less than 16 years of age. Now the fact sheet on cybersecurity audits, which is available online and at the front desk over here, will include the -- provides additional resources you can look at about what personal information and sensitive personal information include. All right. Next slide, please.

Now there are four main things a business would have to do to complete this cybersecurity audit. First, it would have to select an auditor. Now note, the auditor would have to meet certain requirements, which we will cover

in the next slide. But secondly, the business would have to provide all information the auditor requests as relevant to the audit and not hide important facts about -- from them. This is to make it possible for the audit -- auditor to complete a thorough and accurate audit using their own judgment and the information that they consider necessary.

Third, the business would have to report the audit results to the most senior individuals in the business responsible for cybersecurity. There would be guardrails now to make sure that the business didn't improperly influence the auditor as they complete the audit. But at the end of the day, the people who are responsible for cybersecurity need to know the audit results so that they can understand how they're doing and where to focus their attention to better protect consumers' personal information.

So forth and finally, the business would have to submit a certification -- a certification of completion to the Agency through the Agency's website. Now, the certification would be signed by the senior most individual in the business responsible for cybersecurity audit compliance. And it would certify that the business has completed the audit as set forth in these draft regulations, and that they reviewed and understand the audit's findings. Next slide, please.

So as we just discussed, the business would start

by selecting an auditor. And the auditor couldn't just be anyone. First of all, the auditor would have to be qualified, unbiased, meaning their objective and an independent professional. Using professional auditing standards and procedures, these generally are accepted in the profession of auditing.

Now the auditor can be someone working in the business or outside of the business. So if the business already employed someone who met those requirements I just described, that person could be the cybersecurity auditor. But I'll emphasize that independent and qualified are important requirements when we talk about these cybersecurity audits.

Next slide, please. Now that we've discussed who the auditor can be, let's get into the three main things an auditor would have to do to complete the audit. Now, first, the auditor would determine which of the business' systems would need to be audited and how to assess them. They would do that based on their expertise, the information provided by the business as well. That information would likely include things like where and how the business collects processes and stores consumers' personal information.

Second, the auditor would independently review documents, conduct tests, and interview people to support -- to support and to assess the business' cybersecurity

program. The draft regulations list the parts of a business' cybersecurity program that the auditor would have to assess, document, and summarize. We'll cover those as well as some of the -- as well as what the audit would have to include on the next slide. But finally, the auditor would have to certify that they completed an independent and unbiased audit. Next slide, please.

Now, we've talked about what the auditor would have to do at a high level, but the next two slides I'll talk more about what the auditor would have to include in the audit report, what they'd be reviewing for. Now we break down. The cybersecurity audit would have to include into eight key pieces. So the first one is that the audit would have to include the description of those systems they audited.

Secondly, the audit would have to include the information the auditor used to make their decisions and why it supported their findings. This would include why they scoped the audit the way they did, why they assessed the systems and components of the business' cybersecurity program, the way they did, what evidence they examined to make their decisions and assessments.

For example, the documents they reviewed, the sampling and testing they performed and the interviews they conducted, and why all of this was appropriate and

sufficient to justify their findings. Third, the audit would have to include the auditor's assessment of how the business protects consumer's personal information through its cybersecurity program. And that includes the written documentation of the business' cybersecurity program, including its cybersecurity policies and procedures.

And it also includes common ways that businesses protect personal information. Like how it authenticates that its employees and customers are who they claim to be, how it uses encryption to protect personal information, and how it's prepared to handle security incidents. In total, there's a list of about 18 of these components in our draft regulations that an auditor does have to at least check for. Next slide, please.

Now, fourth, the audit would describe how the business follows its own policies and procedures. Policies and procedures aren't really worth much if people aren't aware of them or following them. So the audit would have to look into this as well.

Fifth, the audit would describe the gaps and weaknesses of cybersecurity program and how the business plans to address them, including the resources the business has allocated to resolve them, and the timeframe in which it will resolve them. This is part of how the audit assesses effectiveness of business' cybersecurity programs.

Sixth, the audit would have to include a description or sample copy of data breach notifications that were sent to consumers or agencies, as well as related information and fixes. Seventh, the audit would have to include the dates of when the cybersecurity program was reviewed and presented to the most senior individuals in the business responsible for its cybersecurity program.

And eighth, finally, the audit would have to include the certifications from both the auditor and the business that the audit was independent and unbiased and not subject to any influence or attempted influence by the business. Next slide, please.

So now that you have a sense of who would be responsible for what and what the audit itself would include, let's talk about when all of this would have to be done. So, a business would have 25 -- 24 months from the effective date of these draft regulations to complete their very first cybersecurity audit. Note however, the regulations likely won't go into effect until at least 2025. So the first audits would be -- would have to be completed in approximately 2027.

Now, after a business completes its first cybersecurity audit, it would then have to complete a cybersecurity audit and submit its certification annually.

In other words, every year thereafter, there must also be no

gap in the months covered by successive audits. Next slide, please.

So much like with risk assessments, we recognize that there isn't a need to duplicate audit efforts within a business. So we want to make the same point here that if a business has completed a cybersecurity audit assessment or evaluation for some other purpose, for some other compliance requirement, and what it has done already meets all of the requirements of these draft regulations, the business would not have to redo the same cybersecurity audit.

However, if it doesn't have all of the same components required in these regulations, then it would need to add and supplement to that audit. So, for instance, if it -- with the purposes just meet a few of the requirements, but some are left undone, this audit would have to be upgraded to basically meet all of the requirements of our draft regulations.

And so that in a nutshell is our audits overview for our regulations as well. So now I'm going to talk to you just a little bit further for the final part of our sort of scheduled agenda, and that is about how to participate in formal rulemaking. So next slide, please.

So there are three key steps in the California rulemaking process, and we are still just as you'll see in step number 1. As of today, staff is still refining draft

regulatory text upon the Board's -- based on Board's feedback at meetings in December and march most recently, and drafting the necessary documents to begin the formal rulemaking process.

But before we can do that, the Board will receive and review the draft package for that formal rulemaking, and the Board will actually have to vote and make a decision of whether or not to initiate formal rulemaking making. Step two, however, is the formal rulemaking process you've heard me talk so much about.

And this is very prescribed in the law of these steps and processes and documentation we have to follow. After these documents are prepared, we file them with the Office of Administrative Law and we publish them in what's called the notice register. And that kicks off a 45-day public comment period. Now these public comments can be received through in writing -- through as instructed as you'll see in the notice documents.

And also through oral and written comments during a public hearing that the CPPA would host during the formal rulemaking period. After the public has provided comments, the Agency will consider these public comments and we will in fact respond to all comments received during the formal comment period. The Board will then consider the extent to which the regulations are appropriate as drafted or whether

further modifications are warranted.

And if the Agency decides -- if the Agency and its Board decide to substantively revise or modify the draft regulations, then it will provide an additional public comment period, which is typically a 15 day comment period. And again, we will consider and respond to all public comments during that time. But once we have considered public comment and the Agency Board has determined the draft regulations are in their final and appropriate form, it would take action to adopt those regulations.

And that's when we move to step three. And that is we review this full -- send this full package over to the Office of Administrative Law, which is an independent state Agency that we are not associated with. And they would have 30 business days to review the rulemaking record to ensure we've complied with all of the laws applicable to this process I've been describing. And if OAL approves the regulatory text, it files the text with the Secretary of State and the regulations become enacted typically on a quarterly basis. Next slide, please.

So as you consider participating in public comment, and I see some of you in the room here today, and I know there's people joining us online. So we're looking forward to getting your public comment already today. I wanted to give some tips too, especially when we move into

formal rulemaking of what makes for really effective comments.

So first -- and also how you can keep aware of these things. So first, you can subscribe to our e-mail list to receive updates on our rulemaking and upcoming Board meetings. We've provided the subscribe link right here on the slide, and it's also easy to find on our website as well. This is a way to keep informed of when, for instance, that formal public comment process starts. You will get an e-mail saying it is started and they'll tell you the relevant information about how to submit public comments.

Secondly, you can attend our Board meetings and our public hearings. The agenda for these are always posted on our website at least 10 days in advance. And you can also watch recordings of past meetings if you weren't able to attend in real time. And finally, you can submit public comments through the formal rulemaking process. Again, we have a link here for -- more on tips for effective rulemaking that I encourage everybody to look at. But once we are in that process, we would be -- we'd have the opportunity to hear from you further.

But importantly, part of the reason we're here today is to actually hear from you now because we appreciate all the input we can get as early as possible. So that is -- concludes our presentation at least from the lawyers up

1 And now we are very happy to turn it over to you all front. 2 so that we can get the feedback on what we've proposed here. 3 I'm going to turn it over to Megan, though to give you the 4 rules of the road. MS. WHITE: Can you all hear me? I think you can 5 6 Thank you so much. hear me. Okay. Great. That was a 7 wonderful presentation. So now we are going to move into the public comment portion. As I mentioned earlier -- let 8 9 me just grab my information. We are going to start with 10 people in the room here. You'll be -- can you hear me? 11 Sorry, let me try a different mic. 12 MS. SERENA: Testing one, two. 13 MS. WHITE: Serena wins the day. I won't get too 14 close. Okay. So now we're going to move into public 15 comment. As I mentioned, we're going to be taking it from 16 the room first. We'll be -- it'll be up at the podium. 17 I'll be turning this podium around. So people here in the 18 audience will be introducing their public comments to our 19 staff. As you can tell, the microphones are a little 20 touchy. We might have to do some switch out here and there, 21 but we will certainly get to everybody's public comment. 22 As I mentioned, we're going to go for three 23 minutes for public comment. I'll be timing you for people

who are here in the room. I'll be located right there.

I'll try my best to give you a single one minute and then

24

25

you're going to hear the alarm go off at three and we'll be wrapping it up. As I mentioned in room first, if any of you is joining from the overflow room, please come in here and you can provide public comment in here. Then we'll be moving to online.

So for our online people, when you'd like to make public comment, please go ahead and raise your hand using the raise hand feature on Zoom. Or if you're joining us by phone, press star six and we'll make sure to get to you.

We'll -- our team here will be calling people unmuting and muting you at three minutes. Okay. So now I'm going to turn the podium around and we'll open it up for public comment here in the room. And if everybody up here can just -- are you guys ready? Okay, lovely. Feel free to go ahead.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 1: (Inaudible) and I'm here on behalf of Gig Workers Rising and Power Switch Action, a national network of 21 community-based groups, including seven affiliates here in California. California's consumer privacy protection Agency offers a historic opportunity to put data and a measure of control over how that data is used back into the hands of workers. We have a real chance to set a benchmark for the rest of the country. I will dedicate my comment to sharing stories and themes that emerged in a series of learning sessions we held with

California app-based drivers from companies like Uber and
Lyft and others to hear more about their experiences on the
front lines of today's digital economy.

