1	CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY BOARD
2	
3	TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED BOARD MEETING
4	AMENDED
5	
6	JUNE 8, 2022
7	OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA
8	
9	Present: JENNIFER URBAN, Chairperson
10	VINHCENT LE, Board Member
11	ANGELA SIERRA, Board Member
12	JOHN C. THOMPSON, Board Member
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Transcribed by: Mieghley Williams-McGuire,
23	eScribers, LLC
24	Phoenix, Arizona
25	000

## TRANSCRIBED RECORDED BOARD MEETING

June 8, 2022

2.3

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Good morning, everyone. I'm pleased to welcome you to the California Privacy Protection Agency Board's June 8th, 2022 meeting. My name is Jennifer Urban, and I am the Chairperson of the Board for the Agency.

Before we get started with the substance of the meeting, I have some logistical announcements. First, I'd like to ask everyone to please check that your microphone is muted -- although I'll say a little bit more about that in a moment. Second, I'd like to ask everyone who is here in person to silence their cell phones. Thank you. Third, this meeting is being recorded.

Today's meeting will be run according to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act as required by law. I'm pleased to be here in person with the Board and with some members of the public. Welcome to all of you. And I'd like to welcome everyone who is joining us via Zoom, as well.

As with our May 26th, 2022 meeting, I do have some observations and requests related to the hybrid meeting format and our request to wear masks. First, the rapid increase in COVID-19 cases -- in California generally, and specifically in Alameda County where our physical

meeting is located -- has continued, and it has created some substantial logistical challenges on which I hope you will bear with us.

2.3

We have encouraged the public to join the meeting remotely. We are also strongly encouraging everyone to wear masks if you are attending in person. The CPPA is not requiring either of these things, just encouraging them. However, since our last meeting, Alameda County has reinstated its requirement that masks must be worn in many buildings including government buildings like this one. We appreciate everyone here in person following this requirement.

I also thought it would be helpful to say just a little bit about why we are encouraging this approach, even though we are excited to be here in person together, and generally to be moving to in-person meetings. First, the current variant of COVID-19 is still spreading extremely rapidly due to a high level of contagiousness. And of course, we want to avoid exposing vulnerable members of the community or inadvertently making our public meetings less accessible to those members of our community.

Second -- and this is something that is less, like, intuitive I think to many people -- our temporary ability to meet remotely and still comply with Bagley-Keene has

expired and has thus far not been renewed. This means, unfortunately, that the rapid spread of the virus could pose some serious logistical issues to the Board's work on behalf of the public. This is because we no longer have the option under Bagley-Keene of holding entirely remote meetings, or for any board member to participate remotely, even if they test positive. This means that a COVID-19 positive board member simply cannot participate in a public meeting.

In addition, our board meetings must be publicly noticed ten days in advance, with all physical and remote locations correct on the notice. Accordingly, we cannot easily reschedule if board members test positive or become ill.

This brings me to my second request, which is that everyone please bear with us as regards to any kinks as we run the meeting. We have found that the hybrid inperson and remote meeting can be somewhat complex to administer and ask for patience. If the remote meeting glitches -- for example, if the audio cuts out -- we will pause to fix it. I'll say more about this in a minute as I explain the meeting logistics. But I really appreciate everyone bearing with us. Thank you.

Okay. Now I'll go over logistics and meeting participation. We will proceed through the agenda, which

is available as a handout here in Oakland, and also on the CPPA website. Materials for the meeting are also available as handouts here and on the CPPA website. You may notice board members accessing their laptops or other devices during the meeting. They are using these devices solely to access board meeting materials.

2.0

After each agenda item, there will be an opportunity for questions and discussion by the board members. We have a designated time on the agenda for public comment -- agenda item number 5 today -- and I will also ask for public comment as we go through the agenda items. We have members of the public attending online via Zoom and also in person here in Oakland.

If you are attending via Zoom and you wish to speak on an item, please wait until I call for public comment on that item and allow for staff to prepare for Zoom public comment. I'll say more about that when we get to our first call for public comment so it's clear to everyone. But for now, you will use your raise your hand function in the reaction feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen, so you may wish to locate that now.

Our moderator will request that you unmute yourself for comment. Please note that you must wait for the moderator to give you the ability to unmute. When your comment is completed, the moderator will mute you again.

For those of you on Zoom, please also note that the Board will not be able to see you, only hear your voice. Thus, it is helpful if you identify yourself, but this is entirely voluntary. And you can also input a pseudonym when you login to the meeting.

If you are attending in person and wish to speak on an item, please wait for me to call for public comment, then move towards the podium and form a line, keeping social distancing in place. Please move to the podium directly when you are called to speak in your turn. As with the Zoom attendees, it is helpful if you identify yourself when you begin speaking. But again, this is entirely voluntary, and you are free to refer to yourself as a pseudonym or not give a name. Please speak into the microphone so that everyone participating remotely can hear you, and so your remarks can be recorded in the meeting record.

I would also like to remind everyone of the rules of the road under Bagley-Keene. Both board members and members of the public may only discuss items that are on the agenda for today when those items are up for the discussion. The public can also bring up additional topics when the Board takes up the agenda item for that purpose, which is the agenda item I mentioned -- number 5 -- today.

In addition, items not on the agenda can be suggested for discussion at future meetings when the Board takes up the agenda item designated for that purpose, and that is number 6 today.

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

If you are participating via Zoom, use the raise your hand function so our moderator can recognize you. And if you are in person, please raise your hand and wave at me to let me know I forgot. You will then be called to the podium to provide your comment.

Okay. As I mentioned, these hybrid meeting formats are -- the hybrid meeting format -- excuse me -- is somewhat complex. So first, I'd like to thank the team managing the technical aspects of the meeting today.

Very grateful to Ms. Trini Hurtado, Ms. Megan Sullivan (ph.), and Mr. Oscar Estrella (ph.).

Second, I will explain what to do if those of you attending remotely experience an issue with the remote meeting -- for example, the audio dropping. If something happens, please email info@cppa.ca.gov. That's I-N, for Nancy, F, for Frank, O at C-P-P-A dot California -- C-A

dot gov. This will be monitored throughout the meeting.

