In the Matter Of:

IAB STATE PRIVACY LAW SUMMIT 2024

FIRESIDE CHAT

November 19, 2024



| 1 | IAB STATE PRIVACY LAW SUMMIT 2024 |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | FIRESIDE CHAT |
| 4 | |
| 5 | November 19, 2024 |
| 6 | 1:15 p.m. |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz |
| 10 | 28 Liberty Street, 35th Floor |
| 11 | New York, New York 10005 |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | William Montague Digital Reporter |
| 24 | Notary Commission No. 01MO0009174 |
| 25 | |



| 1 | APPEARANCES |
|----|---|
| 2 | Michael Hahn, Executive Vice President, General Counsel, IAB and IAB Tech Lab |
| 3 | Michele Lucan, Deputy Associate Attorney General, Chief |
| 4 | of the Privacy Section, Connecticut Attorney General's Office |
| 5 | Kashif Chand, Chief, Deputy Attorney General, Data |
| 6 | Privacy & Cybersecurity Section, New Jersey Attorney General's Office |
| 7 | GCIICIAI D OILICE |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |



So I thought maybe we could just get started with both of you giving some background and detail on



enforcement priorities.

23

24

25

the makeup and structure of your respective privacy 1 2 divisions. 3 MS. LUCAN: Sure. Do you want to take it first. 4 5 I can go first. So I'm the MR. CHAND: 6 section chief of the Data Privacy & Cybersecurity 7 Section of the New Jersey Division of Law. 8 Four years ago, we were comprised of myself 9 and two other deputy attorney generals. Now, I think we 10 are the biggest in the country in terms of the size of 11 our staff. I have nine other attorneys who work below 12 me, and we have two openings, so we have the bandwidth 13 to have 12 attorneys working on data privacy and 14 cybersecurity work. 15 Well, thank you very much for MS. LUCAN: 16 having me today. I head up the Privacy Section at the 17 Connecticut Office of the Attorney General, and our 18 office has had a standalone Privacy Section since 2015. 19 We were the first office in the country to do that, just 20 saying. 21 MR. CHAND: We have more. 22 (Laughter.) 23 And so I've been doing privacy MS. LUCAN: 24 work full-time ever since. When I moved over to 25 privacy, there were just two of us attorneys in the



FIRESIDE CHAT IAB STATE PRIVACY LAW SUMMIT 2024

- group, and now we're up to six full-time attorneys. We have two paralegals. We just hired a legal investigator, which was a piece we've been looking to fill for quite a while, so, and for Connecticut, I think that really is an outsized team for our state and shows how much our office cares about privacy.
 - Kash and I work together very frequently.
- 8 MR. CHAND: Yes.

- MS. LUCAN: So I guess another point worth making here is it also doesn't really make sense to look at the individual offices sometimes because we collaborate so often and it's a large team of privacy focused attorneys in AGOs across the country that we're talking to on a daily basis.
- MR. CHAND: Yeah, and we try to -- we all have resources. We try to figure out where we can devote resources, and they don't always have to overlap because we want broader enforcement. And I think the collaboration that the states have, you know, it's something to be admired because we do have constant conversations with one another about what we should be doing.
- MR. HAHN: So, Kash, the New Jersey Data

 Privacy Protection Act, it goes into effect on January

 15th, and it has a number of concepts that are similar



to other state privacy laws. There's an opt out of sale, there's an opt out of targeted advertising.

To what extent will your office look to align with some of the interpretations of those concepts that have been adopted by other regulators?

MR. CHAND: So just to start, I just want to make clear that I speak only for myself and not on behalf of my Attorney General or the Attorney General's Office, but from my position, and you know, obviously, there's -- initially, we're going to look at the statute, right? And we're going to make sure that the definition that we have there meets the conduct or the transfer sharing of information that we're looking at.

But because we have this frequent collaboration with other states, we try to deal with matters in different ways. So for a matter where we're dealing with it, and it's only a New Jersey focused investigation, where no other states are involved, we're going to make sure that, you know, the way we understand the statute, that we're going to push for that.

That being said, we do work on matters with other states, and other states have different laws, and we try to make sure that we overlap in that regard, but at the same time, it's up to opposing counsel to know the differences between our laws and to point that out,



because we will work as a concerted team to resolve the issue for the benefit of the citizens of each of our states.

So to the extent that we can overlap, we try to, and to the extent that, you know, it's New Jersey focused, we, you know, have our statute and we're going to rely on that definition.

MR. HAHN: So the New Jersey Data Protection
Act also grants the Division of Consumer Affairs
rule-making authority to issue rules and regulations to
effectuate the purposes of their privacy law.

Can you provide the audience with a bit of color on what that process involves?

MR. CHAND: Yes. It's complicated. So even our structure is complicated more than other states. So my section is a part of the Division of Law, and that is a separate office, technically, from the Office of the Attorney General. It falls under the purview of the Attorney General's authority.

The Division of Consumer Affairs is also a separate office. They are our client in terms of the attorney-client relationship. So we work with them.

You know, there's been questions asked about different statutes, different privacy laws. You know, we provide quidance, as you would in an attorney-client



٦,

relationship when you're asked to do something.

In terms of the regulations themselves, those, I understand that there may be regulations that are being worked on at this point. I can't speak to those regulations. They tend to loop us in when they need our assistance, and so that's really where we are now.

I am assuming there will be regulations that are coming out, but I can't say anything about what those are because they haven't been made public yet.

MR. HAHN: Michele, your law has been in effect since January 1st, 2023. So could you give us some perspective on what you've seen as areas of non-compliance as well as any general takeaways from the first year of the law being in effect?

MS. LUCAN: I would be happy to. And I actually was here last year, and I remember talking about a lot of our thought process, what we'd be looking at, and I think it is crazy to think about a year has passed since then, and we do have a lot of really good work that we are doing and that we have done, and I'm just happy to talk a little bit about it.

So yes, Connecticut's law has been in effect now for a little over a year. And one interesting piece of the law was that it required us to issue a report, a public report, about our early enforcement efforts, and



that was something that was totally unique to us.

You know, I've never seen a provision like that in a law that we enforce. We weren't opposed to it. And I think we try to issue information about our enforcement efforts and priorities anyway, so we had said we don't really need this requirement because we want to be transparent about issues that we're seeing and what we're working on, but we had this requirement in the law and we did issue what we're calling our CTDPA, that's Connecticut's law, our CTDPA Enforcement Report.

We issued that in February of last year, and it covered the first six months of our enforcement, but obviously wasn't time limited, and these are issues that we continued to work on after that.

And the statutory mandate was pretty narrow. It basically focused on these cure periods that are in comprehensive state privacy laws and asked us to list how many notices we sent, how many issues were cured.

And that, we just felt like was an ill fit, first, because this notion of a cure is a complicated one and we only have to issue those notices for matters where we're looking at violations that can be fixed, that our office deems can be fixed, which you can imagine is a very complicated question to answer.

Second, we also didn't want to just issue a lot of cure notices just to support a higher number in the report. And we provided a lot of detail on what we were working on, both from a cure notice standpoint and just using our regular investigatory tools in that report.

So it is online, it's on our website. If you haven't looked at it, please take a look, because I think it does still show some very good insight into what we're working on.

The areas of non-compliance that we looked at, one big one was privacy notices and non-compliance with the CTDPA's transparency requirements. I've heard this referred to as low hanging fruit, and I think that's right because you can go on a company's website, pull up the privacy notice, check the last updated date, and you have a pretty good idea of how focused that company is on the CTDPA and the CTDPA's transparency requirements.

Our team is doing that every day. We're all consumers. I'm online all the time, and I have become this person that looks at privacy notices before I make a purchase. Sometimes I make purchases anyway. But I really have, we've all gotten in the habit, on Connecticut's team, of doing this exercise, and we'll draft cure notices just based on our everyday online

activity.

And we're still seeing a lot of non-compliance with transparency requirements. So we highlighted this in the report. I think for the companies that we did send cure notices to, we got a lot of cooperation, really positive steps forward, quick updates, more detail than we asked for. So this was all good, but we're still seeing this as a real issue that we need to work on.

We're looking at our laws, protections around sensitive data. That's something we sought, too. The law has, I think, pretty strict requirements around the need to get consent for the processing of sensitive data for Connecticut residents, and the definition of "consent" sets a high bar. It's got to be expressed, it's got to be affirmative, it's got to be specific. Blanket terms don't work, and we're seeing a lot of that too. So I think that's another area where we're still focused on that also -- that we tried to highlight in that enforcement report.