First, lack of transparency. Not having access to your own data and not knowing how it's being used to make decisions, makes the company seem like a black box. The company's algorithm could be secretly penalizing you or flagging you as a problem without you even knowing it until it's too late. It makes you feel like you're fighting with one hand behind your back.

Second, loss of control. The company knows even more about your actions every minute than a human supervisor would. Sometimes it feels like the company can use that information to try to control you or get you to take certain actions sometimes without you even being fully aware of it.

Third, arbitrary discipline and firings. A lot of times if there's a problem, the company expects you to interact with a bot to solve it. Sometimes what the bot says doesn't make sense or you feel like you're talking in circles. Even when you can get in touch with a human, a lot of times that person will assume you're wrong because they think that computers don't make mistakes. The human will just rubber stamp what the bot did.

Fourth and finally, power imbalances. It's a Catch-22, on the one hand, data is power. To have power you

1	need access to your data so that you can know the decisions
2	the company is making about you. On the other hand, because
3	you don't have power in the workplace, the company has
4	incentives to resist your data request. When you're a
5	customer, at least there's this idea that the customer is
6	always right, but when you're a worker, it's the boss who
7	thinks they're always right. The race of our digital
8	economy is underway, but where are the seat belts, the
9	airbags, and the basic protections in place for workers. We
10	can change this through sound rulemaking that requires
11	disclosure of decision making systems to workers, impact
12	assessments, and true human review of automated decisions
13	like firing. Thank you.
14	MR. JASON: Good afternoon. My name is Jason. I
15	drive a Lyft.
16	MR. LAIRD: Sure.
17	MR. JASON: What about that? Yeah. Good
18	afternoon. My name's Jason. I drive a Lyft. I've been a
19	rideshare driver for 10 years. This is my little notebook
20	that I fill out and keep track of my mileage and expenses
21	and such, and I jot down thoughts about how I might be more
22	effective and efficient as a rideshare driver.
23	Ever since I started driving 10 years ago, it's
24	been my intention to enter it all into a spreadsheet and get
25	some high level insights. This whole time's been

frustrating knowing that almost all the data that I'd like to use is already being collected by Lyft and is inaccessible to me. Not only that, but the data that I like to use to maximize my earnings is being used for the exact opposite. With rideshare companies trying to maximize their bottom line by setting drivers against each other.

Rideshare drivers are given certain expectations by Uber and Lyft when we sign up in terms of pay and flexibility. The reality of the rideshare economy is much worse. If a driver wants to figure out what's going on, we'd have to take on what amounts to another part-time job. We'd have to do all the data collection and analysis. All this while Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, Instacart, et cetera, have full and easy access to the relevant data.

I know Rideshare corporations are collecting the following, the star rating each passenger gives me, the star rating I give each passenger, my GPS at any moment, which rides I accept, which I refuse, which rides I cancel or are canceled by the passenger, how much I was paid for each ride, including bonuses, accelerometer on my phone. The app also requests access to my notifications, camera, contacts, microphone, music and audio, photos and videos. They're collecting all of this and probably more. All of this data could be of use to me, and really a lot of it might be inaccurate. And if so, detrimental to my to be -- to my

ability to my job.

livelihood in the form of deactivations. Deactivation is getting fired. It could happen to me if my star rating drops below a certain number chose by Lyft, if I cancel too many rides or if a passenger files a complaint. The most common cause of driver deactivation comes from false reporting by a passenger. It's happened to me. How serious the allegations of passengers are taken is entirely at the discretion of Lyft. False allegations are data. I was able to get my deactivation overturned, but many don't. It leads to a high turnover rate that makes it extremely difficult to organize rideshare drivers to fight for our collective rights.

This is why the CCPA and agencies like the CCPA are so important. Workers should have the ability to at least get a human review of automated decisions like firing. Strong regulations needed to give us access to all the data collected as we work. I work with the driver led group called Gig Workers Rising. And in that capacity, I'd be happy to participate in providing any information needed in developing these important protections. And thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. Thank you.

MR. SIRSHA: Hi, my name is Sirsha(ph), and I want to say I'm looking forward to talking to the CPPA about the

CCPA at the CCAP about COPPA, aka COPPA. Like I said, my name is Sirsha Grace and I'm a research fellow with Oakland Privacy, a regional coalition that advocates for safeguards and guardrails in the interest of privacy protections, civil rights, and community consent.

Oakland privacy appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the CPPA's pre-rulemaking on cyber security, audits, risk assessments, and automated decision making. My comment concerns the actual knowledge standard when it comes to triggering a risk assessment due to the processing of sensitive personal information for minors, and to ask that the Agency strengthen these provisions to ensure the protection of minor's private information.

Section 7150 (b) requires that a business conduct a risk assessment of shares, sells, or processes personal information. And in Section 7001, the portion of the proposed revisions to the CCPA regulations that defines terms says sensitive personal information is personal information to consumers that the business' actual knowledge are less than 16 years of age.

Yeah, sorry. COPPA or the Children's Online
Privacy Protection Act of 1998 places strict limits on what
companies and websites can do of children younger than 13
years of age used its services. These strict limitations
have led to a number of websites requiring users to affirm

they're at least 13 years old. Many major websites use the 13 and older age gate, which allows a website to operate under the assumption that the restrictions described in COPPA do not apply to its users.

And ADMTs make use of AI engines that have been trained on LLMs. And many of these LLMs gather data to create content for their training sources from websites that have COPPA age gates. This all but ensures that content within the LLM contains personal information of minors between the ages of 13, 50 -- 13 and 15, which should trigger the requirement for a business to conduct a risk assessment under 7150.

Therefore, a business can assume -- the fundamental argument here is that the standard should be changed from actual knowledge to a construction -- a constructive knowledge standard, which is based on what a reasonable person would know or ought to have known in a given situation. There could also be two standards where constructive knowledge is the bar for when the stakes are high, and actual knowledge for when the stakes are lower.

If left as is, the actual knowledge standard would allow businesses to process minor's information while still being able to claim that they do not need to conduct a risk assessment or undergo that significant cost. We thank the Agency for its work to strengthen the privacy protections,

and we ask that the definition of actual knowledge be clarified and strengthen -- strengthened to ensure there are robust protections of minor's personal information with regards to AI training models and ADMTs. Thank you.

MR. TORRES: Chair Urban and members, Alex Torres here with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck on behalf of a few clients. First and foremost, the Bay Area Council. On behalf of the Bay Area Council, we represent more than 330 of the largest employers in the nine- county Bay Area. We appreciate the stakeholder sessions that the CPPA has held so far, and the emphasis of course on listening to feedback from a variety of stakeholders.

These policy areas require deliberate and thoughtful consideration by the Agency and its impact will yield significant consequences within the Bay Area and will extend through -- throughout California to businesses of all sizes. The Bay Area Council and our member companies continue to offer ourselves as a resource to this Agency to develop guardrails, while also encouraging and supporting Automated Decision Making and Artificial Intelligence.

On the local level, Bay Area communities are enthusiastic about creating an AI hub respectfully request that you refrain from enacting regulations and mandates that inhibit the growth of that sector. On behalf of the new California Coalition, a statewide organization focused on

mobilizing the 700 -- over 700 ethnic, regional and local chambers of commerce in California in pursuit of solutions of -- to pressing policy challenges. I would echo some of the previous comments I just made and just note the concern from the business community, particularly on the impact of small businesses.

One major concern of the draft risk assessments, which are understood to be covered by essentially all businesses. This is an onerous provision that we believe should be narrowed to cover those who utilize the most high risk applications of AI. Additionally, we urge you to align the proposed regulations with the guidance that Governor Newsom has set forth in his executive order signed in September of 2023. Of note, I would read, you know, or would quote, better yet highlighting how California's measured approach will focus on shaping the future of ethical, transparent, and trustworthy AI while remaining the world's AI leader.

Remaining that global leader in AI yields many benefits for consumers, businesses, and all levels of state government, particularly as it relates to economic benefits and job opportunities. With more than 60 plus bills being considered in the legislature related to AI, and with the guidance from the aforementioned executive order, in addition to the patchwork of state privacy laws across the

country, we hope that the Agency will consider the massive obstacles ahead for businesses as they attempt to comply with these policies.

We strongly encourage the Agency to seek
harmonization across various departments and levels of
government, and that the CPPA will strongly consider
increased outreach to the business community to help educate
on the provisions and how it will impact businesses before
advancing the proposed regulations. Thank you for the
opportunity to express our concern today.

MS. WHITE: Thank you. And just a quicker reminder for everybody to speak into the mic, and we have a team member who will be adjusting the mic to make sure it's at your mouth level.

MR. LOMBARD: Thank you very much. Good afternoon Mayor Urban and members. My name is Edwin Lombard. I'm with ELM Strategies. Today I'm representing ethnic minority chambers throughout the State of California, both African-American, Hispanic, and Asian. The Governor's executive order, which was previously alluded to -- he proclaimed that California small businesses have account from 99 percent of total businesses in the state and employ 7 million people, nearly half of the state's private sector workforce.

Our small businesses are global leaders in

innovation and economic are competitiveness and employ the entrepreneurial spirit that drives the economy of our golden state. Recently here in Sacramento, we held an AI symposium with our small business stakeholders. We invited the Board members and no one showed up and we couldn't understand why. I guess, you know, we've been coming to your Board meetings and making public comment and seems like we're being ignored, and we don't think that that's something that should continue. It should actually cease.

I appreciate the fact that you're doing this road show and you're giving people an opportunity to come and speak to you. Unfortunately, when you do events in the middle of the week, in the middle of the day, small business owners can't break away and attend and participate in these types of opportunities. This was the only one that you gave them opportunity to be on Zoom.

And you know, unfortunately, quite a few people were not even aware of that. So not as many people who should be on Zoom and put -- making these public comments are not going to be able to do so. We ask that you meet us where we are. Most of our chambers throughout the state do monthly events, and it would been very easy for you to log -- tag on to one of those monthly events, show up and make your presentation, and give them the opportunity to express what I'm expressing to you today.

The concern with small business is this, because of COVID, a lot of our businesses transitioned to online instead of brick and mortar, and because of that, they found that they were able to increase their revenues extremely and it also, increase the ability to reach more people.

Unfortunately, if the regulations are so sternly put in place, a lot of these companies are going to go under.

Thank you very much.

MS. GORDON: Hello, my name is Samantha Gordon.