If there is an issue that affects the remote meeting, we will pause the meeting to let our technical staff work on fixing the issue. And again, I thank everybody for patience if we need it.

2.0

2.3

We will take a lunch break when appropriate and shorter breaks as needed. I will announce each break and when we plan to return so that members of the public can leave and come back if they wish before we begin again.

My thanks to all the board members for their service, and to all the people working to make this meeting possible. I would like to thank the team from the Office of the Attorney General supporting us today.

Mr. Milad Dalju is acting as our main counsel. Ms. Trini Hurtado, whom I mentioned, and her team of conference services experts have organized the meeting infrastructure and are moderating today. I would also like to thank the team of expert attorneys from the Office of the Attorney General who are supporting the Agency in its substantive work. I will say a little bit more about that later in the meeting.

From the CPPA, I would like to thank Ashkan Soltani, our executive director; Brian Soublet, our acting general counsel; Vongayi Chitambira, our deputy director of administration; and all the CPPA staff for their work

behind the scenes. 1 I'd also like to continue to express my gratitude to 3 the team at the Department of Consumer Affairs for 4 managing our communications list and website. And the 5 staff at the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency, the Department of Consumer Affairs, the 6 7 Department of General Services, the Office of the 8 Attorney General, and the other agencies who also 9 continue to help behind the scenes as we grow our agency. 10 I will now call the meeting to order and ask our 11 moderator, Ms. Hurtado, to please conduct the roll call. 12 MODERATOR HURTADO: Good morning. I'll begin the 13 roll call. Ms. De la Torre? Mr. Le? 14 BOARD MEMBER LE: Present. 15 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Sierra? 16 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Present. 17 MODERATOR HURTADO: Mr. Thompson? 18 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Present. 19 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Urban? 2.0 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Present. 21 MODERATOR HURTADO: There are four members present 22 and one not present. 2.3 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. 24 Hurtado. The Board has established a quorum. I would

like to say that Ms. De la Torre regrets that she cannot

25

be with us today. And we will go ahead and continue. I would also like to let Board members know that we will be taking a roll call vote on any action items.

All right. The next on the agenda is agenda item number 2. This will cover a brief clarification on one of the changes the Board made to the Incompatible Activities Statement for board members during our May 26th, 2022 meeting. I'm actually going to take this item out of order. We'll skip it now and return to it after the next two agenda items.

So with that, we will move to agenda items number 3 and 4, which we will discuss together. Agenda item number 3 is titled Discussion and Possible Action

Regarding Proposed Regulations, Sections 7000-7304, to

Implement, Interpret, and Make Specific the California

Privacy Act of 2018, as Amended by the California Privacy

Rights Act of 2020, Including Possible Notice of Proposed

Action. Agenda item 4 is titled Delegation of Authority

to the Executive Director for Rulemaking Functions.

We're going to discuss them together because there is only one potential action here. That is, the Board will be hearing from staff on -- and will be discussing whether to approve -- starting the formal rulemaking process for this proposed rulemaking package, which includes authorizing the executive director to take the

steps necessary to do this. Because we're a new agency and a new board -- it was my mistake -- I mistakenly split this when I drafted the agenda. So we will take them together.

2.0

2.3

I will say, first, a bit about the process related to these items and a bit about the purpose of the discussion. And then a description of the draft proposed regulatory text will be presented by Counsel.

So to briefly recap the process so far -- and again, for everyone who's been following along through our work, thank you for your patience as I work to bring up to speed anyone who's just joining us -- the Board has been working since last fall in subcommittees with counsel from the Agency and the Office of the Attorney General to work on draft regulations under -- as we are requested to do under the CPRA as it amends the CCPA.

We have requested preliminary written comments which we received last fall. We held informational sessions with experts from academia and other agencies. We held stakeholder sessions where we heard from stakeholders.

And all of that information was gathered up and went into the draft -- a package of draft proposed regulations, which is part of the meeting materials for these agenda items today.

Now I'm going to say a little bit about where we are

and how the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act interacts with rulemaking because this is a source of some confusion, I think, and it's completely understandable confusion.

Indeed, staff have prepared an FAQ -- frequently asked questions -- document that you can find on our website on the regulations page to help explain this, because it's just not intuitive to a lot of people.

So for those of you who are familiar, again, thanks for your patience. I've explained this at a few public events, but of course not everyone is going to be familiar with how boards and commissions operate under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and how that interacts with the California Administrative Procedure Act. So I'll just walk through it briefly.

I'll actually start with the California APA. When an agency in California writes regulations to implement to statute, it must follow the APA which requires a formal process to ensure that the public has input. If you look at the materials for agenda item 5-A from our May 26th, 2022 board meeting, you'll find a slide presentation from the Rulemaking Process Subcommittee. On slide 2 there's a graphic that describes the APA process at a high level.

In short, once a rulemaking package is ready, it is published with a Notice of Proposed Action and some

explanatory materials, including an initial statement of reasons which explains the background on the Agency's reasoning. That package is subject to a period of at least forty-five days during which the public can submit written comments to the Agency on the proposed rulemaking package. And indeed, they can, you know -- they can send email. You can submit comments in sort of any way during that forty-five-day -- at least -- period.

There's also usually a hearing -- and if I'm recalling our May 26th conversation correctly, we're definitely planning to have a hearing. Mr. Thompson is nodding, and that was the consensus. So there will be a hearing as well.

The Agency will consider all of these formal comments. If it makes substantial changes in response, then there will be another time period for written comments of at least fifteen days. The Agency will summarize and respond to all those comments in the final statement of reasons that is submitted with the final rulemaking package to the Office of Administrative Law. It's a very high-level overview, but it's just so everyone has a picture of how rulemaking happens should we approve the package to go forward for rulemaking and that there are robust procedures for public comment, which we are very much looking forward to.

We are not there yet -- and this is the part that I think is -- can be puzzling. The Agency has not yet commenced the formal rulemaking process, so why are we here today? That's where the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act comes in. The California Privacy Protection Agency is governed by this Board. Under our implementing statute, the Board holds the Agency's rulemaking authority, which means that it is our job to approve commencing the formal rulemaking process.