That's probably way too much from me, but you know how I am.

MR. HAHN: I think that's helpful. So you mentioned that you, in some ways, find matters just by yourself being a consumer, which I think dovetails into,



how do you find your -- how do you inform yourself as to what your enforcement priorities should be?

How do you get cases, or in the case of New Jersey, how do you intend to approach this? Is it from consumer complaints, your own observations? Are there other investigations that are in other areas? How do they matriculate?

MR. CHAND: I'm going to cheat off of
Michele's work in the CTDPA report. No, but in all
honesty, we're lucky enough to, you know -- our law has
caveats that are different from other states, but
there's a large amount of overlap in what other states
have done, and I think part of it is looking at the work
that other states have done, so that we can build off of
that.

So looking at the report, looking at what companies they're looking at, and I agree with Michele's earlier comment that I think the sensitive data, the data that relates to children, that is not covered by CAPA, those are areas where we're going to be keen on trying to determine whether there are violations of the law.

We have an 18-month cure period to sort of test that out for a while and see what works, what doesn't work as well. But I think ensuring the same



priorities that have been central to this office, in the section that we have, kids have been a big part of it.

We filed suits against Instagram and we filed a suit against TikTok. Kids are a core part, and I think that's going to be important.

I think sensitive information that's being used for marketing is also going to be a central aspect of that. And it is -- there's a lot of ways we figure out what cases to, what companies to look at. Sometimes it does come from consumer complaints. You have, you know -- most of the residents in the state aren't going to take the onerous task of going to the Division of Consumer Affairs' website, filling out, you know, a complaint, and sending that to us.

But you do have some citizens who really want their privacy protected, and they will do a lot to call out companies that are violating the law. And so even though we might have one complaint, you know, from a specific individual, it may highlight, oh, this person knows what's going on or is doing some of the work for us in terms of, hey, flagging companies.

But we also have certain issues that come from the front office where they identify areas of concern that will become a priority as well.

But it's trying to figure out with the



resources we have, and as I said, we had a lot of them as compared to Connecticut.

(Laughter.)

MR. CHAND: But in terms of resources, it's not -- we have 10 other deputies. So it's not overwhelming, and we can't put everyone on everything, but we are going to try to triage it to the best of our abilities.

MS. LUCAN: Yeah, so I mean, everything Kash said except that last part.

(Laughter.)

MS. LUCAN: And yeah, we have -- there's many different ways where matters will come into our office. Consumer complaints, yes. I think -- I worked in consumer protection before privacy, and I do think the nature of the complaints we get from Connecticut residents for privacy are different because there are a lot of Connecticut residents that care a whole lot about their privacy, and you know, some of these complaints are impressive. They are giving us all the information that we need to get a good handle on whether this is a big issue.

We're reviewing media reports, we're talking to consumer advocates and advocacy groups, we're talking to our colleagues, we're talking within the office and



1 | outside of the office.

The point I wanted to make, though, is so this report that we issued is, you know, static in time in terms of what's contained in the report, but it's so interesting because these laws are not static. And you've had -- so you still have laws coming online in states like New Jersey, but you also have laws in states like Connecticut and Colorado and California that are being amended constantly.

And for Connecticut, our law was amended before it even took effect, and so that is something that will shift our priorities and help us focus too. So the two big areas where Connecticut's law was updated was to add protections around kids' data, and again, second everything that Kash said there, and consumer health data. So this makes sense. And so just considering those changes in the law, you'll have a pretty good idea of what our team will be focusing on.

The other point I wanted to make too is some of these laws have delayed effective dates for certain provisions. And so for the CTDPA, we have a universal opt-out requirement that's coming online in January. So this was something that didn't take effect when our law did, and it's about to come online, and we're already talking about this requirement very regularly amongst

our team.

We're talking about what efforts can we do to make sure that companies are taking that requirement seriously, to start doing the legwork, like I mentioned, for the transparency requirements, going online and doing these exercises ourselves and figuring out which companies are taking steps to implement these mechanisms and who isn't.

And then, you know, the issues I think that probably you all have been talking about today specific to the ad industry, these are probably the same issues that we're talking about. So I think maybe that's another good way to look at it. I think sometimes I see the agenda for conferences like this, the agendas, and you know, I'll think how timely, and this is exactly, we're having these same conversations in parallel, trying to navigate these issues and address new topics, new technologies, just like you all are.

MR. HAHN: Well, that's really interesting, the discussion about new topics and new technologies, because one of the things that I think I heard both of you say is that, you know, we're consumers ourselves. We're also listening to the consumers in your states.

But there's also an aspect to digital advertising that's not just on the publisher side, the



advertiser side. There is a complex set of data flows
that happen around identity resolution and measurement,
and all these sorts of activities, some of which you
talked about in some detail last year.

And so, as we look at this ecosystem holistically, as opposed to certain constituent parts, how do you think about enforcement priorities going forward?

MR. CHAND: So I think it really does change over time. We have new technologies that come about, and we're oftentimes in a position of lagging behind because we're trying to get up to speed on each of those technologies, specifically AI, right? It's been one of those technologies that came in very quickly, and our laws still don't address data breaches in the most, you know, succinct way, but we're now having to deal with AI laws, and AI, at this point.

And I think one of the things that we have that should -- everyone should be aware of is our UDAAP statutes, our Unfair, Deceptive Practices Act statutes. Those are such powerful statutes to AGs' offices because they fill in the gaps where laws like the NJDPA or other privacy laws don't actually capture the conduct because they might have been specific to the industry, right?

And so that's an area where we have new



technologies, we can use those laws to still regulate what's happening there for the benefit of the residents of the state.

MS. LUCAN: Yeah, that's a good point. I know our colleagues in Massachusetts, their office recently issued something saying, basically stop saying regulations don't exist for AI. They do, and they exist in our Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Acts. I'm paraphrasing, but that was the gist that I got from it.

Other issues that I can offer that I think
we're -- that we're paying attention to, that I think
may be interesting for folks in this room, is,
obviously, opt-outs for targeted advertising. That's a,
I think, a core component of these laws, that opt-out
right?

And I've sat in conferences like this and I've heard folks talk about the complexities involved with getting mechanisms in place to ensure opt-outs are honored down the chain. You know, we're paying attention to those things, but I think the long and short of it is these rights are important and they need to be honored, and that's something our team is focusing on a lot too.

Another topic I know is subject to a lot of attention are online trackers. This isn't a new topic,



it's not new like AI, it's been around, but something we're continuing to look at. I know the FTC has also done a lot of really good work around that, with the idea being that, like, if you're using these trackers, you're responsible to know what information is being sent through these tools. And this is, I think something, it's not -- it's not new, but I think worth highlighting because that's certainly not an issue that has gone away.

MR. CHAND: We have, you know -- we talked about the collaboration earlier between states. You know, even though the office sizes might not have the armies that big law firms have to address these issues, you know, when you look at all of the states, we have our deputies looking at these issues.

I don't tell my deputies to just work on their cases and, you know, bring back good results on those cases. It's not just about resolving the issues that we see, it's about finding the issues that we don't. And so making sure that the deputies are keeping abreast of all of the new developments in technology and reading articles, listening to podcasts that talk about these new technologies.

The first thing I tell my deputies is set a few Google alerts on data breaches and technology and



innovations because that's where new things are occurring that we may not be aware of. And it's been a great way of us to understand, you know, some things are priorities, but they get de-prioritized when there's something else that comes about.

It's a lot of moving and shifting, but we do look at, you know, it's not in a vacuum. We're looking at articles, we're seeing, you know, what's happening in journals and press releases.

MR. HAHN: Let's dive a little deeper, if we could, on the scope of targeted advertising.

One of the issues that privacy lawyers consider is whether an advertiser's uploading of its first-party email addresses to social media platforms constitutes targeted advertising under the state privacy laws, or whether it fits within the exception in Connecticut, for example, for advertisements based on activities within the controllers' own internet websites or online applications.

So, Michele, I know you can't opine on this specific hypothetical, but how would you more broadly approach that kind of issue?

MS. LUCAN: Well, you know I love hypotheticals. I love them, love them. No, I don't. I don't. But it is tough for us to answer these



- questions, A, because, first of all, it's just me speaking, like Kash said; B, because we can't offer legal advice, you know, we're not allowed to.
 - But I think what I can do is just share a little bit more about how we would address this question if it came up to us as part of one of our investigations, and that is do the legwork to make sure that we understand every piece of the picture.