Can you hear me? Okay. I'm the Chief Program Officer at

Tech Equity Collaborative. Thank you for the opportunity to

comment today. I am submitting these comments on behalf of

Tech Equity, as well as my colleague, Dr. Annette

Bernhardt, who is the UC Berkeley Labor Center's Director of

Technology and work, and couldn't be here today.

At Tech Equity we envision a world where the tech industry is responsible for building widespread economic prosperity and is held accountable for the economic harms it creates in our communities. We have a lot to say about ADMTs, opt-outs and a variety of things within the proposed rulemaking. But for today, we're going to focus our comments on the workplace context given the constraint of time. So we believe that AI and other digital technologies represent one of the most important issues that will shape the economic opportunity of workers in California for

decades to come.

At Tech Equity over the last four years, we've conducted participatory research with contract workers in the tech industry. Many of these workers are the humans behind the magic we see in these AI systems. They do everything from training search algorithms, moderating content online, cleaning, and labeling data that power the large language models and AI systems. And while they build the technology, they're also managed through technologies like ADMTs and other digital technologies that control their workload, performance ratings, pay, and ultimately whether or not they continue in those roles.

I want to share two examples gleaned from our research relevant to this rulemaking on how these systems can impact workers. In repeated interviews, we heard workers share similar patterns where they work for a tech company through a third party employer. As a W-2 employee, their work product was often reviewed and assessed by an algorithmic or automated process. In some instances, that automated process denied submissions of work product leading to uncompensated time, deemed their work product insufficient or low quality, and created a quota system for work production based on information that was unknown to workers and that they found unsustainable.

For example, one worker who was transcribing and

training an artificial intelligence system shared that they would submit approximately 500 files per hour on a typical day to do automated -- to an automated review system. At times, they would get a rejection for that submission. When a submission was rejected, they'd receive a vague air message and the system would deny their entire set of 500 files or one hour of work. The worker would then not be compensated for that time and will receive no notice as to why they were denied. When asked what recourse they had when that happened, the worker said, you do it again.

Another example is the ways in which these systems are deployed to survey and compare workers' productivity rates and contest whether or not a worker had completed a quote -- appropriate amount of work for the time they are said to have worked. If a worker completed 150 tasks per hour, but the system had determined a different benchmark for the number of tasks that should be completed in that hour, workers would receive an e-mail warning them about the imbalance between the tasks completed and the hours they had billed. However, workers shared they had no way to verify if the comparison was accurate, what the employer deemed was an appropriate productivity rate or baseline to provide context about why their rate might be higher or lower for that period of time. Thank you.

MS. OATES: Howdy. I am tall. There we go. I'm

Maggie Oates. I'm here on behalf of Consumer Reports.

We're a hundred year old nonprofit focused on making tech
policy work for consumer interest. I want to start off by
giving you all a compliment. I don't think anyone's done
that yet today. I want to say that there is a lot to love
in these draft rules, and it's clearly not a first draft.

There's a lot of thought and detail poured in, and we see
that and shout out to the CPPA staff for undoubtedly putting
in many hours on this topic.

We said it before, and I'll say it again, that one thing we're really excited about in this draft is the innovative and very comprehensive expansive definition of behavioral advertising. We love that it's making clear that consumers have a right to opt-out of ads across multiple sites under one company. So, for example, we love the idea and we want to live in a world where consumers can opt-out of Google using Gmail data to target Google Flight's ads. And this is something that we've supported for years and we're excited to see glimpses of it in the (inaudible).

And now I will un-compliment, I'm sorry to say. I have several points, mainly focused on ADMT today and some changes we saw since the December draft that we're concerned about. The first is that we notice the narrowing of the definition of ADTM and we're worried that it creates an easy way for businesses to sidestep these rules. You know, this

definition is the crux on -- upon which all the rest of the rules reside. And we're seeing glimpses to support this in our research. We put out a report recently with Cornell and Data and Society that looked at New York City's new AI bias rule, and we found that only four percent of major employers in NYC put out any notice required -- related to AI and hiring.

In comparison, if you look at Harvard Business
Review's recent reports about industry surveys, industry
members said that 63 percent of them had automated part of
their hiring process. So four percent of people are telling
consumers that they're using automation in hiring versus 63
percent of businesses are telling Harvard Business Review
that they're using automation and hiring.

This discrepancy could be for a lot of reasons, but we're pretty certain that one of them is the fact that the weak definition of substantially assisting human decision making in that bill. So we'd love to see a stricter definition of ADMT reinstated or at minimum we'd love to see more clarifying examples that cover what substantially facilitate and what key factor mean to help gesture more and to what that means in practice.

The second is that we'd love to urge the Board to revise the definition of adverse significant decisions to incorporate not only binary yes, no decisions, but also

things like increases in pricing. So on a personal level, last year in a series of freak accidents, I had two cars totaled. And just last month, my insurance company called me -- and this is too short. I thought we had five minutes, but I want to lift up the voices of the labor coalitions as well. It's not our area of expertise, but we love that they're here and we support their voices. And thank you for having us.

MS. SERENA: Testing.

MS. COMSTI: No, I don't think so. Wait, I'll go close. That's -- okay. Are we good still? Okay. Good afternoon. I'm Carmen Comsti, lead regulatory policy specialist with the California Nurses Association, the largest union representing registered nurses in California, over a hundred thousand registered nurses throughout the state. Nurses see healthcare employers use ADMTs being rapidly adopted as cost cutting measures that automate, descale and devalue the work and professional clinical judgment of nurses.

Nurses urge the CPPA and state regulators to use what we call in the healthcare sector, the precautionary principle when approaching ADMTs. This means that when there's new healthcare tools, including ADMTs, we must find evidence of safety before being deployed. The use of automated tools in clinical prediction and assessment leaves

patients without the human to human relationships that is the basis of nursing, undermining nurses' professional judgment, and threatening both patient and worker safety.

Automated clinical prediction tools are increasingly being used by healthcare employers to make decisions under staffing levels, bed assignments, whether or not to provide care, when to discharge a patient, but it's often difficult, if not impossible for direct patient cared nurses and patients to identify when or how a predictive tool is being used, let alone understand the patient and worker safety risk that they may pose.

ADMTs to predict patient acuity, so this is how sick a patient is did not match their own clinical assessment. But over half of these nurses said that these tools could not be modified to reflect the nurse's judgment and assessment of the patient. Inadequate and inaccurate patient assessments can lead to adverse events, harmful delays in denials of treatment, medical errors, and even death.

Predictive algorithms have been found to result in significant racial bias, even when race was not a factor reducing care for black patients -- Latino patients and other patients of color. Employers use ADMTs through chatbots, wearable devices, electronic medical records, to replace hands-on assessment of nurses. And these tools are

used to recommend when a patient should be seen by a doctor or sent home or moved to a cheaper, lower level type of care.

Instead of 24 hour nursing care, patients are given remote monitoring tools and wearable devices that track their movement and biometric data. Major health systems have come under fire for predictive tools that pressure clinicians to move patients to hospice and palliative care early. These predictive clinical tools simply do not work as intended and fail to evaluate vital cues about patients or issue false alarms. Regulations must be drafted broadly to ensure pre-market testing and regulatory approval of any new technology and healthcare before they are deployed. Thank you.

MR. YATES: I'm here. Thanks for coming and doing these hearings, much appreciated. I want to say before my statement that I think that the ADMT needs more regulation than I've heard in your presentation. So good afternoon. My name is Thomas W. Yates. I was born and raised in Sacramento, and I currently live here. I have been a professional illustrator for most of my adult life, mainly drawing comic books. For the last 12 years, I've drawn the Sunday newspaper strip Prince Valiant, running currently in hundreds of newspapers across the country. Before that, I drew Tarzan of the Apes, Zorro and many other characters for

DC and Marvel comics.

The reason I've come here is to testify is my profession and those of creative artists, illustrators, writers, musicians, songwriters, actors, et cetera, are under my profession, is under threat from very powerful forces. Those forces are often represented by highly paid lobbyists, working for those who are stealing and would like to continue stealing our life's work through forgeries of that work.

These forgeries are created from computer software programs and applications. This software is used by artists, illustrators, et cetera, to create their work in our -- as necessary today as the pencils, paper, pen, and ink were, when I began my career illustrating for DC comics 45 years ago. Unfortunately, these programs that is now necessary to use are scraping or harvesting all our data, personal, professional, et cetera, from our personal computers and from the internet. This personal data is then used to create forgeries of our work.

This has gotten to the point that our calling to create from our imaginations, work that millions of people enjoy and purchase around the world is no longer paying us for all of our work, because more and more of it is being forged, and it is the forgers who are paid for that product of our imaginations. To fight back against these forgeries,

1 I am here to implore California regulators to include 2 forgeries in proposition for the law against deepfakes in 3 Creators must have the right to opt out of their 4 names being a prompt of AI. Ultimately, we really need 5 harvesting of our very identities and the resulting thefts 6 to be stopped. Thank you very much. MR. JONES: Hi, my name is Kelly Jones. I'm --7 like Tom, I've been doing comic books and illustration for 8 9 film and television. Most recently, Sandman for Netflix 10 adapted my work. I had just recently finished some work for 11 Tim Burton on Beetlejuice and I'm -- just had working on 12 some Batman stuff for DC, so you get around a lot. 13 What will happen if there isn't something for illustration is it will take away the elements of ideas. 14 15 And what I mean is that you -- we're now struggling with 16 this technical thing where people can just take stuff and do 17 what they do. What will happen is that homogenizes 18 everything in my world, and the ideas will stop because 19 they're just going to go for the technical. If there isn't 20 some kind of protection, then what will happen is those 21 ideas will dry up. 22 For example, I was asked to redesign the character

For example, I was asked to redesign the character of Mr. Freeze about middle nineties. And so I did, and the design went all the way up the chain. They accepted it, took it. The people making the Batman film were going to

23

24

25

use this character of Mr. Freeze. So what what happened was they liked it so much at the -- at the film studio that they asked for all of my work and wanted to see my development and they recast the film based on that to what they were going to do to Arnold Schwarzenegger, the former governor of the state.

If it were done the way they're doing it now, without having to go through us, they would just program or just ask for something and get something completely different. It wouldn't have had any kind of eccentricity to it. So my main thing is you don't want the next governor to lose out on a big part, right? So, as far as I'm concerned, there does have to be some kind of consideration for how much of this. It's very -- I know it's bizarre but these things just don't -- well, they do come out of thin air. It -- it's hard to put that in. But what will happen is it's easier and easier is always better than harder, but harder is what everyone knows, and that's what they all remember, and it gives governors an extra job. So I think that has to be considered. Thank you very much for listening.