2.0

2.3

The Board is governed by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, which means that all of our discussions are considered in public meetings that are noticed at least ten calendar days in advance, and any materials that we use for the meeting that are distributed to us are also available to the public. So in practice, what that means is that the public gets to see our draft regulations and listen to and comment on our discussion about the process before we ever start the formal rulemaking.

This is different from what many regulatory advocates are familiar with -- especially for Federal rulemaking -- but also for other state agencies that are not governed by boards, because in most situations the draft rules aren't published with the notice to start the formal rulemaking process. So we are one -- we're a step ahead of that and have put the rules out in advance of

that.

2.0

So what are we considering today? Today we will be considering a motion to start the formal rulemaking process and authorize the steps needed to accomplish that. Should that motion carry, then the formal rulemaking process will commence. But it is not a decision by the Board on whether to adopt the final rules or whether to amend them. The Board will need to have further meetings to discuss public comment and make further decisions about the rules. So accordingly, the motion before us will be whether to approve the draft proposed regulatory text for the formal rulemaking process and authorize the executive director to take the steps necessary to initiate that.

To support our discussion, we have in front of us the draft proposed regulatory text, which counsel will introduce in a moment. We also have a draft initial statement of reasons. This is supportive material that will be on the regulatory package. And I'm really grateful to the staff and counsel for getting it ready for us so we have this background information, too.

I also want to thank staff and counsel for the careful, thorough work they have done on this draft proposed regulatory text. In my view, this is very impressive work on a very difficult timeline that takes

into account a lot of really helpful feedback from the public.

2.0

2.3

I would also like to thank them specifically for getting both Board and the public the draft text so quickly after the May 26th board meeting in which we discussed process. Indeed, the very next day. This gave us all the maximum time to review before today's meeting. And I would also like to thank them for getting a draft ISOR ready for us to serve as background.

These materials support our discussion, of course, but also provide that extra measure of transparency, and notice for the public that Bagley-Keene requires well before the formal process commences. And I just want to say I know it was a lot of work, and I really value that work.

I will now turn things over to attorneys from the team at the Office of the Attorney General that has been assisting the Agency in putting together the draft regulations, acting as counsel for the Agency. This team and members of the team from the Agency itself (indiscernible) tireless in considering all the preliminary information we've gathered and working with the Board subcommittees and Agency staff to carefully draft regulatory text. They're peerless in their expertise. They have experience with consumer law

generally, privacy law, and specifically the California Consumer Privacy Act and the existing CCPA regulations and California administrative law.

I would like to especially thank the two members of the team who are presenting to us today. Deputy Attorney General Lisa Kim, and Senior Deputy Attorney General Stacey Schesser. I will now turn it over to them for an overview of the draft proposed regulatory text, after which we will turn to Board questions and discussion followed by public comment.

Deputy Attorney General Kim, thank you very much for all your work on this and for presenting to us today.

Please go ahead.

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL KIM: Thank you very much,
Chairperson Urban. Good morning. My name is Lisa Kim,
as Chairperson Urban stated. And I've been assisting the
Agency in preparing and drafting the regulations and with
regard to this general rulemaking process. Supervising
Deputy Attorney General Stacey Schesser and I will be
providing a general overview on a high level of the
proposed regulations, and I'm happy to answer any
questions that you may have about the particular sections
or anything, or if you'd like me to speak in greater
depth with regard to any of the particular sections
throughout.

But as an initial matter, I just also wanted to point out to you -- just as Chairperson Urban mentioned -- the ISOR -- or we call it the ISOR for short, but it's the Initial Statement of Reasons -- is a very helpful and useful document. It basically answers the question of why is the regulation necessary, and what benefits does it provide. And so if there's any particular thing that you wanted to go back to at a later time, it's a great place to start.

2.0

Also I thought I'd point out -- in case it wasn't obvious -- but the PDFs that are on our meeting materials on our website are actually bookmarked. So if you open up the bookmark tab, it's a very useful tool that I use particularly often, and it's easy to navigate through the document for both the regulations and the ISOR.

I wanted to note, also, that since providing the actual draft regulations to the Board, we have caught a few nonsubstantive errors just with regard to formatting and that sort of thing, and so we intend to correct those prior to commencing any kind of formal rulemaking. So I want to give that heads up to you all.

So speaking about the general overview of the proposed regulations, the proposed regulations generally do three things. The first thing it does is update existing CCPA regulations to harmonize them with the CPRA

amendments to the CCPA, and to address any confusion that exists in the marketplace even now. The second thing it does is it operationalizes new rights and new concepts that were introduced by the CPRA amendments. And thirdly, it reorganizes and consolidates some of the requirements in the law, so that it is easier to follow and understand. It basically restates the law, consolidates them into one place, just so that it aids in the understanding.

2.3

I'll work through the -- there are nine articles currently. And the first eight articles are basically the same, but they've been added to. Article 9 covers investigations and enforcement, and Ms. Schesser will be covering that when I'm done with the first eight. But I just want to walk you through the different articles and point out the three components that I had just mentioned.

So starting with Article 1, that is the section that deals with general provisions of the CCPA regulations.

It covers definitions that are used throughout the regulations themselves. And again, here is an example of how we're updating the existing CCPA regulations. One example would be the use of the term consent. That is a new term that was introduced by the CPRA amendments, and it replaces affirmative authorization, which is what we had previously used for that term. And so affirmative

authorization is deleted, and so there's an example of how we're updating to align the regulations to the existing law.

Second is with regard to implementing new concepts. We include in this section a Section 7004, which has to do with giving consumer consent. And it addresses this idea of -- that was introduced by the CPRA amendments that has to do with the fact that consent that is obtained through the use of dark patterns is not considered consent. And so what -- the question is left for the office -- or the agencies to explain what is a dark pattern. And so Section 7004 sets forth that in greater detail and provides many examples for the public to understand that.

An example of how we restate and reorganize the law to aid in understanding would be Section 7002, which is also in that general provision. This pertains to data minimization and purpose limitations that were newly introduced in Civil Code Section 1798.100. Now this is something that is in the law, but we brought them into the regs to help businesses understand what is required of them when it comes to only collecting information that's necessary and proportionate to the purpose that it serves.