Okay, so there are too many issues in privacy world to be an expert on everything, and I think we are humble about that, and the first thing we will do is look at the language of the law, okay? So we have a definition of targeted advertising, we have this exception that Michael just referenced, which I think, you know, there's an intent behind that exception, and we'll think about that, which I think was really to mean that it's not talking about internal stuff.

And here, what I heard was there's a transfer of information to a social media platform. So these are the type -- this is the type of thought process that we'll take.

We also have a definition for "sale" in the law, which is very broad, I think rightfully so, and covers the exchange of data, not just for monetary consideration, but any valuable consideration. So we'll

FIRESIDE CHAT IAB STATE PRIVACY LAW SUMMIT 2024

look there. We'll ask the companies involved, you know, what was -- what was going on? Why were you sharing this data? What benefit did you get out of it? Did you put any parameters around this data sharing? These are the types of things we'll look at.

So it's not an answer, but I guess what I'm trying to do is just assure you that we will -- we take this seriously and we will, for all of these complicated issues that we look at, make sure we have all the information we need to make a fair assessment, and then, ultimately, have an answer that I can't provide today, but we would eventually get to if we were working on it as part of an investigation.

I don't know, Kash, if you agree.

MR. CHAND: I think that was exactly how the process works. I tend to treat, because I have a litigation background, a lot of these investigations like litigation, to some degree, from the outset, because a lot of the information we need is in the hands of the company. And so we -- if we get that information, we can better understand what the conduct was and whether it falls within the language of our statutes.

And so it's very important for us to make sure that we're taking a concerted effort to look at each



piece of the process, especially for the when, where, why, how, you know, of why this sharing took place and does that fit our statute, and then what is an appropriate response from our offices? Because it's not scorched earth for everything. It is not, you know, one size fits all in terms of penalties or injunctive relief or a settlement or litigation. We take that all into consideration and we speak to the companies.

MS. LUCAN: And also one last piece, which I think could be helpful too, is it shouldn't be surprising that we're going to take a consumer protective approach. That's our jobs.

So if there's anything that's hanging out on the cusp, you know, we're going to be looking to protect our state residents and preserve their privacy. So maybe that's just helpful to know too, like those areas where you could be -- if you can take an approach that's consumer protective or you can take the opposite approach, you know what we'd be looking for.

MR. HAHN: It's real interesting that you say that because, you know, oftentimes, lawyers in the industry, we're faced by, you know, commercial demands and we're faced with, you know, balancing privacy, we're faced with counter-parties who also have different positions. Sometimes they're more privacy centric,



1 sometimes they're not as privacy centered. 2 And it's interesting to hear because, you 3 know, lawyers do a lot of things, like interpreting the 4 law and how does it apply to a certain set of facts? 5 And in my experience in dealing with regulators during 6 the course of my career, I've never met a regulator who 7 said, you know, I'm going to narrowly apply that 8 consumer protection statute. It hasn't happened once. 9 And so I'm just curious, and I know this isn't 10 in the script, but --11 MS. LUCAN: Now we're going to go roque. 12 MR. CHAND: We're going roque. 13 MR. HAHN: But when you're conducting an 14 investigation and you're presented with, you know, 15 really smart outside counsel who makes some sort of 16 creative argument that narrowly applies the law, than 17 broadly applies the law, does that fall on deaf ears? 18 Does that occasionally resonate? How does that work? 19 MS. LUCAN: Great question. I'll --20 MR. CHAND: No, go ahead, go ahead. I --21 MS. LUCAN: You had your answer ready. 22 MR. CHAND: I was going to say it depends. 23 always love hearing the creative arguments, even though 24 they just have that "huh" moment to them. But I like

hearing them to see, okay, this is the most tortured way



25

you're going to use our statute. If you were to say
that to a judge, would that have any persuasiveness to

it?

And so it gives me a lot to understand where the counsel is coming from because if that's what you're giving me, it means that you know there's not much here for you in terms of arguing against the application of the law. And we obviously, you know, if it actually is a narrowing of the statute that actually, you know, fits with the language and it was intended by the legislature, you know, not to cover, you know, let's say certain types of people or certain numbers of people, if it does that, it's the law. We are going to look at the black letter of the law, and if it fits, it fits.

But if it's a creative argument that, you know, floats on different interpretations of an undefined word, that is a tougher one to say, okay, we're going to step away from this investigation.

If you have good creative arguments, we do want to hear them, and we do take that into consideration because it is also about what the law was intended to do. At the same time, there's a lot of telling that comes from making certain creative arguments as to what your position is at the end of the day, and so we read that as well.



MS. LUCAN: Yeah, I was going to say creative is not bad, it's not wrong, and I think -- I think, if we are having these conversations, you know, we're not -- we're not discounting other views from the outset. We listen. And I think that is something that, for the cases we work on, if you've ever worked with us before, hopefully that's something that you've seen.

The other point I guess just to make here is, yeah, there's -- we want to apply our laws in a consumer protective way, but we also don't play "gotcha." We don't take gray area cases, we don't -- Kash made the point before that we have limited resources and we're constantly making decisions about how to best leverage those. So maybe that can offer some reassurance too.

I think there's always going to be cases where sometimes you -- our interpretations are totally different and we have to agree to disagree and try to get at the heart of the matter and hopefully seek a resolution that puts consumers in a better standpoint from a privacy perspective.

But I don't -- I don't think we see a lot of this. We don't see it a whole lot where opposing counsel will come to us with an argument that really just doesn't make any sense. Maybe I'm --

MR. CHAND: No, it's a rare --



MS. LUCAN: You know, yeah --1 2 MR. CHAND: But it happens, yeah. 3 MS. LUCAN: -- I think it's mostly realizing 4 that there's, you know, there's always a lot of common 5 goals as part of these discussions. There's always a lot of what we do agree on. It's less, oh my gosh, that 6 7 position was so wild, could they even raise it? 8 I didn't think of it that way, and even if I don't 9 agree, can we talk about how we can find common ground 10 and come to an approach that helps people? 11 MR. HAHN: So, Kash, under Section 8(b) of 12 NJDPA, it states that, after six months from the law's 13 effective date, the controller needs to opt-out rights 14 via the universal opt-out mechanism. 15 But before then, under Section 8(a), 16 controllers need to honor opt-out rights where the 17 consumer has designated an authorized agent via browser 18 settings or other global device settings. 19 Can you talk about the relationship between 20 8(a) and 8(b)? 21 MR. CHAND: Yeah, I think it's a little bit 22 confusing, and when you first read it, 8(a) specifically talks about the ability to designate an agent. 23 24 again, these are all my way of reading it, there's

nothing official from the AG's office on this, but the



25

way I see it is that it does, after six months, then
that's when you can start using, as a consumer, the
global opt-out, but that global opt-out has to meet the
requirements that follow Paragraph B.

It can't, you know, impact other -- other companies. It has to be able to determine whether the resident is actually a resident of New Jersey. And so that's an area where, you know, there's a little bit of confusion. It might be an area where there's further regulation on or, you know, regulations that clarify that.

But it's going to be really hard for a company, I think, to receive a global opt-out when they're able to get that in other states and not accept that global opt-out. If other states have that as part of their provisions and they're already able to take that in, doesn't mean that it's something that can be actionable on our part.

But there's also a part of what a company does as a whole, which we also see in terms of other issues that may arise. So if they're being very specific to the black letter of the law that is to the detriment of consumers, it might be right in one instance, but it may -- there might be a violation of the law in other areas. But we're looking at the company as a whole. So

1 it is really a thing that will be fleshed out more in 2 negotiations of the other issue.

MR. HAHN: A question for both of you. So if a consumer opts out, whether it's via the GPC or the toggle on their page, do you expect the opt-out to persist on an account level for users or device by -- or at device level?

MR. CHAND: I think --

MR. HAHN: How do you think about that?

MR. CHAND: I think that's a hard one. Again, this is another area where our law is still new and we're trying to determine, with the benefit of our client, how it's going to be enforced.

I think it goes back to the same general principles of what is the company doing as a whole in terms of the opt-outs. Is there -- is there something that they could be doing that's protecting consumers? It might not be actionable, and we'll talk to them, you know, with the company about that.

But on the other side of the spectrum, it's you may be investigated again or you may be investigated for another issue, and is that sort of the tone you want to take in terms of the discussions?

MR. HAHN: So, Michele, under the Connecticut

Data Privacy Act, a controller is required to have a



contract with its service provider where they need to allow for and cooperate with reasonable assessments by the controller.

Of course, the law itself doesn't mandate that the controller actually has to exercise that contractual right. So what is your expectation for controllers in conducting due diligence of service providers?