MS. FLANAGAN: Thank you so much. Good afternoon, Chair Urban and members of the CPPA. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. My name is Anne Flanagan. I am the Vice President for Artificial Intelligence at a non-profit organization called The Future of Privacy Forum. At FPF we

specialize in responsible data practices, including the intersection of emerging technologies, business practices, and their -- and their impact on individual privacy.

And we have testified before this Agency previously, and we'll be happy to do so again. Thank you so much for the opportunity to comment. I have three short points to make today and I'll get right to them. In the interest of time, I'm going to restrict my comments specifically to ADMT and risk assessments and exclude cybersecurity at this juncture.

vulnerable to harm are explicitly recognized across the regulations. At FPF in 2017, we documented a wide range of potential harms that are related to the risks of using personal data in ADMT, including particularly in respect of protected classes. When decisions, particularly significant decisions are made in respect of protective classes and ADMT is the tool that is used, the harms tend to be more acute. It is therefore recommended that the regulations be explicitly inclusive and reflective of California's diverse population and we welcome your inclusion of public opinion and bias experts in this process.

Second recommendation is to build on existing frameworks and other ongoing processes to ensure interoperability and proportionality. Risk assessments are,

of course, a longstanding aspect of privacy impact assessments, and we really welcome that the -- that the impact assessment piece here is additive rather than an extra-- an extra burden on businesses. We hope that the Agency continues to draw lessons from global governance efforts, including processes underway at NIST where the NIST RMF is being updated for generative AI and including most recently, Colorado's Privacy Act.

There may be some aspects there that might be interesting including their definitions around the degree of human involvement in a process -- a profiling system, and how profiling is evaluated for fairness and disparate impact. And my final recommendation is to ensure that any new risk assessments are effective and pragmatic. And a couple of small points on this. Given that many high risk ADMT systems are continually ingesting data and training their models, it can be difficult to determine when they undergo material change.

We see that there are time-bound revisions to when impact assessments and risk assessments need to take place. That may depend on the degree of severity of risk of any individual model. We also recommend that it may be useful to distinguish between developers and deployers in risk assessments, particularly because the different respective roles will have different visibility and different

empowerment to adjust systems. Thank you so much for the opportunity to comment. Thank you.

MR. YATES: Right. Yeah. So this is from Dan Brereton. He's -- lives in northern California, Roseville area professional illustrator, graphic storyteller for 36 years. "As a fan of illustration and graphic storytelling, viewing simulated artificial attempts at creativity makes me cringe. As a practicing creative professional who realizes what I am seeing is a form of theft, it makes me angry. Maybe a little worried as well, especially after a few years ago when I found a disturbing amount of my artwork being used to train AI revealed by the Do Not Train website.

Basically, this text scrapes up the creative endeavors of thousands of artists who cover more than a century of endeavor and brilliance piles it into a trove of riches, takes what it wants, free of any current restrictions. Since that time, I'm sure hundreds more examples of my work have been captured by the scrape our names and our visual trademarks and innovations all collected for use. Stolen.

Stealing from hardworking artists, co-opting individual brilliance and making it commonplace, but attractive enough to an audience which may not realize it's seeing a deceptive form of plagiarism. AI tech may make it easier to displace the jobs of tens of thousands or more

people who earn a living by being uniquely gifted and enormously experienced. That's a lot of creative professionals who pay taxes, have families who depend on them, who will by necessity after give up what was once a career, a future body of work, contributing to any number of media. Imagine the careers of creative professionals who have left an indelible mark on our society through their craft. Imagine they're stifled because they can't get work. It's scary to think about.

Here's an example. When I see people using AI to reimagine Star Wars, that is one of the greatest insults I can think of. If George Lucas had come after AI, there may have been no Star Wars, apply any groundbreaking creator and their genius work to this formula, imagine the results. That's a world we're entering if we don't take action. Personally, nothing is going to stop me. Not a computer program or an audience, briefly taken in by a cheap trick. I have dedicated audience, but it's taken over 30 years in this career to build up. Not every artist has that, especially the young and upcoming. And because of this technology, they may not get that chance. Thank you."

MS. WHITE: Great. Wonderful. If we have additional public comments, wonderful. Feel free to come up.

UNKNOWN FEMALE 2: Okay. So my reason for being here today is to highlight some foundational cybersecurity components that are not clearly articulated and need to be accounted for as we're talking about the regulations that we're focusing on here, and I'm representing those of us that want to get this right. I am a mom of two kids. I'm a business owner. I flew in from Chicago because I'm very passionate about this topic, and I find this to be a very historical period of time that we are in. And like Maggie said, like kudos to the group for the extensive work that has gone into this many years of work, and I applaud that.

So I would like to direct the focus on the cybersecurity audit piece. So, Mr. Laird, I'm going to address it to you since you were sharing the slides. So I'm very concerned that there's language here on what a cybersecurity audit should include. Cybersecurity, the terminology is very interesting. It means at a very high level, we're looking to protect information. And oftentimes it's information that we're not able to see. It's information that lives in devices that can connect to services. And there can be copies of lots and lots of datas and transformation. And we're talking about measuring risk for something that we're not able to see, which is just like mind boggling.

So if we're looking to be specific on what a



cybersecurity audit should include we need to do several things. Specifically remove the requirement to -- for the auditor to assess, assess how a business protects personal information. A security audit is -- you're measuring against something. You're comparing if something is being done, yes or no. An assessment is something different. Here we're conflating two different things, and specifically for the assessment piece, that belongs more in the risk management portion.

I could have never imagined how much these kinds of devices would impact my personal life, able to call an Uber to get here, check in at the gate for my flight. I wasn't expecting that my 6-year-old son would be addicted to YouTube, and that we have to fight that. That concerns me, and I applaud you for being here to taking the time to seek our input. I think you have done an extraordinary job of soliciting comments from the public, and I look forward to providing more input as more opportunities arise. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: Is there anyone else in the room who would like to provide public comment? Okay, then I think we're going to move over to Zoom. Just a reminder, if you'd like to make comment. Oh, one second, please. We're actually going to take a quick break, so we will be back in about 10? Five to 10 minutes, just a quick break, and then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we will take comments online. Thank you so much. (BREAK).

MS. WHITE: Okay. Thank you everybody who's joining us online and in the room for allowing us to take that quick break. We are going to come back now and we're going to start with public comment online. Everybody online, same as in the room. It's a three minute public comment. If you're joining us via Zoom, please use the raise hand feature. If you're joining us via the phone, please press star six after we complete public comment online. And since we've completed it in the room, we will allow people to provide a second public comment because we will be here until 6:00 p.m. So I'm going to turn it over to our moderator who will be calling on people, muting them and unmuting them. Oh, I'm sorry. One more thing. If you are providing comment in Spanish and need a translation service, please let us know before you begin your public comment. We have a translator here who can assist. you.

MS. SERENA: Tasia Kiefer, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You'll have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're writing.

MS. KEEFER: Hi everyone, my name is Tasia Keefer and I'm here representing the LA County Business Federation, also known as BizFed. BizFed is composed of over 240

diverse business organizations and represents over 410,000 employers with 5 million employees across Southern

California and California's capital. We thank you for hosting a stakeholder session today and allowing us to provide comments. But you should be aware that business organizations and individual businesses are completely unaware of the risk assessment and Automated Decision Making requirements that you are proposing.

We do not know what problems the CPPA is intending to address and whether those are legitimate problems that justify a new regulatory program. And actually, I spoke with business members who will be significantly impacted by these rules the Agency is proposing, and they were not aware of the Agency or the drafted rules. We respectfully request that the CPPA engage in an effort to inform Californians about the regulations that you're proposing by engaging with business sectors like entertainment, goods, movement, and manufacturing.

Furthermore, every region in California utilizes automation and AI, or in this case ADMT. Throughout the state, small businesses leverage these technologies to boost productivity, streamline business processes, and guard against cybersecurity threats and more. In fact, a new small business entrepreneurship council survey found that 75 percent of small businesses are utilizing AI tools. In a

time where business expenses are at an all time high, every dollar is critical to business survival.

We need to ensure that we preserve the use of ADMT and we urge you to avoid regulations that would hinder AI innovation. The draft rules also create a new opt-out mechanism that would break basic website functionalities that businesses rely on to improve customer service. These simple low risk uses of ADMT are critical functions that ultimately drive revenue. Therefore, we urge CPPA to offer a narrower definition of ADMT.

And lastly, we strongly recommend that the CPPA coordinate all regulatory efforts with Governor Newsom and the legislature, especially regarding automation and AI. The legislation is considering over 35 AI related bills, many of which intersect with the CPPA's proposals. It is important for businesses to have clarity when it comes to complying with regulations and the Agency's draft rules will be a burden on the business community and businesses are what make California work. We appreciate your consideration of these requests. Thank you very much.

MS. SERENA: Julian Canete, you have three minutes. I have unmuted you. Go ahead and speak.

MR. CANETE: Thank you. Julian Canete on behalf of the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce and the California businesses. We were represent through our

membership of over 125 Hispanic and diverse Chambers of Commerce and Business Associations to -- we wish to express our collective concerns about CPPA's lack of collaboration and engagement with California's small business community. As Governor Newsom has often said, California small businesses account for more -- over 90 percent of total businesses in the state and employ more than 7 million individuals. Nearly half of the state's private sector workforce.

Our small businesses are global leaders in innovation and economic competitive competitiveness and embody the entrepreneurial spirit that drives the economy of the golden state. Over the last two years, we have raised our concerns about CPPA's regulatory approach. We have made and wrote numerous comments and have offered to collaborate with CPPA to better understand small business concerns. But the CPPA has not once responded to our concerns or offer to the best of our knowledge any collaboration.

Recently, California's major statewide ethnic chambers held an AI policy symposium in Sacramento to educate policymakers and regulators of the importance of AI in the day-to-day operations of small business. We had made both verbal and written invites to CPPA to attend the event. No Board member or staff member from CPPA attended. The lack of attendance is troubling and amplifies the CPPA's

lack of interest in collaborating and engaging with our communities and business altogether. We appreciate the scheduling of recent meetings held in Fresno and Los Angeles.

While we appreciate the gesture, truthfully, it appears to be a check the box type of activity for CPPA. The timing and location, especially in the LA area made it almost prohibitive small business to participate and with no online access. Like today's meeting, it makes it even more prohibitive for small businesses to engage. There are many opportunities to engage small business and hear our concerns and our solutions and for potential regulations. Our organization throw events that you can participate in or be a part of. You can meet us where we are, we can -- we can set up webinars and you must provide a -- to participate online.