And then also, again, another example of us

restating the law and reorganizing it so that it's easier for the public to understand is Section 7003, which sets forth all the requirements for disclosures. It puts all the information about how disclosures to consumers -- it puts that all in one place instead of repeating it over and over again in the separate sections that deal with the particular notices to be given to consumers. And so we thought that that would make a lot more sense for consumers to be able to understand.

2.0

2.3

Moving on to Article 2. Article 2 has to do with the different required disclosures that the CCPA expects businesses to give to consumers. Again, here we are updating existing CCPA regs to align them to the new language of the law. There's updating that has been done in the notice of collection requirements that pertains to third parties that are controlling the collection of personal information on the first party's online or offline premises. We have also updated the notice of the right to opt out of sale, because the CPRA amends the CCPRA to extend that right to both sale and sharing of personal information.

Some of the new concepts that are introduced in this section have to do with the limit the use of my sensitive personal information link. That is something that was newly introduced -- a new right that was newly introduced

by the CPRA amendments, and so that has been operationalized in Article 2.

2.3

And also, with regard to the reorganization and the restatement of the law, we have section -- a good example of that is the section on privacy policies. It looks like there's a lot of red in that section, but in actuality it's not changed very much substantively. It's just been reorganized to sort of -- to map out or to follow the organization in which most businesses put their privacy policies together currently so that it's easier for the public and businesses in particular to understand what is required to be in the privacy statement.

Moving on to Article 3. Article 3 is the business practices for handling consumer requests. This was previously the section that set forth all the methods and the timelines and specifications with regard to CCPA requests that are made to businesses under the CCPA. Again, here we have updated existing regulations. We have extended the right to opt out of sale, to include the right to opt out of sale and sharing of personal information. We have updated the methods by which consumers can submit their CCPA requests to align to the existing law -- the changes that were made to the law. We have corrected that -- or we have clarified that the

right to know and the right to delete no longer applies to household information, because that is a change that was made by the CPRA amendments to the CCPA.

2.0

We have also, in Article 3, operationalized the new rights introduced by the CPRA. Specifically, the right to correct, as well as the right to limit the use of my sensitive personal information. There we have noted which methods should be used or offered by the business with regard to submitting those requests, as well as which timelines by which a business must respond to those requests.

A few other things -- there's a lot in there, and I'm kind of covering it at a high level -- but another example of something that we've done there to operationalize things is the opt-out preference signal. The opt-out preference signal in Civil Code Section 1798.185 Subsection (a) (19) and (a) (20) are -- is authority that was given to the Agency to set forth the requirements for opt-out preference signal.

This is a section -- this section has often been misunderstood with regard to interpretations that the opt-out preference signal is optional to respond to by business, but this is not what the law itself says. And so this section here -- which I believe is 1725 -- 7025 -- Section 7025 -- sets forth how, you know, the law

works. And so the regulations, as well as the ISOR, address this head on and clearly explain how the statute works.

Finally, with regard to the reorganization that was made in Article 3, there were some things that we did in that section to kind of aid in the public's understanding of the regulations. And one that I can point out to is with regard to the right to limit the use of sensitive personal information. There are many exceptions to that right, and the exceptions are somewhat spread out throughout all of the CCPA. And so what we did was we tried to consolidate those and set them forth very clearly so that businesses understand what are the exceptions that apply to the request to limit.

Article 4 is the section that deals with service providers, contractors, and third parties. Again, we update the existing CCPA regulations in there. There were amendments that were made to the CCPA by the CPRA that speak to the purposes for which service providers can process personal information. So that's been updated to the line -- to the language of the statute.

There's new concepts that were added there, because there is a new -- a group of persons that have been introduced into the CCPA by Prop 24 -- the CPRA -- and that is the term contractors. So we clarified what

requirements applied to contractors and updated that as well.

And finally, we reorganized -- or provided some reorganization and restated all the contractual requirements that the CPRA amendments add to the CCPA. And that pertains to certain contract requirements of what must be in a contract with a service provider or a contractor. Some of this is all spread out, again, throughout the statute, and what we did is we pulled them all from the different subsections to put them in one place, so it was very clear that businesses understand what is required of a contract with a service provider or a contractor.

Similarly, there is a new requirement in the CCPA by the CPRA amendments that pertain to contractual -- a contract to be in place with regard to third parties.

And this is a new section within the CCPA, and so that has been clearly set forth and included in this section.

Finally, for my portion, Articles 5 through 8.

These are pretty much the same as before. This has to do with verification, and special rules consumers under the age of sixteen, nondiscrimination, and training and record keeping. There has been updating throughout those articles that align the language of the regulations with the CPRA amendments to the CCPA, but on the most part

they're very -- they pretty much track similarly to what they said before.

Now I'm going to turn over to my colleague, Ms. Schesser, and she will cover Article 9.

SUPERVISING DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHESSER: Thank you, Ms. Kim. Article 9 -- again, I'm going to go through a high-level overview as Ms. Kim just did so eloquently for the first articles, from Article 1 through Article 8. Article 9 covers investigation and enforcement.

These provisions outline first what is required to be in a public complaint to the Agency, which leads to an investigation and is governed by Civil Code Section 1798.199.45. For example, the proposed regulation provides how sworn complaints may be submitted to the Agency, and it also balances maintaining the confidentiality of what's alleged in those complaints to balance the Agency's interest in conducting its investigation. The article then goes on to outline how the Agency may open its own investigations and permits the Agency to open a matter at its own determination.

The next provision establishes requirements for probable cause hearings. This is a threshold procedural requirement before the administrative enforcement process may begin. The context to this is -- this section -- is

particularly important, as the CPRA amendments to the CCPA codified in Civil Code Section 1798.199.55 and is a requirement for the Agency's administrative enforcement process.

Importantly, any probable cause determination is not a final decision on the merits of the entire investigation. It is a preliminary hurdle that must be cleared in order to proceed with an enforcement action. The process for conducting an administrative hearing -- which follows a probable cause finding -- is codified in the APA starting at Government Code Section 11.500. The process is highly detailed, and there is no need for further regulations in this area.