And similarly, if I can add onto that and make a compound question that you can object to --

(Laughter.)

MS. LUCAN: Sure.

MR. HAHN: And what about third parties that the controller has sold personal information to, which is something that's covered in California under diligence but not explicitly in Connecticut?

MS. LUCAN: Yeah, this is -- this is a great question, and we actually, we've done a lot of work in this space already, vendor management overall, okay? So, you know, even between -- before these comprehensive consumer data privacy laws took effect, we've had breach notice laws, personal information protection acts, or unfair deceptive trade practices acts, and we've dealt with a bunch of data breaches involving vendors.

So we've had our Experian T-Mobile case, which we settled a few years ago, which was a big breach at



Experian, impacted data that Experian was holding on T-Mobile's behalf. That was a case where we were talking about vendor management.

And we've always taken the position, on the data security side of things, that you can delegate responsibilities with respect to data, but you can't delegate the obligation that you have under the law to protect your customers' data. So this is something, like, you know, there's already -- the work is already there to support this.

For these matters, both on the data security side and the privacy side, we will look at contracts and what rights exist. So this is all irrespective of this requirement. Do you have the right to audit your vendor? Do you -- what do you -- what do you ask for in return? And I think this can be case specific, but if this is a whole lot of sensitive data and you have contractual rights that you are not exercising ever, I think that would be an interesting conversation.

So we've -- we've had those conversations. There might be some vendors that are very low risk. It's not a lot of data, it's not sensitive. I don't know what the answer would be there about the expectation.

But if you have sensitive data, we need to see



proactive steps to make sure that vendors are protecting data, both from a privacy standpoint and a data security standpoint. And I think our state AG settlements, you can look at them, they're also on -- you know, we issue press releases. They're online.

There's been a number of recent settlements that contain vendor management provisions that require companies to have contractual terms, allowing for these audit rights and requiring companies to exercise them, follow up on deficiencies, and make sure they're remedied.

So I think we've kind of already spoken on this, even if it's not in the law, I think there's an expectation for these vendors that are holding sensitive data of yours, that you have to be doing more to make sure their privacy and data security practices are what they should be. You can't just assign away the responsibility over that data.

MR. CHAND: Yeah. Michele alluded to this, that, you know, even though the respective data privacy laws may not say that you have to conduct due diligence, there's still an argument that your failure to conduct due diligence is a violation of the UDAAP statutes.

It's going to be a very fact specific analysis, right?

But if you have very sensitive information and



you give it to a vendor that does not have the security capability to protect that information, that's going to be telling of whether there may be an issue there.

You have a repeat offender who is not protecting their data and you know it internally in the company and you still did nothing, that's another situation where it could cause, you know, us to look more closely at whether your vendor management is appropriate.

It is going to be fact specific. We can't tell you specifically what facts are going to be a violation of the law, but even if they're not under our data privacy laws as a requirement to have vendor management, I think, generally, you know, you're going to want it as a company to protect yourselves from, you know, potential negative side effects. But we're also going to look at the whole world of facts to determine whether you should have done more on your vendor side.

MS. LUCAN: We forgot your subpart, but that applies down the line. So there we go. Now, I covered it.

MR. CHAND: There we go.

MR. HAHN: Final question to take us out for the day.

What is one thing that you find that



FIRESIDE CHAT

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

businesses get wrong or misunderstand about privacy 1 2 compliance?

MS. LUCAN: Okay, so my -- my number one thing I think is just waiting for an issue to come up to really be taking a look at your privacy practices. have seen that before where I think companies just bury their head in the sand and, you know, don't have a lot of -- to show for themselves about efforts to come into compliance until we reach out, and that is tough. think that's the -- that's the biggest thing that I see that I would caution against and being proactive is best.

Our office views it itself as a resource for companies that are well-meaning and trying to comply. We are here. We want to see compliance best for everyone.

MR. CHAND: I think one of the things that concerns me the most is when companies create this gigantic privacy program, they have everything in place, but they don't consider the impact on consumer privacy. It's more business focused privacy, protecting the internal documents versus protecting the information of individuals. So they will have these big programs, but central to that program is no discussion of how to protect consumer information.

And it surprises me oftentimes because I 1 2 think, sometimes, if you do put that consumer focus 3 first, you will avoid a lot of money spent down the 4 line. A lot of the actions companies take, because they have limited resources, just like every other section of 5 the AGs, just like every other part of the world, 6 7 there's limited resources, but if you make sure that 8 you're protecting consumer information, you're going to 9 protect that bottom line as well. 10 There is the initial expenditure that you 11 have, but there's also the liability down the line. And 12 if you at least address the consumer protection of information, it's going to go a long way to avoiding 13 14 spending more money down the line that you didn't want 15 to spend anyway. Well, thank you so much for this 16 MR. HAHN: 17 incredibly helpful discussion for the IAB community. Wе 18 really appreciate you joining with us. 19 MR. CHAND: Absolutely. 20 MS. LUCAN: Thank you for having us. 21 Thank you. MR. CHAND: Thank you. 22 (The proceedings concluded at 1:59 p.m.) 23 24



25

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF DIGITAL REPORTER |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I, WILLIAM MONTAGUE, a Digital Reporter and |
| 4 | Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do |
| 5 | hereby certify: |
| 6 | That the foregoing proceeding is accurately |
| 7 | captured with annotations by me during the proceeding in |
| 8 | the above-titled matter, all to the best of my skills |
| 9 | and ability. |
| 10 | I further certify that I am not related to any |
| 11 | of the parties to this action by blood or marriage and |
| 12 | that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this |
| 13 | matter. |
| 14 | IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my |
| 15 | hand this 22nd day of November 2024. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | (AAR |
| 19 | WV 12 |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | Commission No.: 01MO0009174 Expiration Date: June 7, 2027 |
| 23 | DAPILACION DACC - O MIC 1, 2021 |
| 24 | |
| | |



25

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I, NANCY KRAKOWER, Legal Transcriptionist, do |
| 4 | hereby certify: |
| 5 | That the foregoing is a complete and true |
| 6 | transcription of the original digital audio recording of |
| 7 | the testimony and proceedings captured in the |
| 8 | above-entitled matter. As the transcriptionist, I have |
| 9 | reviewed and transcribed the entirety of the original |
| 10 | digital audio recording of the proceeding to ensure a |
| 11 | verbatim record to the best of my ability. |
| 12 | I further certify that I am neither attorney |
| 13 | for nor a relative or employee of any of the parties to |
| 14 | the action; further, that I am not a relative or |
| 15 | employee of any attorney employed by the parties hereto, |
| 16 | nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome |
| 17 | of this matter. |
| 18 | IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my |
| 19 | hand this 22nd day of November 2024. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Nancy E. Krakower |
| 22 | Manag O. Manouev |
| 23 | |
| 24 | nancy krakower, franscriptionist |
| 25 | |





November 19, 2024

| | ACT LAW SOWI | | | |
|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 16:24 | avoiding | 15:13 | bury | caveats |
| assessment | 35:13 | 19:13 | 34:6 | 12:11 |
| 22:10 | aware | 30:25 | business | centered |
| | 3:12 | 34:23 | 34:21 | 24:1 |
| assessments | 17:19 | biggest | | |
| 30:2 | 20:2 | 4:10 | businesses | central |
| assign | | 34:10 | 34:1 | 13:1,7 |
| 32:17 | | | | 34:24 |
| | В | bit | С | centric |
| assistance | | 7:12 8:21 | | 23:25 |
| 8:6 | back | 21:5 | | |
| Associate | 3:2 19:17 | 27:21 | California | chain |
| 3:8 | 29:14 | 28:8 | 15:8 | 18:19 |
| | | black | 30:14 | Chand |
| assuming | background | 25:14 | call | 3:4,17 |
| 8:7 | 3:25 | 28:22 | 13:16 | 4:5,21 |
| assure | 22:17 | | | 5:8,15 |
| 22:7 | bad | Blanket | calling | 6:6 7:14 |
| | 26:2 | 11:17 | 9:9 | 12:8 14:4 |
| attention | 20.2 | bottom | CAPA | 17:9 |
| 18:11,20, | balancing | 35:9 | 12:20 | 19:10 |
| 25 | 23:23 | 33.9 | | 22:15 |
| attorney | bandwidth | breach | capability | |
| 3:4,5,8,9 | 4:12 | 30:20,25 | 33:2 | 24:12,20, 22 26:25 |
| 4:9,17 | 4.17 | breaches | capture | |
| 6:8 7:18, | bar | 17:15 | 17:23 | 27:2,21 |
| 19 | 11:15 | 19:25 | 17.23 | 29:8,10 |
| 10 | based | | care | 32:19 |
| attorney- | 10:25 | 30:23 | 14:18 | 33:22 |
| client | 20:17 | bring | career | 34:17 |
| 7:22,25 | 20.17 | 19:17 | 24:6 | 35:19,21 |
| 2++0×20114 | basically | 1 | 24.0 | change |
| attorneys | 9:17 18:6 | broad | cares | 17:9 |
| 4:11,13, | 1 | 21:23 | 5:6 | |
| 25 5:1,13 | basis | broader | 4040 | chat |
| audience | 5:14 | 3:21 5:18 | case | 3:3 |
| 7:12 | behalf | | 12:3 | cheat |
| | 6:8 31:2 | broadly | 30:24 | 12:8 |
| audit | | 20:21 | 31:2,16 | |
| 31:14 | benefit | 24:17 | cases | check |
| 32:9 | 7:2 18:2 | browser | 12:3 13:9 | 10:16 |
| authority | 22:3 | 27:17 | 19:17,18 | chief |
| 7:10,19 | 29:12 | | 26:6,11, | 3:4,8 4:6 |
| · | big | build | 15 | 3.4,0 4.0 |
| authorized | 10:12 | 12:14 | | children |
| 27:17 | 13:2 | bunch | caution | 12:19 |
| | | 30:23 | 34:11 | circulate |
| avoid | 14:22 | 2(1 • ·) 2 | | |