And finally, by adhering to the balance sought in section 39(c)(1) under Proposition 24, which states "the rights of the consumer and the responsibilities of business should be implemented with the goal of strengthening consumer privacy while giving attention to the impact on business and innovation". I appreciate the opportunity to share our perspective again with the CPPA and we look forward and are prepared to work with CPPA in getting it right. Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Thank you Julian. Sam Tung, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comments, so please begin when you're ready.

MR. TUNG: Hi, everyone. My name is Sam Tung. I am a storyboard artist for film animation and video games. And I -- and I really appreciate you taking the time to hear comments from us today. You might know some of my work from the recent animated series, Xmen 97, or the upcoming Twister sequel, which is coming out this summer.

The first thing I want to say is that these, these jobs working in illustration, working in entertainment, these are great jobs. If you — if you work hard and you master your craft, you can earn a good middle class living in a creative field. I can — I can pay my mortgage and I can send my kid to preschool, right? And the culture and business of the entertainment industry is a cornerstone of California and the United States, and something that we absolutely do not want to see disappear.

But these jobs are at serious risk. If generative AI as part of ADMT is allowed to propagate in its current form you know, there's a lot of risks that I know that you're looking to mitigate here. A lot of these generative AI programs, which are powered by data that was taken from all of us without our consent, credit, compensation, or transparency they are prone to hallucinations, right? So

they can -- they spit out things that are inaccurate. They can perpetuate stereotypes. If you -- if you try to generate an image of a family, it usually generates a white family, which is not particularly representative of California or the US. And if you leave decision making up to these things it might tell you to do things that also perpetuate stereotypes.

For example, in animation rendering black hair is challenging and takes more computing power. And AI system that is telling you what movies to make might tell you to make movies that don't have black characters in it, right? And that would not be something that we're trying to do, right? So we need to make sure that these companies are operating ethically and that they are not taking Californians private work and material to create products that directly compete with us functionally, right? Like this is a violation of trade dress and deepfakes are tantamount to forgery, right?

If these companies can go online and take all of my work and create a piece of software that tirelessly replicates me and cuts me out of employment that's bad, right? Like -- and they're creating work that is in my style that I have no control over. But that might look like my work and reasonably confuse someone who might employ me. I know we're getting low on time, but these are the big

points that I want to hit. And please keep an eye on these companies. Window's new operating system, Windows 11 seeks to take screenshots of your computer constantly to improve performance apparently. So again, privacy for Californians is really threatened by these generative AI systems. Thanks so much for your time.

MS. SERENA: Oops, sorry. Thank you, Sam. Julian Canete, I'm going to unmute you now. You have three minutes. The FCA admin, I'm going to unmute you. Go ahead and speak.

MS. MANASCO: Alessandra Manasco on behalf of the California Fuels and Convenience Alliance, a statewide trade association representing the needs of independent wholesale and retail marketers of gasoline, diesel, lubricating oils, and other alternative fuels products, transporters of those products and retail convenience store operators. The vast majority of our members are small business owners, with many of them being family owned businesses passed down from one generation to the next. Our association provides the lifeblood of our economy, transportation, fuels and energy to the motoring, public and business economy.

In simple terms, our members deliver transportation, fuel, and energy from the -- their manufacturers to end customers, such as wholesale, retail participants who then deliver the fuel to individual users

or to bulk purchasers. Our members serve every region, city, county, and locality in this state. AI holds tremendous values for our members to make their work more efficient and environmentally conscious. Benefits include optimizing routes, which allows them to use AI to minimize fuel consumption and emissions. While predictive maintenance ensures vehicles operate at peak efficiency, further reducing their carbon footprint.

Additionally, AI-driven inventory management reduces waste and energy usage in warehouses. Machine malfunction prediction when implemented in the transportation industry, plays a critical role in cost optimization. It increases safety by allowing for predictive maintenance, performance forecasting, and real-time risk management. AI collects data by connecting to all types of machinery. Sensors will be able to identify machine malfunction before it is noticed by humans. With this, accidents can be prevented and a ton of money can be saved by looking at the damage predominantly before the machine collapses.

By hindering innovation for our members to utilize these efficient technologies, it is not only hurting small business growth, the safety of workers, but the overall environment and its -- and its goals to combat climate change in the golden state. Thank you for the opportunity

to give our comments. Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Matt Scherer, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes. Go ahead and start when you're ready.

MR. SCHERER: Good afternoon. I'm Matt Scherer and I lead the workers' rights project at the Center for Democracy and Technology. I appreciate your work on this issue, and thank you for taking the time to hear from stakeholders like Ms. Oates from Consumer Reports, I want to address the narrowing of the definition of ADMTs and the revised draft regulations. I fear that the revised language, which would apply only to systems that are a substantial factor in covered decisions, would basically give companies a license to opt themselves out of the laws requirements. Here's why.

Workers and regulators and consumers usually don't know which companies are using ADMTs, much less how. It was interesting hearing business representatives object that they haven't had an opportunity to have input on these regulations because the millions of consumers and workers who are subjected to ADMT decisions without being told that they are doing so definitely have not had any input in this process. Companies have strong incentives to keep their use of these systems hidden and generally do so whenever they can.

This is in large part because having an information monopoly gives companies a huge competitive advantage over consumers and workers. It makes it much easier for companies to use ADMTS to drive up prices, drive down wages, or otherwise use these systems to increase their profits at Californian's expense. But the part that they won't say out loud is that many companies fear transparency because they know that many, if not most ADMTs are biased snake oil or both, and that disclosing their use will subject them to discrimination in consumer protection lawsuits.

Consequently, companies are likely to take advantage of any loopholes that give them discretion to wiggle out of ADMT regulations that would reveal their use of these systems and the substantial factor requirement to create such a loophole. Companies always claim that ADMTs merely make recommendations that are one factor among many, and that humans have final say in decisions. It would be easy for companies to avoid compliance by adopting an internal policy saying that ADMTs shouldn't be over relied upon, even if in reality those tools recommendations are decisive and human reviewers defer to AI outputs, this creates a catch 22.

Once a company chooses to assert that a tool does not meet the substantial factor requirement, it may not even



disclose the existence or use of the tool. The outside world may not then be even aware of the tool and thus won't be able to challenge the company's determination that the tool's not being used as a substantial factor. In effect, that requirement gives companies the unilateral ability then to opt out of complying with the law. Such a requirement threatens to make the ADMT regulations a dead letter with companies largely ignoring them. That's what appears to have happened with New York City's ordinance on AI and hiring.

According to a study by Cornell Consumer Reports and Data and Society release earlier this year, I urge you to go back to the original broader definition of ADMTs. It's essential that the CCPA rules be written in a way that ensures companies cannot use their information monopoly on ADMTs to avoid transparency and accountability. Thank you so much.

MS. SERENA: Thank you Matt. Brynne O'Neal, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MS. ONEAL: Hello, my name is Brynne O'Neal with National Nurses United. Rulemaking on AI and automated decision making technology is urgent and essential. Our nurses are already seeing ADMT used to make staffing decisions that can be life or death for patients. And

industry is rushing to use generative AI to communicate with patients about their healthcare, replacing professional nurses with unproven unreliable technology.

For example, nurses working at Kaiser hospitals in California have reported that their electronic health record system called EPIC feeds algorithms that determine a patient's acuity. Acuity measures how ill or fragile a patient is and predicts how many hours of nursing care that patient will need. Algorithmically driven acuity measurements, work off a limited set of data and miss the subtleties and nuances that a nurse's observational skills can have. They don't take into account the educational or emotional needs of a patient or their family.

And importantly, these systems depend on a nurse's ability to chart in real time, which in the midst of a staffing crisis with understaffed hospitals and overloaded healthcare workers isn't possible. So as a result, on a daily basis in unit after unit, nurses have multiple patients whose acuity is underrepresented, meaning there are not enough nurses to provide optimal care in a timely manner. This in turn, makes it impossible for nurses to chart in real time and you get a vicious cycle. These systems collect extensive workers data on workers and on patients, and use it for really harmful decisions on the healthcare that consumers get and the allocation of work to

employees. And AI isn't just being used to minimize nurse staffing. Industry is also threatening to use it to replace nurses altogether.

NVIDIA and Hippocratic AI are advertising the development of virtual healthcare assistance, which they claim can use gen AI, generative AI, to discuss critical healthcare issues with patients like medication and chronic disease management. And their marketing materials explicitly say this tech is cheaper than paying a nurse, but this represents incredibly unsafe processing of sensitive personal information from patients, which due to the nature of of generative AI, does not allow the issuance of any meaningful information about the logic involved in the system's decision making processes as is required in the CCPA statute.

So right now, really strong regulations are needed to ensure that patients and workers personal data are not being fed into ADMT systems that put them at risk. We must preserve patient's rights to safe, high quality person to person care and nurses' rights to exercise clinical judgment and override unsafe automated decisions. Thank you so much.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Ian Maloney, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You'll have three minutes to make your comment.

MR. MALONEY: My name is Ian Maloney. I'm the

Senior Vice President and Head of Policy and Regulatory
Affairs at the American FinTech Council. I just want to
thank Chair Urban and members of the CPPA Board for holding
this meeting along the opportunity to provide comment on the
draft risk assessment and ADMT regulations. AFC is a
standards based trade association representing some of the
largest financial technology companies and innovative
financial institutions to partner with them. Our members
offer innovative financial products and services to millions
of Californians each year.

AFC seeks to promote innovative, transparent, inclusive, and consumer-centric financial system by supporting responsible innovation in FinTech and encouraging sound public policies. AFC members use ADMTs to improve access to financial services in a number of situations, especially for communities that have been historically underserved. Given the time constraints, I'll be more targeted with my -- and concise with my comments and try to provide some signposts to relevant provisions as it relates to the risk assessment sections of the draft regulations.

I think first on section 7152, subsection (3)(d), articulating the approximate number of consumers whose personal information the business seeks to process could create potential compliance issues for lenders entering new markets or seeking to expand their offerings without perfect

information. Therefore, I think CCPA should provide additional regulatory guidance or flexibility for this provision.

Secondly, given the breadth of meaning that within section 7153(a), the "making automated decision making technology or artificial intelligence available to another business may have within a bank FinTech partnership, CCPA should provide additional clarity within the regulation or provide subsequent guidance on that point."