Article 9 also establishes regulations for how the Agency resolves an investigation through the filing of a stipulated order entered by the Board. For example, if the parties were to reach a negotiated resolution without an administrative hearing.

Finally, the last section outlines the Agency's audit authority, and is pursuant to 1798.185(a)(18). Audit is an investigatory tool and similar to administrative subpoena. It covers who the Agency may audit, how a subject is selected for audit, and how any personal information shall be protected under an existing legal framework for a state agency. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Sorry, the mask is stymicing me.

Thank you both very much for that helpful presentation.

Are there questions or comment -- and it's all right if

we ask you questions, yes? You're ready for -- okay.

Great. Are there comments or questions from board

members?

BOARD MEMBER LE: I can go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Mr. Le, please.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I just, you know, want to thank you all for your work. These are very detailed. You know, it's going to be a while for us -- for me, at least -- to process all of these. But you know, I think you did a really good job of, you know, providing examples for businesses and California consumers, and you know, making sure that these rules -- especially the stuff around dark patterns -- make sure that we get actual consent and that consumers actually know what they're getting into and have the least barriers to just browsing the internet and protecting their privacy at the same time. So yeah. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. Ms. Sierra?

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes. Thank you, Chair Urban.

And I, too, very much want to thank --

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Ms. Sierra, can you speak closer to the microphone? Thank you.

**BOARD MEMBER SIERRA:** Is that better?

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Yeah.

2.3

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: So I too would very much like to thank Deputy Attorney General Lisa Kim, Supervising Deputy Attorney General Stacey Schesser for all this work. This is -- I'm very, very impressed as well. And I am finding working through and reading the initial statement of reasons -- the ISOR -- extremely helpful. And I think it's going to be very helpful to the public as well as all of us as board members, and to businesses to really understand the thinking, and the rationale, and what was considered. So you know, kudos to you both for all this work on this.

You know, just for example, I'm looking at when you were speaking at the data minimization. You know, I think the explanation in the ISOR is extremely helpful on that point. And I also very much appreciate toward the latter part of the initial statement of reasons, the different concepts that were considered, and the balancing, and the thought that went behind some of those decisions on those key concepts. So I think that's very, very helpful.

So I think, you know, as we are going through this and, you know, listening to the public comment that we receive on these, you know, I will be guided by these and

will -- I'm very open to hearing all the different perspectives on these issues. But right now seeing this proposed draft, I feel like it does provide a lot of clarity. I think the clarity was going to help both businesses and consumers. I think the different examples are very helpful. And I'll be very interested in hearing the different thoughts on them. So thank you, again.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra. Other comments or questions on -- yes, Mr. Thompson. Please, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. I want to echo the comments that have been made and thank the staff and the rest of the Board for this incredible milestone that we've reached in this process. This has been an interesting journey since we started as an agency a little over a year ago, and this is a really significant and major milestone. Thank you for the fine work that has gone into this product. You know, I think we all share a desire to ensure that we issue regulations and enforce those regulations in a way that protects consumers privacy in a way -- and allow consumers to understand and make informed decisions about protecting their own privacy and balancing that with clarity and regulatory certainty for those who are regulated under these regulations.

Like Mr. Le said, I'm still digesting the regulations and the initial statement of reasons, and what I've seen thus far, I think we're doing a good job in striking that balance and taking a mix of approaches. From mandates on the regulated entities, definition of affirmative rights that consumers possess, and then harnessing market forces where appropriate to ensure that privacy is protected. So I'm really happy that we've got this far and thank you for all your fine work.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Further questions or comments at the moment?

2.0

All right. Seeing none. I already said thank you, but I really can't thank you enough. And I also really appreciate the Board's careful attention to what is, of course, a very important task for the Board and also a particularly complex one. And the Board's assertions of how they're looking forward to public comments -- which I am as well. I think that will help us as we work through the regulations -- hearing comment from all stakeholders in California through the formal process. So I'm looking forward to that.

I just will go ahead and read the draft motion that I've put together so we have that, and then we will ask for public comments before we move forward. So the motion that I think that we are considering is to approve

the proposed regulatory text for Sections 7000 to 7304 and authorize the executive director to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process and public comment period, make any nonsubstantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing.

2.0

And so that gets us up to accepting public comment, doing a hearing, and then of course there's the process that committee outlined for us. The Board will need to meet in order to discuss the regulations in more detail, to discuss public comment, and to decide where we are at that stage of the process. But this would get the regulations into the formal rulemaking process.

With that, I would like to call for public comment on this topic, which is the combination of agenda items 3 and 4. We are hoping that we can make this very smooth with the technical complexity notwithstanding. So if everyone can be just a little bit patient and follow directions for a second, it will help.

So for those of you attending via Zoom, if you'd like to comment and you have your hand raised, thanks for being proactive, but please lower it now. We'll wait a second, and then staff will lower any additional hands and I'll ask people to raise them again.

The reason we're doing this is because we've had people raise hands and then walk away and forget that

they were there, and we're trying to avoid that and make sure that we hear from everyone who wants to speak on this. So if you give us a second to do that, while we wait, if any members of the public attending in person here in Oakland would like to comment, please rise and form a line behind the podium. Respect social distancing.

Okay. Trini, are the hands down? Okay. Great.

All right. Thanks, everyone on Zoom, for your patience.

Now if you are attending and would like to comment on this topic, please raise your hand using the raise your hand function on Zoom. And we'll wait a second to let the queue build on Zoom.

MODERATOR HURTADO: Should I begin?

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Sure. Could you let me know how many?

MODERATOR HURTADO: Right now, there's one hand raised.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.

Before we start speaking, I'd just again like to remind everyone to stay on topic so that we are in compliance with Bagley-Keene. Please keep your comments to three minutes or less so every speaker has a chance to speak, and of course just let us know if you have questions. We look forward to hearing from you. So yes, Ms. Hurtado,

please begin.

2.0

2.3

MODERATOR HURTADO: Okay. Our first speaker is

Lucine Chenkezian (ph.). You may now speak. You have
three minutes.