| | ACY LAW SUMM | VIII 202 1 | IIIdex | : citizenscounse |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 3:12 | 11:4 | compound | Connecticut | continued |
| citizens | 12:17 | 30:9 | 's | 9:15 |
| 7:2 13:15 | 13:9,17, 21 16:3,7 | comprehensi ve | 8:22 9:10 10:24 | continuing |
| clarify | 22:1 23:8 | 9:18 | 15:13 | 19.2 |
| 28:10 | 28:6 | 30:19 | gongont | contract |
| clear | 32:8,9 | 30.19 | consent 11:13,15 | 30:1 |
| 6:7 | 34:6,14, | comprised | 11.13,13 | contracts |
| | 18 35:4 | 4:8 | considerati | 31:12 |
| client | company | concepts | on | |
| 7:21 | 10:17 | 5:25 6:4 | 21:25 | contractual |
| 29:13 | 22:20 | 3 23 0 1 | 23:8 | 30:5 |
| closely | 28:13,19, | concern | 25:21 | 31:18 |
| 33:8 | 25 29:15, | 13:23 | constant | 32:8 |
| | 19 33:6, | concerns | 5:20 | controller |
| collaborate | 19 33.6, | 34:18 | | 27:13 |
| 5:12 | 13 | | constantly | 29:25 |
| collaborati | company's | concerted | 15:9 | 30:3,5,13 |
| on | 10:15 | 7:1 22:25 | 26:13 | |
| 5:19 6:15 | compared | concluded | constituent | controllers |
| 19:11 | 14:2 | 35:22 | 17:6 | 27:16 |
| | | | | 30:6 |
| colleagues | complaint | conduct | constitutes | controllers |
| 14:25 | 13:14,18 | 6:12 | 20:15 | 1 |
| 18:5 | complaints | 17:23 | consumer | 20:18 |
| color | 12:5 | 22:21 | 7:9,20 | |
| 7:13 | 13:10 | 32:21,22 | 11:25 | conversatio |
| Colorado | 14:14,16, | conducting | 12:5 | n |
| 15:8 | 19 | 24:13 | 13:10,13 | 31:19 |
| 13.0 | | 30:7 | 14:14,15, | conversatio |
| commenced | complex | conferences | 24 15:15 | ns |
| 3:1 | 17:1 | 16:14 | 23:11,18 | 5:21 |
| comment | complexitie | 18:16 | 24:8 26:9 | 16:16 |
| 12:18 | s | 10.10 | 27:17 | 26:3 |
| | 18:17 | confusing | 28:2 29:4 | 31:20 |
| commercial | | 27:22 | 30:20 | gooporato |
| 23:22 | compliance | confusion | 34:20,25 | cooperate |
| common | 34:2,9,15 | 28:9 | 35:2,8,12 | 30:2 |
| 27:4,9 | complicated | | | cooperation |
| , | 7:14,15 | Connecticut | consumers | 11:5 |
| communicate | 9:21,25 | 3:9 4:17 | 10:20 | core |
| 3:21 | 22:8 | 5:4 11:14 | 16:22,23 | 13:4 |
| community | aomp1 | 14:2,16, | 26:19 | 18:14 |
| COMMIGNATION | comply | 18 15:8, | 28:23 | TO.T4 |
| | 21.11 | | 20 • 17 | |
| 3:21 | 34:14 | 10 20:17 | 29:17 | counsel |
| | 34:14 component | 10 20:17 29:24 | contained | counsel 6:24 |



| 25:5 | cusp | de- | deputies | 3:10 |
|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| 26:23 | 23:14 | prioritized | 14:5 | 16:20 |
| aum bors | aughor-s-al | 20:4 | 19:15,16, | 34:24 |
| counter- | customers' | deaf | 20,24 | 35:17 |
| parties 23:24 | 31:8 | dear 24:17 | deputy | discussions |
| 23.24 | cybersecuri | 24.1/ | 3:4,7 4:9 | 27:5 |
| country | ty | deal | 3.4,7 4.9 | 29:23 |
| 4:10,19 | 3:5 4:6, | 6:15 | designate | 29.23 |
| 5:13 | 14 | 17:16 | 27:23 | dive |
| cover | | dealing | designated | 20:10 |
| 25:11 | D | 6:17 24:5 | 27:17 | Division |
| covered | | dealt | detail | 4:7 7:9, |
| | a.:1 | | | 16,20 |
| 9:13 | daily | 30:22 | 3:25 10:3 | 13:12 |
| 12:19 | 5:14 | deceptive | 11:7 17:4 | |
| 30:14 | data | 17:20 | determine | divisions |
| 33:20 | 3:4 4:6, | 18:8 | 12:21 | 4:2 |
| covers | 13 5:23 | 30:22 | 28:6 | documents |
| 21:24 | 7:8 | a | 29:12 | 34:22 |
| | 11:11,13 | decisions | 33:17 | |
| crazy | 12:18,19 | 26:13 | | dovetails |
| 8:18 | 15:14,16 | deems | detriment | 11:25 |
| create | 17:1,15 | 9:24 | 28:22 | draft |
| 34:18 | 19:25 | doopor | development | 10:25 |
| creative | 21:24 | <pre>deeper 20:10</pre> | s | due |
| 24:16,23 | 22:3,4 | ∠U•⊥U | 19:21 | 30:7 |
| | 29:25 | deficiencie | device | |
| 25:15,19, | 30:20,23 | s | | 32:21,23 |
| 23 26:1 | 31:1,5,6, | 32:10 | 27:18 | |
| CTDPA | 8,11,17, | definition | 29:6,7 | E |
| 9:10 | 22,25 | | devote | |
| 10:18 | 32:2,15, | 6:12 7:7 | 5:16 | |
| 12:9 | 16,18,20 | 11:14 | | earlier |
| 15:21 | 33:5,13 | 21:13,22 | differences | 12:18 |
| | | degree | 6:25 | 19:11 |
| CTDPA's | date | 22:18 | digital | early |
| 10:13,18 | 10:16 | delayed | 16:24 | 8:25 |
| cure | 27:13 | - | 4414 | 0000 |
| 9:17,21 | dates | 15:20 | diligence | ears |
| 10:2,4,25 | 15:20 | delegate | 30:7,15 | 24:17 |
| 11:5 | 13.70 | 31:5,7 | 32:21,23 | earth |
| 12:23 | day | domenda | disagree | 23:5 |
| | 10:19 | demands | 26:17 | |
| cured | 25:25 | 23:22 | | ecosystem |
| 9:19 | 33:24 | depends | discounting | 17:5 |
| | | 24:22 | 26:4 | effect |
| curious | | | | |