And then lastly, with risk -- with regards to risk assessment as written in section 7154, there's inherent ambiguity in how to implement the prohibition against processing if risk to consumers privacy outweigh the benefits. Therefore, CCPA or CPPA should provide additional guidance and or regulatory flexibility regarding the cost benefit analysis to ensure proper compliance with the regulation. Two points as it relates to the ADMT sections I think while plain language explanations of Automated Decision-making Technology are beneficial, I think there needs to be additional exemptions on that point. And then also there's a lot of costs that are associated with CPPA as it relates to training uses. So there should be additional points on that considered by CPPA. I thank you for my -- for allowing me to provide these comments.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Allison Adey, I'm going to

unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MS. ADEY: Thank you very much. Good afternoon,
Chair Urban and members. My name's Allison Adey,
representing the Personal Insurance Federation of
California. PIF is a statewide trade association that
represents 11 of the nation's largest property and casualty
insurance companies. We appreciate the opportunity to
provide comments on the draft regulatory package that the
Agency has prepared. The majority of our feedback has been
provided in prior written comments. So today I want to
focus on two particular issues that are of paramount concern
to us.

The 2018 negotiations in the legislature around the California Consumer Privacy Act widely recognized that the insurance industry requires certain personal information in order to write personal lines insurance, and that the consumer protections inherent in Proposition 103 already prohibit rates from being excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. Because of the unique positioning of the insurance industry, there was explicit language that certain information necessary to continue to offer insurance would remain under the exclusive regulatory power of the Department of Insurance. We are urging continuous and clear ongoing communication between the agencies to ensure that

those lines are delineated in accordance with the original intent of the CCPA.

Additionally, under the CCPA, there are clear carve outs for entities that are subject to certain federal laws, specifically The GrammLeachBliley Act (GLBA). Given that reiterating the explicit exemption for GLBA practices was deemed necessary in the ADMT regulations, we feel it is in -- essential that similar clarity be included in the cybersecurity audit and risk assessment regulations. Should the exemption be reiterated in one regulation and not stated in another, it could be construed that the Agency is attempting to limit the scope of the exemptions in the original statute, resulting in confusion regarding the scope of the regulations. Thank you again for the opportunity to raise these concerns, and we look forward to working with the Agency as they move forward on this regulatory package.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Rick Arney, I'm going to mute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MR. ARNEY: Thank you very much. My name is Rick Arney. I'm Vice Chair of Californians for Consumer Privacy, The umbrella organization that sponsored Proposition 24. As such, I was a co-author of CCPA and CPRA. I want to focus my comments just real quickly on, I'll start with risk assessments. My comment here is that the inclusion criteria

for risk assessments is just simply too broad, and I don't believe that this will actually help the case for privacy. It actually will hurt it. And the Agency's own example in this proposed regulation, I think proves the point. The use of a simple spreadsheet to determine which employees of a given business should be terminated under the proposed regulations does constitute ADM. But if we pull the lens back and look at that, what is being described there is —what I think is the most basic computer functionality that's been around since the advent of Lotus 1-2-3 in the early eighties.

It's simply a spreadsheet that's been used with some numbers to make that type of decision. And I guess I challenge the Agency to think through how is the use of a spreadsheet a significant risk to privacy? Why should that generate a risk assessment? What will result with this proposed regulation from my perspective is that the Agency will be overwhelmed with paperwork. There'll be really no signal to noise ratio. This will not help privacy. It will swamp the Agency with largely meaningless form documents. And so then the question becomes, well, what -- what's an alternative? Well, one alternative should -- would be to say that risk assessments should examine the usage of PI and SPI that actually presents serious risk to consumer privacy. That's what's in the statute as written, and if it goes

further beyond that as proposed, it's very clear to me that industry will sue and they will probably win.

This regulation could be essentially meaningless, problematic and not actually pro privacy. The second comment I want to make is about Automated Decision Making. Under the proposed regulations, consumers have the right to opt out of ADM if there is a "significant decision happening. A significant decision is defined basically as a massive, huge swath of the economy, access to provision or denial of housing, insurance, education, justice, employment, healthcare, essentially all essential goods and services. It also includes what's defined as profiling any form of automated processes or personal information to evaluate certain personal aspects.

If you -- if you really dig deep in that, you actually realize that that proposed regulation actually includes contextual ads. So what this would mean is that a consumer would be able to opt out of all ads for a huge swath of the economy, and it's really unclear about how would that actually work. How does a site pay for itself? It will essentially break the internet if that -- if that type of regulation survives and it really destroys the concept of a privacy protective contextual ad as written I challenge the Agency to engage.

MS. SERENA: Thank you so much, Rick -- Rick.

Tiana, you have three minutes. Go ahead and speak when you're ready.

MS. AURELIA: Thank you. Hi, sorry. Can you hear me.

MS. SERENA: Yes, we can hear you.

MS. AURELIA: Okay, great. Hello, my name is Tiana Aurelia and I'm a concept artist and illustrator based in San Francisco that primarily works in the games industry. As a professional artist, I rely on or more accurately used to rely on tools like Adobe Photoshop to complete my professional work. With the introduction of their new generative AI system Firefly, my trust began to falter.

The fact that they trained on stock images without the explicit permission of many of the artists within the Adobe stock system has made me rethink my trust in these programs and companies. How am I to know what will or won't suddenly -- won't suddenly decide to change within their terms of service. What data becomes fair game to -- for them to use for profit? When service terms are often coercive, there isn't the ability to opt out, especially when there are no alternatives.

This doesn't just apply to me as an artist, but also to consumers across the Board that must agree to coercive terms of service that put their data in the trusted hands of these services. Many industry professor

--professionals, including myself, sign NDAs. And the fact that I can't trust entities like Adobe or Slack now puts me at risk.

Breaking an NDA can put you in a precarious position and even result in job loss. It is a threat to my livelihood, but also my own private data that I did not consent to for use. Artists need the definition of deep -- Deepfakes to include forgeries in order to protect their, -- our livelihoods and the future of our other artists and workers. Some of the work I have that got scraped into the LAION-5B dataset that many of these AI companies use to change -- train their models is artwork I did as a child.

If you're unfamiliar with the LAION-5B dataset, the 5B stands for 5.87 billion images that were scraped into this dataset. I have no way to know that my work -- I posted online to art forums and communities to help build my skills and get inspired would be used in the very software that is now currently trying to replace me. The fact that these companies can indiscriminately use this type of data even of children is troubling. We need complete transparency and the ability to opt out. Clearly, companies often make it difficult to know how to opt out or completely impossible.

Many people aren't even aware that their data was used. How are people supposed to protect themselves from



this data heist if they aren't even aware it's happening?
We can build an innovative and -- innovation with consent
and compensation if we truly want a future that is filled
with innovation and possibility. We can't let an industry
full of that creativity be squashed in favor of the few who
benefit. Thank you so much for your time and allowing
me to comment.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Peter Leroe Munoz, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MR. MUNOZ: Good afternoon. My name is Peter Leroe Munoz. I'm here on behalf of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which represents hundreds of innovation economy companies. The use of AI and ADMT technologies is crucial for our members and the customers they serve. These technologies have powered the functions of self-driving cars help delete fraudulent credit card fraud and identity theft, analyze medical data to diagnose diseases, develop solutions to minimize climate change impacts, etc. These are the just a few examples of groundbreaking use cases that we fear could be at risk due to the regulations proposed by the Agency.

Our organization and members recognize the transformative power of AI and have been active participants in business meetings discussing widespread uses of AI, harms

of over-regulation by the Agency, and the need to protect the technological advancements that yield benefits for communities in California and across the country.

During these meetings, we hear growing concern among the business community that the Agency's actions will stall AI innovation and that the CPPA is going beyond its mandate of privacy while getting ahead of the legislature and the governor. As it relates to specific areas of the Agency's proposed regulations, our concerns today are regarding the definition of AI and ADMT, risk assessment requirements, and opt-out provisions, AI and ADM definitions. The definitions of AI and automated decision making are too broad, potentially including even basic algorithms and simple uses that are low risk.

As it relates to risk assessments, the current requirements for assessments to the Agency are overly burdensome, presenting challenges for staff and may require businesses to hire additional team members solely for compliance, and pose significant risks to businesses because it may require documentation of proprietary information. Regarding the impact of opting out, while the opt-out provisions for Automated Decision-making Technologies are well intended, allowing users to opt out could degrade the quality of models produced. This would stifle innovation negatively impact technological advancements and lead to

poor AI and ADMT outputs.

Lastly, many of our members in California businesses operate beyond state lines and are already navigating a complex patchwork of privacy regulations. Adding another layer of industry specific privacy mandates, especially for sectors like finance, healthcare, entertainment, etc, complicates compliance, further harmonization across states, (inaudible) for businesses. We share the CPPA's commitment to consumer privacy. However, we're in need of a solution that strikes a balance between regulation and fostering a thriving AI economy that benefits us all. Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Thank you, Peter. Yadi, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin when you are ready.

MS. YADI: Hi, I'm Yadi, a member of Oakland Privacy. My comments are related to the ADMT opt-out because the opt-out preference model -- excuse me, was selected over opting in. This has placed consumers in the position of having to overcome status quo bias or the lack of inertia to undertake action to change the status quo in order to exercise their privacy rights. Denying customers, the -- consumers, the opportunity to explicitly consent or opting into the sharing of their personal information means that these optout mechanisms, must be made straightforward,

and frictionless for consumers to use if they wish to do so.

We also want to waste concerns with two of the exceptions to providing opt-out, the human appeal exception, which states that a business does not need to offer the option to opt-out if the business grants consumers the ability to appeal significant decisions to a qualified human decision maker, significantly hamstrings the power of opting out.

This human appeal process is significantly more burdensome than executing an opt-out preference. The burden will likely result in few consumers taking advantage of the human appeal process, even if they feel they have been a victim of an adverse significant decision. The evaluation exception, which states that a business does not have to provide a consumer the opportunity to optout as long as the business has conducted a self-evaluation of the ADMT to ensure it worked as intended and has implemented safeguards to ensure that the ADMT worked as intended and was not discriminatory.

Places an enormous amount of trust in companies, that they will in fact conduct a rigorous self-evaluation and will attest honestly to having met the obligations set forth under the permissible exceptions. A recent PEW study found 52 percent of Americans are more concerned than excited about AI in daily life, and only 30 percent of

Americans were able to correctly answer questions about awareness of AI in everyday life, and consumers are not alone with concerns about AI.

A report found that organization leaders have concerns about the bias and ethics of their AI systems. Of the organizations polled most reported, having encountered ethical issues relating to the use of AI within the last three years. In nine out of 10 organizations, executives admitted to having awareness of ethical issues resulting from the use of AI at their organizations.

Moreover, some major employers who are already aware of issues with the use of ADMT have come together with a commitment to some form of self-regulation. However, it's been mostly centered around AI literacy, but lack meaningful commitments or assurances to preventing bias or discrimination. Given the growing examples of companies misusing consumers' data and the lack of trust by the public about how their data is used, it is important to tighten the opt-out requirements and make the process as frictionless as possible to give consumers the strongest possible protections. We thank the CPPA for its work to protect consumer privacy. Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Thank you -- thank you. Bernadette King (inaudible). I'm going to unmute you this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin



when you're ready.