MS. CHENKEZIAN: Lucine Chenkezian, counsel at Civil Justice Association of California. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We are still in the process of reviewing the proposed regulations but have a few initial points we would like to raise today.

Regarding the proposed symmetry choice standard for dark pattern, it is overly broad and likely unworkable. The regulations can support clarity by specifying the definition of dark patterns. This focused on design practices that amount to consumer fraud. The consumer fraud approach is a well-developed and highly effective standard, while the symmetry choice standard would interfere with design choices that seek to promote benefits to consumers while navigating a product or service experience.

As to the global opt-out preference signal, the CPRA clearly states that businesses have the option of honoring a global opt-out signal or providing a do not sell button. It is Agency overreach to try to remove the choice created by the statute. On a related note, we appreciate the alternative link option and would request

1	clarification that this is in the menu of options for
2	opt-out.
3	To the extent that new regulations are created
4	around ADS or other areas, we would request the
5	enforcement deadline be extended by at least six to
6	twelve months. Thank you, again.
7	CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much. Ms.
8	Hurtado, is there further comment?
9	MODERATOR HURTADO: Yes. We have one more
LO	commenter. Our next commenter is Titi Guyen Nguyen.
L1	Sorry. One moment while we promote you to panelist.
L2	Oh. There they are. Okay. You now have three
L3	minutes. You may speak when you're ready. You might
L 4	need to unmute.
L5	We just received a message that they did not raise
L 6	their hand.
L7	CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Oh. Okay. All right. Sorry
L 8	for cold calling.
L9	MODERATOR HURTADO: The hand was raised though. I
20	promise.
21	CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. Is there anyone else on
22	Zoom?
23	MODERATOR HURTADO: No. No more hands are raised at
24	this time.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

25

No one in person has stood up, so I'll just give a moment. I apologize. I am a law professor in my day job, and I don't mean to put people on the spot, but it's kind of part of my job. And I want to be sure everyone has a chance. If you're just thinking that you have time to decide a comment.

All right. So thanks to the woman from CJAC for the comment. And we really do look forward to comments that we get through the formal process. I will say a little bit about what I personally hope to see in comments.

If you are a consumer, just let us know what your experience is. I mean, let us know anything you'd like, but if you can let us know something about your experience, that would be very helpful. If you're a business looking to comply, it would also be very helpful to have specific as to any successes you've had complying, any challenges that you have complying, challenges that you might anticipate, or successes you might anticipate with the amendments to the rules. And to let us know specifically how that might affect you and any ideas that you have for addressing it, including regulatory language if you can. So those would be particularly helpful comments when we get to the formal rulemaking process.

Are there any other Board comments or questions

1 before we go? Mr. Le? **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Yeah. I just want to second the request that, you know, if you do have regulatory 3 4 language suggestions, please submit those. You know, so 5 that we can consider those and not just have to guess, you know, what changes that you would like or suggest. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. Also we 8 can't change the statute. 9 BOARD MEMBER LE: Yes. MODERATOR HURTADO: Chair Urban? 10 11 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Yes. 12 MODERATOR HURTADO: Excuse me. I don't mean to 13 interrupt, but we do have one more hand raised, if you 14 want to --15 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Oh. Okay. Sure. We will --16 let's go back to public comments since we do have another 17 hand raised, and then we will move on. 18 MODERATOR HURTADO: Okay. The next commenter is 19 Howard's Pixel (ph.). You have -- one moment while we 20 promote you. 21 Okay. Howard's Pixel, you have three minutes. You 22 may speak when you're ready. Please unmute. 2.3 MR. PIXEL: I finally found the button. I'm sorry for delaying my comment. 24

No worries.

MODERATOR HURTADO:

MR. PIXEL: I think it's a well-done draft and I'm concerned about the lack of specificity for being able to opt-out. The practice right now of suppressing the -- the cookies is very varied among sites. Some sites do it right up -- up front. Or you know, one click to do it. Others, it's buried in the privacy language. Now I believe you dealt with the privacy language, but I don't think you've dealt adequately with trying to promote some kind of a standard so that users know exactly what to do. That's the first comment.

2.0

2.3

And the second is that it should be somehow recorded so that you don't have to answer every time you go to a site. We don't know whether the cookie settings (indiscernible) is maintained between sessions maybe (indiscernible). Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Pixel.

Ms. Hurtado, is that?

MODERATOR HURTADO: That was the only hand that was raised.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

Thank you to those who engaged in public comment. We appreciate that, and we do look forward to comments during the formal proceeding should we approve it.

And with that, may I have a motion to approve the proposed regulatory text for Sections 7000 to 7304, and

1 authorize the executive director to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process and public 3 comment period, make any nonsubstantive changes to the 4 package, and set the matter for a hearing. 5 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I'll so move. CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you. May I have a second? 6 7 **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Yeah. I'll second. 8 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you. I have a motion from 9 Ms. Sierra and a second from Mr. Le. Ms. Hurtado, would 10 you please call the roll call vote? 11 MODERATOR HURTADO: Of course. Ms. De la Torre? 12 Mr. Le? 13 **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Aye. 14 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Sierra? 15 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye. 16 MODERATOR HURTADO: Mr. Thompson? 17 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Aye. 18 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Urban? CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Aye. 19 2.0 MODERATOR HURTADO: There are four ayes and one absent. 21 22 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. 23 Hurtado. The motion carries with a vote of four to zero. 24 Thank you very much to the Board, of course the staff,

and counsel, and to everyone in the public. And I will

look forward to seeing the formal rulemaking process for this package.

2.0

2.3

Congratulations, everyone. I feel like this is a big step to get our regulations into the formal process. And thank you.

With that, we will return to agenda item number 2.

And thanks for everyone's patience. My understanding is that this is a brief clarification, but I will turn it over to Mr. Brian Soublet, our acting general counsel, to say a little bit more.