| 8:11,14, | exchange | fact | firms | 11:6 17:8 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 22 15:11, | 21:24 | 32:24 | 19:13 | frequent |
| 23 30:20 | exercise | 33:10 | first-party | 6:14 |
| effective | 10:24 | facts | 20:14 | |
| 15:20 | 30:5 32:9 | 24:4 | Eir | frequently |
| 27:13 | exercises | 33:11,17 | <pre>fit 9:20 23:3</pre> | 5:7 |
| effects | 16:6 | failure | 9.20 23.3 | front |
| 33:16 | 10.0 | 32:22 | fits | 13:23 |
| | exercising | | 20:16 | fruit |
| effectuate | 31:18 | fair | 23:6 | 10:14 |
| 7:11 | exist | 22:10 | 25:9,14 | |
| effort | 18:7 | fall | fixed | FTC |
| 22:25 | 31:13 | 24:17 | 9:23,24 | 19:2 |
| ££ | | £-11# | | full-time |
| efforts 8:25 9:5 | expect 29:5 | falls 7:18 | <pre>flagging 13:21</pre> | 4:24 5:1 |
| 16:2 34:8 | 4 3 •3 | 7:18 22:22 | | |
| | expectation | | fleshed | G |
| email | 30:6 | February | 29:1 | |
| 20:14 | 31:24 | 9:12 | floats | |
| end | 32:14 | felt | 25:16 | gaps |
| 25:24 | expenditure | 9:20 | | 17:22 |
| . 5 | 35:10 | 61 | flows | general |
| enforce | 7 | figure | 17:1 | 3:4,8 |
| 9:3 | Experian 30:24 | 5:16 | focus | 4:17 6:8 |
| enforced | 31:1 | 13:8,25 | 15:12 | 7:18 8:13 |
| 29:13 | 21.1 | figuring | 35:2 | 29:14 |
| enforcement | experience | 16:6 | focused | General's |
| 3:23 5:18 | 24:5 | filed | 5:13 6:17 | 3:6,9 6:8 |
| 8:25 9:5, | expert | 13:3 | 7:6 9:17 | 7:19 |
| 10,13 | 21:10 | | 10:17 | |
| 11:20 | | fill | 11:19 | generally |
| 12:2 17:7 | explicitly 30:15 | 5:4 17:22 | 34:21 | 33:14 |
| 22000 | 30:15 | filling | focusing | generals |
| ensure 18:18 | expressed | 13:13 | 15:18 | 4:9 |
| 10.10 | 11:15 | Final | 18:22 | gigantic |
| ensuring | extent | 33:23 | | 34:19 |
| 12:25 | 6:3 7:4,5 | | folks | |
| eventually | | find | 18:12,17 | gist |
| 22:12 | | 11:24 | follow | 18:9 |
| | F | 12:1 27:9 | 28:4 | give |
| everyday | | 33:25 | 32:10 | 8:11 33:1 |
| 10:25 | faced | finding | forast | giving |
| exception | 23:22,23, | 19:19 | <pre>forgot 33:19</pre> | 3:25 |
| 20:16 | 24 | fireside | | 14:20 |
| 21:14,15 | | 3:3 | forward | 25:6 |



| global | guidance | health | holisticall | implement |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 27:18 | 7:25 | 15:16 | Y | 16:7 |
| 28:3,13, | | hear | 17:6 | important |
| 15 | | 24:2 | honesty | 13:5 |
| goals | Н | 25:20 | 12:10 | 18:21 |
| 27:5 | | 23.20 | 12.10 | 22:24 |
| 27.5 | habit | heard | honor | 22.24 |
| good | 10:23 | 10:13 | 27:16 | impressive |
| 8:19 | HAHN | 16:21 | honored | 14:20 |
| 10:9,17 | 3:2,16,19 | 18:17 | 18:19,22 | incredibly |
| 11:7 | 5:23 7:8 | 21:18 | | 35:17 |
| 14:21 | 8:10 | hearing | humble | |
| 15:18 | 11:23 | 24:23,25 | 21:11 | individual |
| 16:13 | 16:19 | 24.23,23 | hypothetica | 5:11 |
| 18:4 | 20:10 | heart | 1 | 13:19 |
| 19:3,17 | 23:20 | 26:18 | 20:21 | individuals |
| 25:19 | 23:20 | helpful | | 34:23 |
| 71- | 27:11 | 11:23 | hypothetica | |
| Google 19:25 | | 23:10,16 | ls | industry |
| 19.25 | 29:3,9,24 | 35:17 | 20:24 | 16:11 |
| josh | 30:12 | 33.17 | | 17:24 |
| 27:6 | 33:23 | helps | - | 23:22 |
| gotcha | 35:16 | 27:10 | I | inform |
| 26:10 | handle | hey | | 12:1 |
| 20.10 | 14:21 | 13:21 | IAB | |
| PC | hands | | 3:13,21 | information |
| 29:4 | 22:19 | high | 35:17 | 6:13 9:4 |
| grants | 22.19 | 11:15 | idea | 13:6 |
| 7:9 | hanging | higher | 10:17 | 14:20 |
| 7 • 9 | 10:14 | 10:2 | 15:18 | 19:5 |
| gray | 23:13 | | 19:4 | 21:19 |
| 26:11 | hannan | highlight | | 22:10,19 |
| great | happen 17:2 | 11:19 | identify | 21 30:13 |
| 3:19 20:3 | 17.2 | 13:19 | 13:23 | 21 32:25 |
| 24:19 | happened | highlighted | identity | 33:2 |
| 30:16 | 24:8 | 11:3 | 17:2 | 34:22,25 |
| | happening | | | 35:8,13 |
| ground | 18:2 20:8 | highlightin | ill | initial |
| 27:9 | 10.7 70.0 | g | 9:20 | 35:10 |
| group | happy | 19:8 | imagine | |
| 5:1 | 8:15,21 | hired | 9:25 | initially |
| | hard | 5:2 | | 6:10 |
| groups | 28:12 | | impact | injunctive |
| 14:24 | 29:10 | holding | 28:5 | 23:6 |
| juess | | 31:1 | 34:20 | |
| | head | 32:14 | impacted | innovations |
| 5:9 22:6 | | | Impacted | 20:1 |



| IND OTHER TRIES | ACT LAW SOM | VIII ZUZ- | 1110 | ex. msigntiimted |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|
| insight | 24:14 | 19:13,15, | keeping | 32:13 |
| 10:9 | 25:18 | 18,19 | 19:20 | 33:12 |
| Instagram | investigati | 20:12 | kids | law's |
| 13:3 | ons | 21:9 22:9 | 13:2,4 | 27:12 |
| 13.3 | 12:6 21:7 | 28:20 | | 27.12 |
| instance | 22:17 | | kids' | laws |
| 28:23 | | - | 15:14 | 3:22 6:1, |
| intend | investigato | J | kind | 22,25 |
| 12:4 | r | | 20:22 | 7:24 9:18 |
| | 5:3 | January | 32:12 | 11:10 |
| intended | investigato | 5:24 8:11 | | 15:5,6,7, |
| 25:10,22 | ry | 15:22 | | 20 17:15, |
| intent | 10:5 | Jersey | L | 17,22,23 |
| 21:15 | involved | 3:5 4:7 | | 18:1,14 |
| interesting | 6:18 | 5:23 6:17 | lagging | 20:16 |
| 3:10 8:23 | 18:17 | 7:5,8 | 17:11 | 26:9 |
| 15:5 | 22:1 | 12:4 15:7 | language | 30:20,21 |
| 16:19 | 22.1 | 28:7 | 21:12 | 32:21 |
| 18:12 | involves | jobs | 22:22 | 33:13 |
| 23:20 | 7:13 | 23:12 | 25:10 | lawyers |
| 24:2 | involving | 23.12 | | 20:12 |
| 31:19 | 30:23 | joined | large | 23:21 |
| | | 3:7 | 5:12 | 24:3 |
| internal | irrespectiv | joining | 12:12 | legal |
| 21:17 | е | 35:18 | Laughter | 5:2 21:3 |
| 34:22 | 31:13 | | 4:22 | |
| internally | issue | journals | 14:3,11 | legislature |
| 33:5 | 7:2,10 | 20:9 | 30:10 | 25:11 |
| internet | 8:24 9:4, | judge | law | legwork |
| 20:18 | 9,22 10:1 | 25:2 | 4:7 7:11, | 16:4 21:7 |
| 20.10 | 11:8 | | 16 8:10, | 1.44 |
| interpretat | 14:22 | | 14,22,24 | letter |
| ions | 19:8 | K | 9:3,9,10 | 25:14 |
| 6:4 25:16 | 20:22 | | 11:12 | 28:22 |
| 26:16 | 29:2,22 | Kash | 12:10,22 | level |
| interpretin | 32:4 33:3 | 3:4,7 | 13:17 | 29:6,7 |
| g | 34:4 | 5:7,23 | 15:17 | leverage |
| 24:3 | issued | 14:9 | 17,23 | 26:13 |
| | 9:12 15:3 | 15:15 | 19:13 | |
| investigate | 18:6 | 21:2 | 21:12,23 | liability |
| d | | 22:14 | 24:4,16, | 35:11 |
| 29:21 | issues | 26:11 | 17 25:8, | limited |
| investigati | 9:7,14,19 | 27:11 | 13,14,21 | 9:14 |
| on | 13:22 | keen | 28:22,24 | 26:12 |
| 6:18 | 16:9,11, | 12:20 | 29:11 | 35:5,7 |
| 22:13 | 17 18:10 | | 30:4 31:7 | |
| | | | | |
| Í | | | | |