MS. KING: Good afternoon. My name is

Bernadette and I'm a research analyst at SEIU, United

Healthcare Workers West. We are a labor union representing

120,000 allied healthcare workers across California. Our

members are frontline caregivers as well as patients and

consumers who aim to improve the healthcare system by

providing quality care for all patients, expanding access to

excellent, affordable healthcare for all Californians and

improving standards for all workers.

We're very grateful to the staff and Board of the CPPA for inviting the opportunity to comment, which we are eager to do because of the profound impact of this policy on the healthcare workforce. For our union healthcare workers, AI represents one of the most important issues that will shape the future of work in California for decades to come and have significant daily impact on the lives of working people. These technologies have the potential to affect workers' wages and conditions, race and gender equity, job security, health and safety, the right to organize and issues of autonomy and dignity.

It is vital that this rulemaking process be informed by workers, their unions, and other worker advocates who have concrete knowledge about how AI and related technologies are actually playing out in the

workforce. I'd like to provide a brief example from our members to illustrate some of these impacts. Northern California hospital facilities and a large hospital chain has started rolling out the use of automated carts to deliver food to patients aside from potential harm to (inaudible). If the cart, for example, misdelivers a non-diabetic meal to a diabetic patient, we are concerned about adverse employment actions like suspension or termination being taken against a worker who gets blamed for a mistake made by the robot.

Two, proper training for workers to integrate the use of these new technologies into their work duties. And three, data monitoring and tracking of worker activity that are done by the robot that could be used to surveil the activities and efficiencies of workers.

These devices include electronic monitoring mechanisms, but it's not clear what data is being collected and how it's being used against workers. We have have similar concerns about a set of robotic room cleaners that have been used in some healthcare facilities where our members work. One of our concerns highlighted by these examples is the lack of healthcare workers' ability to know and understand how the data collected by these technologies are being used in ways that could or do impact their jobs and performance assessments.

Workers and their union representatives should get full disclosure about these technologies before they are rolled out and should be partners in assessing the impacts on their jobs ahead of deployment. Examples like these are why labor groups and other advocates are paying such close attention to the CPPA rulemaking process.

California is the first and only place in the US where workers are starting to gain basic rights over their data and how employers use their data to make critical decisions about them. We have a historic opportunity to lead the United States in establishing workers as key stakeholders in decisions about how best to govern artificial intelligence and related technologies. It will take the CPPA's sustained attention to data-driven technologies in the workplace to realize that promise, including in this very rulemaking process.

MS. SERENA: Thank you so much, Bernadette.

MS. KING: Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Natalie Bast, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MS. BAST: Sorry, I was muted. Good afternoon, chairwoman Board members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Natalie Bast and I'm here representing the California Business Roundtable. Our

organization represents major California employers across all sectors of the state's economy with a combined workforce of over a million employees. I'm speaking today to urge the CPPA to provide additional stakeholder sessions to allow the business community to address the concerns related to the risk assessments and AI and ADMT in a meaningful way.

While we appreciate the brief overview of the proposed regulations shared today, we recognize the intricacies and varying degrees of compliance involved, so we believe it's essential to allocate more time to comprehend these regulations and their potential impact on our business' operations. Additional sessions would help the business community digest the information you provided today and determine the necessary steps to ensure compliance.

Only then can we provide informed feedback and responses to the specific regulations. AI has tremendous potential for California, serving as a pivotal industry sector that will further bolster our state's leadership and technology, stimulate job growth and drive economic development. From safeguarding consumers against fraud and cybersecurity threats to enhancing customer service and supporting understaffed businesses, ADMT has demonstrably positive business applications.

By slowing down and engaging more stakeholders,



the Agency can ensure that regulations not only address
potential concerns, but also cultivate an environment
conducive to harnessing the full potential of these powerful
tools for the benefit of all of California. Rushing the
regulatory process risks, inadvertently stifling innovation
affecting California's national and international
competitiveness, and impeding the positive contributions
ADMT can make across the various sectors of our economy.
Thank you very much for your time.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Barbara Lawler, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comments, so please begin when you are ready.

MS. LAWLER: Hello, I'm Barbara Lawler. I am president of the Information Accountability Foundation, an independent nonprofit think tank, creating research and education on accountable risk and governance frameworks.

Our members are committed to the foundational principle of accountability. First developed out of the Global Accountability Dialogue in 2009.

We applaud the extensive effort to draft the draft regulations, and thank you for holding these stakeholder sessions. We believe that to be trusted business must be responsible and answerable and be prepared to demonstrate their accountability. We believe that governance frameworks based on accountable risk and data governance enable

beneficial data-driven innovation, while protecting individuals in society from the potential harms that may arise in the digital age. We have three comments as part of our current research project, demonstrable accountability with evidence. We note the crucial emphasis on accountability and the need to demonstrate. We note that parts of the draft rules also go beyond what is expected or required by the GDPR.

However, we encourage the Agency to consider where possible and appropriate harmonization of requirements across ADMT risk and cyber assessments, which contain overlapping elements. Many organizations today conduct multiple risk assessments through embedded business processes and technology. While the concept of use the assessment you have, but add to it is laudable. It belies the complexity of changing internal business workflows and the supporting technology.

Two, we encourage additional outreach and education to business. It's important to remember that the impact of these draft rules go well beyond tech companies and digital advertising technologies. It's important for California to maintain its global leadership and innovation. Third, and finally, we encourage seeking interoperability with other frameworks such as the NIST privacy, security, and risk AI -- AI risk frameworks through such tools as the

- 1 Crosswalk, a resource that will help businesses of all types
- 2 and sizes while avoiding the paperwork of privacy.
- 3 | Additionally, such a tool can provide consistency,
- 4 interpretive capability for enforcement actions by both the
- 5 | Agency and the AG office. Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Ian McPherson, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MR. MCPHERSON: I'm ready. Thank you so much. I'm here just representing myself and I wasn't planning to speak today except for listening to all the feedback from everybody else. You know, I've actually been in technology sales for a long time, specifically in data privacy and security. I helped a lot of companies maybe 75 or so with preparation for GDPR and CCPA, and I can tell you that the most companies really don't have an idea of what data they collect or what they do with it. And even for folks who, you know, saw GDPR coming, they did a data inventory. They haven't kept that up to date.

And hearing the feedback of everybody else here today, there -- there's a lot of, I think fear and I -- lack of education on what it means for privacy. That privacy is about consumers and protecting personal data about people.

And, you know, hearing the small business folks they've all asked to have these sessions on Zoom like this more often.

And so thank you for doing this. It's really actually enlightening to hear other people's concerns. And so I would encourage the Board to do these more often and hear this, but also to provide more education, right? Like the idea that optimizing routes or machine performance would be at risk, I think is misguided, right? That those are about creating a route that makes the most sense. But there is a way that could be applied to the driver specifically in measuring their performance versus the route itself. And so helping people and educating people about what it means to be, you know, high risk versus low risk.

It also isn't about risk to the business. It's risk to the consumer -- to the individual. And so, you know, I'm a nerd about privacy. I listen to podcasts all the time, and once you start getting into it, you can identify that there are real harms to real people in terms of data tracking. But most of these small business teams, they're worried about what they're doing and they don't have time to worry about privacy.

And so I would just encourage the Board here to do more proactive education about how data is used in different ways and how that actually in the end has a result, an impact on real people and their data. And so thank you so much for having this. The other one thing I would just say back to that risk assessment idea is it's sounds like it's

similar to legitimate interest in under GDPR, which again, is not weighing the interest necessarily of the business, but the interest to the consumer and their use of data, what they get out of it versus the risk to them and educating people about that would be helpful as well. So thank you.

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Isabella Rojas, I'm going

MS. SERENA: Thank you. Isabella Rojas, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You'll have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin when you're ready.

MS. ROJAS: I'm ready. So I'm here on behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the oldest and largest business organ association in the region, representing the interests of a broad spectrum of organizations across the private, nonprofit, academic, and public sector, including the business, community, job creators and innovators in the LA region.

We're here to express our deep concerns regarding the proposed rules set forth by the Agency, which we believe will impede the growth in operational efficiency of our members. While we appreciate the CPPA's aim to protect consumer privacy and understand that the proposed rules are well-intentioned, the proposed draft rules go beyond its statutory mandate and will have far reaching consequences on our business community, local and statewide. We ask the CPPA avoid advancing regulations that would harm AI innovation and peed upon the business and societal benefits

gained by this technology.

AI is an instrumental tool for the business community. Recently, the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council reported nearly half of small businesses started using AI tools in the past year, and 29 percent have been using them for one to two years, which has allowed them to vastly improve efficiency and save hundreds of billions of dollars annually. The proposed regulation must ensure that we preserve the use of AI technology for low risk purposes that many businesses utilize the technology for.

The increased efficiencies and boost and profitability enabled by ADMT has a significant impact, not just on businesses, but the consumers and communities that we serve. Organizations using ADMT would need to provide -- or sorry -- as the regulations are currently drafted in regards to ADMT, food delivery platforms may treat every individual delivery that's offered to an individual worker as a significant decision that is on par with things like the denial of housing or withholding of healthcare. Thank you.

MS. SERENA: Thank you -- Thank you. Rick Arney, I'm going to unmute you at this time. You'll have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MR. ARNEY: Thank you. Just finishing off my comments earlier, this is Rick Arney, Vice Chair of Californian's for Consumer Privacy and co-author CC --

MS. SERENA: I'm so sorry. I'm going to have to circle back to you once everyone has had a -- an opportunity to comment for the first time. Carla Ortiz? Yes. This is our last person, and then we can circle back. Carla Ortiz I'm unmuting you now. You have three minutes. Go ahead and begin when you're ready.

MS. ORTIZ: Can you all hear me.

MS. SERENA: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: Great. Then I am ready. Hi everybody, my name is Carla Ortiz. I'm a San Francisco based artist. I'm sure you'll have many things to consider when it comes to the harm generative AI has presented. I, myself, have been personally affected and harmed by generative AI. You see, the training data utilized to build many of these models is taken indiscriminately from the internet. This includes almost the entire body of my artistic worth, both personal and commercial, but not just me. Also the entire body of my peers, my friends, heck, even my own family.