MR. SOUBLET: Good morning and thank you Chair
Urban. We just had a very short period of time in order
to get agenda items for this morning's board meeting, and
at the time I thought there was something that needed to
be more clarified on the item that we had discussed at
the last board meeting. However, after looking at the
language and then taking a deeper dive into the statute,
I don't think there's anything we need to address with
respect to that item this morning. So there's no further
discussion that's actually warranted on it at this time.
We will just proceed with what had been authorized by the
Board at the prior board meeting.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Soublet. Any questions from the Board? Okay. Wonderful. Thank you, Mr. Soublet. So the version of the Incompatible

Activities Statement as amended by the Board last time will be circulated and put on the website.

MR. SOUBLET: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you.

MR. SOUBLET: Thank you.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much. Is there any public comment on this item?

MODERATOR HURTADO: I see no hands raised at this time on Zoom.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you. Anyone here in person who would like to comment?

All right. I'm seeing no requests for public comment in person either. We'll move to agenda item number 5, public comments on items not on the agenda. This is the item I mentioned at the top of the meeting, in which the Board invites comments on items that are not otherwise on the agenda.

Before we proceed with public comment on this, please note that the only action the Board can take is to listen to comments and consider whether to discuss the topic at a future meeting. No other action can be taken on an item at this meeting. Although this may seem at times like board members are not being responsive, we do not intend to be, and following these guidelines is critical to ensure that the rules of the Open Meeting Act

are followed and to avoid compromising either the commenters goals or the Board's mission.

So with that, is there anyone who would like to comment on items not on the agenda on Zoom?

MODERATOR HURTADO: There are no commenters at this time.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: All right. Comments from someone in person? I see we do have a commenter.

MR. LOMBARD: Yes.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Please step forward. You have three minutes.

MR. LOMBARD: Thank you. Good morning, Chair and members of the board. My name is Edwin Lombard. And I am here as a small-business owner, and I consult with the -- and represent -- small, black-owned businesses throughout the state of California.

I've been working hard to keep black businesses apprised of the privacy regulations that you are trying to implement, but the Agency has not been forthcoming about its process. It's lack of outreach to small businesses are the consequences businesses will face as a result of these regulations.

Further, I'm concerned about the message the Board is sending about its willingness to hear more from the public, as it opted for a staff-lead meeting -- staff-led

meeting during the upcoming public comment period.

2.0

2.3

In conversations I've had with black businesses across the state, it's become clear the Board should be taking more -- talking more with small, black-owned businesses and not less. More needs to be done to reach out to businesses where they are and help them gather input on regulations that will affect their bottom line.

While releasing the draft regulations is a big step in the right direction, they're incomplete. The Board has already indicated that there are multiple issues that have not been addressed, so we don't even have a full draft to reveal and comment on. There are enormous compliance costs associated with these regulations, and the claim that small businesses will not have to show to the burden of these costs is simply not true.

Small businesses rely increasingly on online platforms and making these -- and making these platforms more costly and less effective will have a direct impact on them and the consumers and communities they serve. How are the members of the public -- especially small-business owners whose livelihoods are impacted by these regulations -- expected to participate in the upcoming public comment periods if the members of the Board might not even show up.

We are asking for a transparent, inclusive process

informed by input from California small businesses.

California cannot afford to implement regulations that force small businesses to close their doors, especially as minority-owned businesses have already been disproportionately affected by the pandemic and so many other ongoing issues.

2.0

2.3

Also in your last meeting, the Board expressed preference in conducting staff-meeting-like approach during the public hearing testimony, which means the Board's presence will not -- may not be necessary if my understanding is correct.

MODERATOR HURTADO: Thirty seconds.

MR. LOMBARD: If true, this is unfortunate. Lastly, the Board needs to commit to a part of the regulation, or in some form or capacity that the enforcement deadline will be extended for six months to give businesses time to comply. This is far -- this is fair in light of the Board's lateness in adopting regulations. It's not too late to get this right for California. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr.

Lombard. Is there further public comment? Yes, there's a public comment on Zoom. All right.

MODERATOR HURTADO: It takes a second to transfer over. Our next speaker is Mitchel CH -- Michelle CHCC.

There we go. Just one moment. Michelle?

MR. LOPEZ: Hi. Yes. Sorry, it's -- I was supposed to be Luis Lopez.

2.0

2.3

MODERATOR HURTADO: Okay. Mr. Lopez, you have three minutes to speak. Your time begins now.

MR. LOPEZ: Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Board. My name is Luis Lopez and I'm here on the behalf of the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

It is important to remember that privacy regulations will impact California businesses of all sizes who operate online or use online services to reach and serve customers. We appreciate that the Agency is now releasing its draft privacy regulations, which will impact millions of California businesses — including approximately 1.2 million minority—owned businesses. While this has been a significant undertaking, our members have serious concerns about the lack of transparency regarding this process and the effect the regulations will have on their ability to serve their communities.

Some board members and staff have previously indicated that the Agency will miss its July 1st, 2022 statutory deadline to adopt regulations. However, we have not heard when the Agency will actually adopt new regulations, or -- as important -- if and when the enforcement deadline will be extended to ensure ample

time for businesses to comply with the new regulations.

2.0

The Board needs to commit as part of the regulations -- or in some formal capacity -- that the enforcement deadline will be extended by six months to give businesses time to comply. This is fair in light of the Board's lateness in adopting the regulations. Will you let these small businesses know today how long you will extend the enforcement -- the enforcement deadline to make sure they have enough time to prepare for them as intended in Proposition 24?

As you are all well aware, the pandemic has forced small businesses to learn on the fly to connect with and serve their customers online just to stay afloat.

Thousands of businesses were not able to make the transition. The last thing our state needs is to force the closures of more small businesses in an attempt to rush a complex regularity framework that can have severe unintended consequences. These consequences are largely avoidable.

I strongly encourage you to engage more small businesses in these process. Be transparent about what you are and are not doing, and study -- study the impact of these regulations on small businesses in our state.

We're all counting on you to get this right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Lopez.

Ms. Hurtado?

2.3

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: All right. Then I would like to thank our commenters for this item. We very much appreciate your engagement and participation. And we will move to agenda item number 6, which is the opportunity to discuss future agenda items.

I have a running list that I went through in the last meeting. I can go through it again, but I won't unless you want me to. And would like to ask if the Board have any agenda items you'd like to suggest that have come up?

BOARD MEMBER LE: I -- I -- I would.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Yes, Mr. Le.