November 19, 2024

| AB STATE PRIV | VACY LAW SUM | VII I 2024 | index: obse | ervationsprioritie |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 31:7 | 25 15:6, | overwhelmin | 25:12 | point |
| observation | 22,24 | g | 27:10 | 5:9 6:25 |
| | 16:5 | 14:6 | | 8:4 15:2, |
| S | 18:25 | | period | 19 17:17 |
| 12:5 | 20:19 | | 12:23 | 18:4 |
| occasionall | 32:5 | P | periods | 26:8,12 |
| У | | | 9:17 | |
| 24:18 | openings | p.m. | nongi at | position |
| o a a u w w i w a | 4:12 | 3:1 35:22 | persist 29:6 | 6:9 17:11 |
| occurring 20:2 | opine | D | 29.6 | 25:24 |
| 20.2 | 20:20 | Paragraph | person | 27:7 31:4 |
| offender | | 28:4 | 10:21 | positions |
| 33:4 | opportunity | paralegals | 13:19 | 23:25 |
| | 3:20 | 5:2 | | |
| offer | opposed | 11-1 | personal | positive |
| 18:10 | 9:3 17:6 | parallel | 30:13,21 | 11:6 |
| 21:2 | | 16:16 | perspective | potential |
| 26:14 | opposing | parameters | 8:12 | 33:16 |
| office | 6:24 | 22:4 | 26:20 | |
| 3:6,9 | 26:22 | , . | | powerful |
| 4:17,18, | opposite | paraphrasin | persuasiven | 17:21 |
| 19 5:6 | 23:18 | g | ess | practices |
| 6:3,9 | | 18:9 | 25:2 | 17:20 |
| 7:17,21 | opt | part | picture | 18:8 |
| 9:24 | 6:1,2 | 7:16 | 21:8 | 30:22 |
| 13:1,23 | opt-out | 12:13 | | 32:16 |
| 14:13,25 | - 15:22 | 13:2,4 | piece | 34:5 |
| 15:1 18:5 | 18:14 | 14:10 | 5:3 8:23 | |
| 19:12 | 27:13,14, | 21:6 | 21:8 | presented |
| 27:25 | 16 28:3, | 22:13 | 23:1,9 | 24:14 |
| 34:13 | 13,15 | 27:5 | place | preserve |
| | 29:5 | 28:15,18, | 18:18 | 23:15 |
| offices | | 19 35:6 | | 23 23 |
| 5:11 | opt-outs | | 34:19 | press |
| 17:21 | 18:13,18 | parties | | 20:9 32:5 |
| 23:4 | 29:16 | 30:12 | platform | pretty |
| official | opts | parts | 21:19 | 9:16 |
| 27:25 | 29:4 | 17:6 | platforms | 10:17 |
| 27.25 | 20.1 | | 20:14 | 11:12 |
| oftentimes | outset | passed | | 15:18 |
| 17:11 | 22:18 | 8:19 | play | 13.10 |
| 23:21 | 26:5 | paying | 26:10 | principles |
| 35:1 | outsized | 18:11,19 | pleased | 29:15 |
| onorous | 5:5 | | 3:3 | priorities |
| onerous | | penalties | | 3:23 9:5 |
| 12.12 | | | podcasts | J. ZJ 9.J |
| 13:12 | overlap | 23:6 | | 12:2 12:1 |
| 13:12 online | overlap 5:17 6:23 | 23:6 people | 19:22 | 12:2 13:1 15:12 |



| AB STATE PRIV | ACY LAW SUMI | VIII 2024 | Inde | ex: priorityrequi |
|----------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 17:7 20:4 | protect | 8:9,25 | rare | regulation |
| priority | 23:14 | publisher | 26:25 | 28:10 |
| 13:24 | 31:8 | 16:25 | reach | regulations |
| 13.771 | 33:2,15 | 10.23 | 34:9 | 7:10 8:2, |
| privacy | 34:25 | pull | 34.9 | 3,5,7 |
| 3:5,8,22 | 35:9 | 10:15 | read | |
| 4:1,6,13, | | purchase | 25:25 | 18:7 |
| 16,18,23, | protected | _ | 27:22 | 28:10 |
| 25 5:6, | 13:16 | 10:22 | | regulator |
| 12,24 6:1 | protecting | purchases | reading | 24:6 |
| 7:11,24 | 29:17 | 10:22 | 19:21 | |
| 9:18 | 32:1 33:5 | | 27:24 | regulators |
| 10:12,16, | 34:21,22 | purposes | ready | 6:5 24:5 |
| 21 13:16 | 35:8 | 7:11 | 24:21 | relates |
| | 33.0 | purview | | 12:19 |
| 14:15,17, | protection | 7:18 | real | 12.19 |
| 19 17:23 | 5:24 7:8 | 7 • 10 | 11:8 | relationshi |
| 20:12,15 | 14:15 | push | 23:20 | p |
| 21:9 | 24:8 | 6:20 | | 7:22 8:1 |
| 23:15,23, | 30:21 | | realizing | 27:19 |
| 25 24:1 | 35:12 | put | 27:3 | |
| 26:20 | 33.12 | 14:6 22:4 | reasonable | releases |
| 29:25 | protections | 35:2 | 30:2 | 20:9 32:5 |
| 30:20 | 11:10 | puts | 30 2 | relief |
| 31:12 | 15:14 | 26:19 | reassurance | 23:6 |
| 32:2,16, | | 20 27 | 26:14 | 23.0 |
| 20 33:13 | protective | | receive | rely |
| 34:1,5, | 23:12,18 | Q | 28:13 | 7:7 |
| 19,20,21 | 26:10 | | 20.13 | remedied |
| 19,20,21 | provide | question | recent | |
| proactive | 7:12,24 | 9:25 21:5 | 32:6 | 32:11 |
| 32:1 | 22:11 | | | remember |
| 34:11 | | 24:19 | recently | 8:16 |
| | provided | 29:3 | 18:5 | |
| proceedings | 10:3 | 30:9,17 | referenced | repeat |
| 3:1 35:22 | provider | 33:23 | 21:14 | 33:4 |
| process | - | questions | | report |
| 7:13 8:17 | 30:1 | 7:23 21:1 | referred | 8:24,25 |
| 21:20 | providers | 7.23 21.1 | 10:14 | 9:11 |
| 22:16 | 30:7 | quick | regard | |
| 23:1 | | 11:6 | 6:23 | 10:3,6 |
| 23.1 | provision | | 0.23 | 11:4,20 |
| processing | 9:2 | quickly | regular | 12:9,16 |
| 11:13 | provisions | 17:14 | 10:5 | 15:3,4 |
| | 15:21 | | | reports |
| program | 28:16 | R | regularly | 14:23 |
| 34:19,24 | | | 15:25 | 11-20 |
| | 32:7 | | | require |
| programs | | | regulate | |
| programs 34:23 | public | raise 27:7 | regulate 18:1 | 32:7 |