As companies like Meta have claimed ownership of the imagery available on Facebook and Instagram, and soon Microsoft itself will ensure every single thing you do on your PC is recorded, analyzed for their own generative AI

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In another time, this would've been called Spyware. models. The kicker is it just doesn't stop at huge overreach in claiming all media and information that the inner is theirs. But generative AI companies take this media and information that is not theirs, utilize it, train their models without anyone's consent, and use that to profit immensely without any regards to our rights or consent or even ability to This is most recently shown case by OpenAI's kerfuffle with Ms. Scarlett Johansson. As an artist, has been taking advantage of this same -- in this exact same My work is copyrighted, yes, but it goes so far beyond This is work that I have toiled over for decades, for that. which is a part of me. I remember every single detail of every painting I've made, how I felt. It is a reflection of my life. So when generative AI companies take that work without consent, then profit from it, and then compete in my own -- in our own markets with it, well, this feels more about copyright, that feels more like identity theft to me. Because of this is so personal to us, and this is so egregious. I'd like to offer three solutions, expand the

Art -- artist's style is their trade dress. And it's important that both artists and consumers are protected

definition, deepfakes to also include forgeries, because

forgeries are a type of deepfake.

1 from copies and forgeries and any forms of trade dress 2 violations, and reconsider that opt-outs are not technically 3 feasible and shift of responsibility to consumers and 4 Californians, and that's just not okay. It's also deeply unsustainable. So opt-in is really the only solution here. 5 6 That way we can protect the creativity, innovation, hard work, and privacy of all Californians. 7 Guys, we really know what is right and wrong here, 8 9 and a few tech businesses with vested interest cannot derail 10 or delay the action we so desperately need. Delay, deny and 11 deflect is how these companies, you know, are trying to do 12 it. But this will not just affect just these few companies. 13 These things affect whole industries like the entertainment 14 and injure artists like myself. So the more the delay, the 15 less protections I have and the scar it gets for all of us. 16 And that's a loss, not just California's economy to our 17 creative innovation, but our overall health as a society. 18 Thank you all so much for your time. 19 MS. SERENA: Rick Arney, I'm going to unmute you at 20

this time. You have three minutes to make your comment.

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you so much, Rick Arney, vice MR. ARNEY: chair, California Consumer Privacy and co-author of CCPA and Thanks for letting me come back just briefly to finish off my comments. I'll just finish with Automated Decision Making. Under the proposed regulations, consumers

have the right to opt-out of ADM if there is a "significant decision." Point I'd like to make here is that is quite broadly defined covering a very large SWAT of the economy, access to provision or denial of housing, insurance, education, justice, employment, essentially all essential goods and services.

This then goes into of course, profiling, which again is written very with wide breadth. My feeling is that this reg as written includes the ability to allow a consumer to opt-out of contextual ads. And that's, I think, a bit of a problem because if someone's allowed to opt-out of essentially all advertising on a site, what -- then how does a site actually end up paying for itself?

This, from my perspective, destroys the concept of price -- privacy protective contextual ads. There is indeed an exception for appeal, but there's not really a lot of meat on the bone on the appeal process. What if a company just denies all appeals? Then we're kind of back where we started.

I'll leave you with the challenge. Think of an exercise where ask yourself, do we want a consumer opting out of Amazon's grocery delivery schedule or a simple online booking for a medical appointment? This section should really be reworked in light of those examples where we really don't want consumers to be able to opt out of what

1 are essentially just basic business processes. I advocate 2 that perhaps this should match Colorado's approach where you 3 do not have the right to opt out of human assisted 4 decisions, period. So thank you so much for your time. Appreciate all the hard work you're doing this, and thanks 5 6 for hearing out my comments. Thank you. We have one more 7 MS. SERENA: commenter, Ian Maloney. I'm going to unmute you at this 8 9 You'll have three minutes to make your comment, so 10 please begin when you're ready. 11 MR. MALONEY: Thank you. Ian Maloney with the 12 American FinTech Council. I just wanted to finish up my 13 comments as well. First on the ADMT section 722 or 7221 14 subsection 6. You know, lenders will likely face 15 significant costs if they're required to allow consumers to 16 opt-out of the use of Automated Decision-making Technology 17 used to train other models. And it may inhibit their 18 ability for lenders to effectively train their models to 19 ensure that they properly assess risk and avoid any bias. 20 Therefore, CPPA should consider adding training 21 uses of Automated Decision-making Technology as set forth in

Therefore, CPPA should consider adding training uses of Automated Decision-making Technology as set forth in section 7,200 to the list of exempted activities for consumer opt-out requirements. Then there are some rather beneficial provisions within this regulation. So I wanted to note those as you all are considering any changes to the

22

23

24

25

1 draft. For the risk assessment section, I think the use of 2 the GLBA risk assessments to avoid any duplicative 3 requirements is -- is very important and beneficial. 4 Similarly, the cybersecurity audits allowing for any existing laws and regulations to allow, you know, that 5 exemption is important. I think it should be spelled out a 6 little bit further there as a previous commenter noted. And 7 then also within section 7220 (c) I think that the 8 9 consolidated pre-use notification provisions could be beneficial for streamlining the user experience. So those 10 11 are -- those are definitely beneficial and should be kept. 12 And then lastly, for seven -- section 7222 13 subsection (4)(d), the exemption on providing consumer 14 explanations on security fraud prevention, safety use cases, 15 I -- that's, you know, very important and, you know, really 16 -- I think is crucial to ensuring that those use cases 17 remain functional. So thank you for allowing me the opportunity to finish up my comments and I look forward to 18 19 working with you all in any capacity in the future. Thank 20 you. 21 Thank you. Chair Urban, it doesn't MS. SERENA: 22 look like we have any more public comments online. 23 CHAIR URBAN: We have one more public comment in the room, so we'll move a mic back up. 24 25 MS. ROCIO: Ooh, testing. All right. Yes, it

actually is. So thank you for allowing me to close out my comments. Rocio Babaesa (phonetic) mum of two, business owner. There's a number of implementation steps that I think make sense to consider as part of the rulemaking process specifically for cybersecurity audit regulations. So my background -- so born in LA, so raised in Chicago. I've been in the tech space for the last 20-ish years specifically right now supporting online lenders that are partnering with banks and they don't have the in-house expertise to comply with a number of regulations one of them being CCPA.

So this is a very interesting topic because it's not mature like accounting is, or the medical space is.

Like I said previously, we're looking to manage risk on information that we're not able to see and it lives in many different places. And when we've worked with clients, we actually spend a considerable amount of time educating compliance officers and general counsel who have an amazing, capability to like assess laws and regulations. But when something like this cybersecurity audit requirement enters, there's a number of foundational cybersecurity components that are not commonly known.

Different people's understanding of encryption, like that's a thing. And because -- or until we have this idea of being able to standardize concept so that we can

communicate on the same level, we'll continue to spin wheels and likely create a situation where just creating administrative burden that in the end of the day is not going to be helping Californian consumers and beyond because other states are going to be following suit. It's only a matter of time.

I'm very passionate about this space. I was a host of GDPR standup a few years back. And I think that these commentary opportunity -- opportunities are very helpful and I just want to leave you with the two takeaways. So I invite industry professionals to make contributions and that the -- Agency develop guidance to show how to do this. So we can do it right. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: So just for those online who may not have heard, we are going to take a 10 minute break. So we will be back at 5:10. So a little bit more than a 10 minute break. And we will be here until 6:00. So if additional people would like to speak, we will be reopening public comment at approximately 5:10. Thank you so much.

(BREAK)

MS. WHITE: Okay. For members of the public who are joining us online, just to let you know, public comment is reopened. If you'd like to make public comment, please use the raise hand feature on Zoom. And if you're joining us via phone, please press star six.

MS. SERENA: Dina I'm going to unmute you at this time. You have three minutes to make your comment, so please begin as soon as you're ready.

MS. DINA: All right. I'm I unmuted? Okay.

MS. SERENA: We can hear you.

MS. DINA: Okay. Dina (inaudible), Concept Art Association. So our organization represents a number of artists and creators in film, television, video games, cartooning, and throughout entertainment. One thing that needs to be made abundantly clear is that artists are consumers of software programs, applications, and cloud storage that they must use as employees to do their job.

Additionally, they need to advertise themselves on websites so that they can get work. This is now the industry standard. There's no way that they can avoid this. As consumers, artists have to buy and use these products to do their job. These products then steal their data from them while they're working and they then have to compete against themselves in the marketplace for work. A number of artists have already mentioned today that the ability for these AI programs to generate forgeries is problematic for them. Forgeries are a form of deepfake right now.

An AI model could presumably generate a Simon Stalinhag painting that he never painted, both the artist Simon Stalinhag and the unsuspecting consumer or fan who was

unfortunately duped into paying for the forgery for a fake Simon Stalinhag painting also need to be protected. AI can harm an artist's future prospects for work. A lot of these artists, especially the ones who work in Hollywood, need to sign NDAs to take a job.

If all of a sudden there are forgeries out there of things these artists aren't legally allowed to create, which appear to have violated an NDA that they signed, they could legally be in jeopardy for something they had nothing to do with. Additionally, forged images could be generated of offensive materials that can accidentally be attributed to an artist and fundamentally destroy their reputation. So it's essential that the training data and the methods for acquiring training data have to be addressed via regulations.

Some of the solutions we are thinking about could include things like expanding the definition of Deepfakes to also include forgeries because forgery is a type of Deepfake. Also an artist's style is their trade dress. It's important that both artists and consumers are protected from copies and forgeries or any other forms of trade dress violations. There should be some sort of filter or ban on artists' names being used as prompts. Artists should be able to opt-out, like do not call but say, I don't want my name to be an input or a prompt for an AI.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Some of the other things we're thinking about like in section 7030 (c)(1), when you're requiring that they provide notices, we think that those links should also explain why pre-use opting out is necessary. And they should also inform consumers that once data has been used for generative artificial intelligence training, that there is no practical way for the business to remove that data from the training data sets so that they truly understand the gravity of not opting-out. The way artists earn a living is being severely diminished right now. We've had artists lose their jobs, their livelihoods, their homes, some have even sadly lost their lives at this point through suicide. We thank you for these listening sessions these past two weeks and can hope to continue working with you and that we get some strong regulations written. Thank you so much.

MS. SERENA: Thank you so much. If there are any other members of the public who'd like to speak at this time, please go ahead and raise your hand using the Zoom raise hand feature or by pressing star six. If you're joining us by phone, if there are any other members of the public who'd like to speak at this time, we'll be here for 10 more minutes. So please go ahead and raise your hand using Zoom's raised hand feature or by pressing star six if you're joining us by phone. Thank you.

(BREAK) Thank you all for attending today's MR. LAIRD: presentation. We are going to go ahead and conclude. And once more, thank you on behalf of the Privacy Protection Agency for all those who attended and provided public comment. We've really learned a lot today and we look forward to hearing more as we move into formal rulemaking in the coming months. Thank you. Bye.