BOARD MEMBER LE: I mean, in regards to these public comments, can we -- and it may even be good to ask the staff -- but can we get a legal opinion on what we can share around enforcement deadlines? I do know this is something that the public is interested in, but we are also -- as a Board and as an Agency -- not allowed to say a lot of things because of underground rulemaking rules.

Is there any way we could share that with the public? Maybe an explanation about underground rulemaking or anything like that? Or I'd like to hear --

maybe -- your all thoughts on if that would be a helpful agenda item.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. So an agenda item to give us the parameters on what we can discuss and maybe options.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. And we don't -- I mean, I would like to hear the staff's opinion, too, if that's allowed on whether that's something that we should do, or we can do. Because, yeah, I do think there's a communication gap that, you know, we are -- as a Board,

2.3

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. I'll put that on the list. That makes sense to me. Any other requests or questions from the Board?

by the rules and by statute -- kind of constrained by.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I would --

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Yes, Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I'd echo Mr. Le's observation and I think he's spot on to agendize that for a future meeting. I think we probably -- I want to have the ability to discuss how we're going to process changes --

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- proposed changes to the rules on a future agenda. May not use that item, but I want to have the option.

1 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: All right. Any further items? BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I don't have anything 3 additional. 4 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. Wonderful. So I have a 5 legal opinion and possibly guidance from staff on what Board and the Agency can disclose on enforcement 6 7 practices and enforcement deadlines, and maybe what 8 options are. And an agenda item that would allow us to 9 discuss how to process proposed changes to the rules that 10 we receive in the public comment process. 11 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. They could be -- I 12 wouldn't limit it to --13 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. 14 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- received through the 15 public comment process, because they could be generated 16 by ourselves as well. 17 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Right. Okay. Sure. I was just 18 imagining what meeting that would be. Okay. Thank you 19 all very much. And are there any public -- excuse me --2.0 any agenda items or comments on potential agenda items 21 from the public? 22 MODERATOR HURTADO: We do have one hand raised. 2.3 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. 24 MODERATOR HURTADO: Okay. Our speaker is Jeremy

Barnett (ph.). Mr. Barnett, you have three minutes to

speak. You may begin now.

2.3

MR. BARNETT: Thank you very much. I greatly appreciate all the work of this committee and for the evolution of CCPA and CRPA to help move things forward.

I think -- I -- I think that we all acknowledge that the need for clarity and transparency in working with, you know, certainly online privacy is really important.

I wanted to suggest that perhaps in the future when we're discussing -- or as the committee is looking at enforcement -- that perhaps there's an agenda item relative to -- I'll call it tools and technologies -- that can help companies comply. It feels like there's a lot of emphasis on the -- the regulations and the language around it. But I know -- you know, as a technology company -- it's really difficult for a lot of companies to comply when they don't have the tools or understanding in house to help them, you know, identify, monitor, manage the myriad data elements that are being requested to be -- to be managed. So as a -- both a regulatory body and as a leader in the state of California -- to help companies figure out how to do this, it would be really helpful.

And maybe it's, you know -- it's something of an adjunct advisory board or something like that to help the committee understand -- I mean, California, we are -- we

are developing the technology that both causes the -the -- the privacy concerns, as well as the technologies
that help people identify the privacy concerns. Like, we
have rich, rich resources right here in the state, you
know, from the North and the South ends of it.

And I just wonder how a public-private partnership can be formulated to help address this, because there are spectacular opportunities for -- for that, specifically in California. Where we can lead by regulation, and we can lead by enforcement, and we can lead by technology.

I think it would really be a wonderful opportunity to figure out how do we -- how do we create such a partnership --

MODERATOR HURTADO: Thirty second warning.

MR. BARNETT: -- advisory board. Yeah. Thank you.
That's all.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr.

Barnett. Public Awareness and Guidance Subcommittee,

does this sound like something for you to think about, or

do you want me to just keep it on my list for general

agenda items?

BOARD MEMBER LE: You know, I -- I -- I thought that was more -- that comment was more around, you know, tools to comply with the privacy regulations.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Um-hum. Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LE: I mean, that could be something

for our committee to talk about. But I also think it -
you know, regarding that idea -- and I know that in

Europe they have tools, and maybe it would be better as,

like, a stakeholder session where we can comment. But

perhaps we could take it up in our committee and then

come back to the Board.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. Sure. I don't mean to -I'm not telling you what to do. I'm just trying to
direct traffic and make sure that we don't lose it and
that we have the right people thinking about it.

**BOARD MEMBER LE:** Yeah.

2.0

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Okay. So we will leave it with the Public Awareness and Guidance Subcommittee for the moment and you'll let us know what you think is a good approach.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

Are there any further public comments?

MODERATOR HURTADO: Not at this time.

CHAIRPERSON URBAN: All right. Thank you all very much. Our final agenda item is number 7, adjournment. I would like to, again, thank everyone -- board members, staff, members of the public -- for all of your contributions to the meeting and to all of the Board's

1 work. Particularly the work that we have been discussing in the meeting today. It is really, greatly appreciated. May I have a motion to adjourn the meeting? 3 4 BOARD MEMBER LE: I'll place that move. 5 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Le has moved. Is there a second? 6 7 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Second. 8 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you. I have a motion and 9 a second. Ms. Hurtado, could you please conduct the roll call vote? 10 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. De la Torre? Mr. Le? 11 12 **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Aye. 13 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Sierra? 14 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye. 15 MODERATOR HURTADO: Mr. Thompson? 16 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Aye. 17 MODERATOR HURTADO: Ms. Urban? 18 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Aye. 19 MODERATOR HURTADO: There are four ayes and one absent. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON URBAN: Thank you very much, Ms. 22 Hurtado. The motion has been approved by a vote of four 23 to zero. This meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board is now adjourned. Thank you. 24

(End of recording)

## TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) COUNTY OF ALAMEDA This is to certify that I transcribed the foregoing pages 1 to 53 to the best of my ability from an audio recording provided to me. I have subscribed this certificate at Phoenix, Arizona, this 15th day of June, 2022. Mieghley Williams-McGuire eScribers, LLC --000--