| | | | | requiredspecifi |
|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|
| required | 31:6 | 6:2 21:22 | service | similar |
| 8:24 | respective | sand | 30:1,7 | 5:25 |
| 29:25 | 4:1 32:20 | 34:7 | session | similarly |
| requirement | | | 3:11 | 30:8 |
| 9:6,8 | response | sat | | |
| 15:22,25 | 23:4 | 18:16 | set | situation |
| 16:3 | responsibil | scope | 17:1 | 33:7 |
| 31:14 | ities | 20:11 | 19:24 | size |
| 33:13 | 31:6 | scorched | 24:4 | 4:10 23:6 |
| | responsibil | 23:5 | sets | sizes |
| requirement | ity | 23.3 | 11:15 | 19:12 |
| S | 32:18 | script | settings | 19.12 |
| 10:13,18 | | 24:10 | 27:18 | smart |
| 11:3,12 | responsible | section | 27.10 | 24:15 |
| 16:5 28:4 | 19:5 | 3:9 4:6, | settled | social |
| requiring | results | 7,16,18 | 30:25 | 20:14 |
| 32:9 | 19:17 | 7:16 13:2 | settlement | 21:19 |
| resident | | 27:11,15 | 23:7 | |
| 28:7 | return | 35:5 | | sold |
| 20.7 | 31:16 | | settlements | 30:13 |
| residents | reviewing | security | 32:3,6 | sort |
| 11:14 | 14:23 | 31:5,11 | share | 12:23 |
| 13:11 | | 32:2,16 | 21:4 | 24:15 |
| 14:17,18 | rightfully | 33:1 | | 29:22 |
| 18:2 | 21:23 | seek | sharing | |
| 23:15 | rights | 26:18 | 6:13 | sorts |
| resolution | 18:21 | | 22:2,4 23:2 | 17:3 |
| 17:2 | 27:13,16 | send | 23.2 | sought |
| 26:19 | 31:13,18 | 11:5 | shift | 11:11 |
| - | 32:9 | sending | 15:12 | space |
| resolve | risk | 13:14 | shifting | 30:18 |
| 7:1 | 31:21 | sense | 20:6 | |
| resolving | 51.21 | 5:10 | | speak |
| 19:18 | rogue | 15:16 | short | 6:7 8:4 |
| resonate | 24:11,12 | 26:24 | 18:21 | 23:8 |
| 24:18 | room | | show | speaking |
| 24.10 | 18:12 | sensitive | 10:9 34:8 | 21:2 |
| resource | | 11:11,13 | | |
| 34:13 | rule-making | 12:18 | shows | specific |
| resources | 7:10 | 13:6 | 5:5 | 11:16 |
| 5:16,17 | rules | 31:17,22, | side | 13:19 |
| 14:1,4 | 7:10 | 25 32:14, | 16:25 | 16:10 |
| 26:12 | | 25 | 17:1 | 17:24 |
| 35:5,7 | | separate | 29:20 | 20:21 |
| - , · | S | 7:17,21 | 31:5,12 | 28:21 |
| | | , | | |
| respect | | , | 33:16,18 | 31:16 |



| AB STATE PRIVACY LAW SUMMIT 2024 | | | Index: specificallytopic | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 32:24 | states | succinct | 31:3 | test |
| 33:10 | 5:19 | 17:16 | talks | 12:24 |
| specificall | 6:15,18, | suit | 27:23 | thing |
| Y | 22 7:3,15 | 13:3 | | 19:24 |
| 17:13 | 12:11,12, | | targeted | 21:11 |
| 27:22 | 14 15:7 | suits | 6:2 18:13 | 29:1 |
| 33:11 | 16:23 | 13:3 | 20:11,15 | 33:25 |
| 22.11 | 19:11,14 | support | 21:13 | 34:3,10 |
| spectrum | 27:12 | 10:2 | task | 34.3,10 |
| 29:20 | 28:14,15 | 31:10 | 13:12 | things |
| | | 31.10 | 13.17 | 16:21 |
| speed | static | surprises | team | 17:18 |
| 17:12 | 15:3,5 | 35:1 | 5:5,12 | 18:20 |
| spend | statute | | 7:1 | 20:1,3 |
| 35:15 | 6:11,20 | surprising | 10:19,24 | 22:5 24:3 |
| | 7:6 23:3 | 23:11 | 15:18 | 31:5 |
| spending | 24:8 | | 16:1 | 34:17 |
| 35:14 | 25:1,9 | т | 18:22 | 34.17 |
| spent | 23.1,9 | | | thought |
| 35:3 | statutes | | technically | 3:24 8:1 |
| 33.3 | 7:24 | T-MOBILE | 7:17 | 21:20 |
| spoken | 17:20,21 | 30:24 | technologie | m21 1 |
| 32:12 | 22:23 | T-Mobile's | | Tiktok |
| staff | 32:23 | 31:2 | S | 13:4 |
| 4:11 | | 31.2 | 16:18,20 | time |
| 4.11 | statutory | takeaways | 17:10,13, | 6:24 9:14 |
| standalone | 9:16 | 8:13 | 14 18:1 | 10:20 |
| 4:18 | step | 1 . 1 | 19:23 | 15:3 |
| | 25:18 | taking | technology | 17:10 |
| standpoint | 23.10 | 16:3,7 | 19:21,25 | 25:22 |
| 10:4 | steps | 22:25 | | 23.22 |
| 26:19 | 11:6 16:7 | 34:5 | telling | timely |
| 32:2,3 | 32:1 | talk | 25:23 | 16:15 |
| start | | 8:21 | 33:3 | L - A |
| 6:6 16:4 | stop | 18:17 | tend | today |
| 28:2 | 18:6 | 19:22 | | 4:16 |
| 20.2 | strict | 27:9,19 | 8:5 22:16 | 16:10 |
| started | 11:12 | • | terms | 22:11 |
| 3:14,24 | | 29:18 | 4:10 7:21 | toggle |
| 1+2+2 | structure | talked | 8:2 11:17 | 29:5 |
| state | 4:1 7:15 | 17:4 | 13:21 | 27 - 3 |
| 5:5 6:1 | stuff | 19:10 | 14:4 15:4 | tone |
| 9:18 | 21:17 | | 23:6 25:7 | 29:22 |
| 13:11 | | talking | 28:20 | tools |
| 18:3 | subject | 5:14 8:16 | 29:16,23 | 10:5 19:6 |
| 20:15 | 18:24 | 14:23,24, | 32:8 | 10.5 19.6 |
| 23:15 | subpart | 25 15:25 | 34.0 | topic |
| 32:3 | 33:19 | 16:2,10, | terrific | 18:24,25 |
| | | | | |



| topics | | 21:25 | websites | |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| 16:17,20 | U | vendor | 20:18 | Y |
| tortured | | 30:18 | well- | |
| 24:25 | UDAAP | 31:3,15 | meaning | year |
| 11 | 17:19 | 32:7 | 34:14 | 8:14,16, |
| totally 9:1 26:16 | 32:23 | 33:1,8, | | 18,23 |
| 9:1 26:16 | 7.1.2 | 13,18 | wild | 9:12 17:4 |
| tough | ultimately | | 27:7 | |
| 20:25 | 3:12 | vendors | word | years |
| 34:9 | 22:11 | 30:23 | 25:17 | 4:8 30:25 |
| + - | undefined | 31:21 | | |
| tougher | 25:17 | 32:1,14 | work | |
| 25:17 | | versus | 4:11,14, | |
| trackers | understand | 34:22 | 24 5:7 | |
| 18:25 | 6:19 8:3 | | 6:21 7:1, | |
| 19:4 | 20:3 21:8 | views | 22 8:20 | |
| | 22:21 | 26:4 | 9:15 | |
| trade | 25:4 | 34:13 | 11:9,17 | |
| 18:8 | unfair | violating | 12:9,13, | |
| 30:22 | 17:20 | 13:17 | 25 13:20 | |
| transcribin | 18:8 | 13.11 | 19:3,16 | |
| | | violation | 24:18 | |
| g 3:11 | 30:22 | 28:24 | 26:6 | |
| 3.11 | unique | 32:23 | 30:17 | |
| transfer | 9:1 | 33:12 | 31:9 | |
| 6:13 | | | | |
| 21:18 | universal | violations | worked | |
| | 15:21 | 9:23 | 8:4 14:14 | |
| transparenc | 27:14 | 12:21 | 26:6 | |
| У | updated | | working | |
| 10:13,18 | 10:16 | W | 4:13 9:8 | |
| 11:3 16:5 | 15:13 | | 10:4,10 | |
| transparent | | | 22:12 | |
| 9:7 | updates | waiting | 22.12 | |
| | 11:6 | 34:4 | works | |
| treat | uploading | wanted | 12:24 | |
| 22:16 | 20:13 | 15:2,19 | 22:16 | |
| triage | 20.13 | | world | |
| 14:7 | users | ways | 21:10 | |
| | 29:6 | 6:16 | | |
| type | | 11:24 | 33:17 | |
| 21:20 | | 13:8 | 35:6 | |
| types | v | 14:13 | worth | |
| 22:5 | | wobai to | 5:9 19:7 | |
| | vacuum | website | | |
| 25・12 | | 10:7,15 | wrong | |
| 25:12 | 20:7 | 13:13 | 26:2 34:1 | |

