



October 28, 2020

Lisa B. Kim, Privacy Regulations Coordinator
California Office of the Attorney General
300 South Spring Street, First Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90013

RE: Third Set of Proposed Modifications to Text of California Consumer Privacy Act Regulations

Dear Privacy Regulations Coordinator:

As the nation's leading advertising and marketing trade associations, we collectively represent thousands of companies, from small businesses to household brands, across every segment of the advertising industry. We provide the following comments to the California Office of the Attorney General ("OAG") on the third set of proposed modifications to the text of the California Consumer Privacy Act ("CCPA") regulations.¹

As explained in more detail below, the OAG's proposed modifications: (1) unreasonably restrict consumers from receiving important information about their privacy choices, (2) prescriptively describe how businesses must provide offline notices, and (3) unfairly fail to hold authorized agents to the same consumer notice standards as businesses. The OAG's potential changes to Section 999.315 would inhibit consumers from receiving transparent information and impinge on businesses' right to free speech. In addition, the proposed modifications to Section 999.326 would not provide any protections for consumers related to their communications with authorized agents, as such agents are not presently held to similar consumer notice rules as businesses. Finally, the OAG's proposed edits to Section 999.306 could stymie the flexibility businesses need to provide effective offline notices to consumers. We consequently ask the OAG to strike or modify the modifications per the below comments.

The undersigned organizations' combined membership includes more than 2,500 companies, is responsible for more than 85 percent of U.S. advertising spend, and drives more than 80 percent of our nation's digital advertising expenditures. Locally, our members are estimated to help generate some \$767.7 billion dollars for the California economy and support more than 2 million jobs in the state.² We and our members strongly support the underlying goals of the CCPA, and we believe consumer privacy deserves meaningful protections in the marketplace. However, as discussed in our previous comment submissions and in the sections that follow below, the draft regulations implementing the law should be updated to better enable consumers to exercise informed choices and to help businesses in their efforts to continue to provide value to California consumers while also supporting the state's economy.³

¹ See California Department of Justice, *Notice of Third Set of Proposed Modifications to Text of Regulations* (Oct. 12, 2020), located at <https://www.oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/ccpa-notice-of-third-mod-101220.pdf?>

² IHS Economics and Country Risk, *Economic Impact of Advertising in the United States* (Mar. 2015), located at <http://www.ana.net/getfile/23045>.

³ Our organizations have submitted joint comments throughout the regulatory process on the content of the OAG's proposed rules implementing the CCPA. See *Joint Advertising Trade Association Comments on California Consumer Privacy Act Regulation*, located at <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/oal-sub-45day-comments.pdf> at CCPA 00000431 - 00000442; *Revised Proposed Regulations Implementing the California Consumer Privacy Act*, located at <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/oal-sub-15day-comments-set1.pdf> at CCPA_15DAY_000554 - 000559; *Second Set of Proposed Regulations Implementing the California*

Our members are committed to offering consumers robust privacy protections while simultaneously providing access to ad-funded news, apps, and a host of additional online services. These are offerings we have all become much more dependent on in recent months with the widespread proliferation of the COVID-19 pandemic. Ad-supported online content services have been available to consumers and will continue to be available to consumers so long as laws allow for innovation and flexibility without unnecessarily tilting the playing field away from the ad-subsidized model. The most recent modifications to the CCPA regulations set forth a prescriptive interpretation of the CCPA that could limit our members' ability to support California's employment rate and its economy in these unprecedented times. We believe a regulatory scheme that offers strong individual privacy protections and enables continued economic advancement will best serve Californians. The suggested updates we offer in this letter would improve the CCPA regulations for Californians as well as the economy.

I. The Data-Driven and Ad-Supported Online Ecosystem Benefits Consumers and Fuels Economic Growth

The U.S. economy is fueled by the free flow of data. Throughout the past three decades of the commercial Internet, one driving force in this ecosystem has been data-driven advertising. Advertising has helped power the growth of the Internet by delivering new, innovative tools and services for consumers and businesses to connect and communicate. Data-driven advertising supports and subsidizes the content and services consumers expect and rely on, including video, news, music, and more. Data-driven advertising allows consumers to access these resources at little or no cost to them, and it has created an environment where small publishers and start-up companies can enter the marketplace to compete against the Internet's largest players.

As a result of this responsible advertising-based model, U.S. businesses of all sizes have been able to grow online and deliver widespread consumer and economic benefits. According to a March 2017 study entitled *Economic Value of the Advertising-Supported Internet Ecosystem*, which was conducted for the IAB by Harvard Business School Professor John Deighton, in 2016 the U.S. ad-supported Internet created 10.4 million jobs.⁴ This means that the interactive marketing industry contributed \$1.121 trillion to the U.S. economy in 2016, doubling the 2012 figure and accounting for 6% of U.S. gross domestic product.⁵

Consumers, across income levels and geography, embrace the ad-supported Internet and use it to create value in all areas of life, whether through e-commerce, education, free access to valuable content, or the ability to create their own platforms to reach millions of other Internet users. In a September 2020 survey conducted by the Digital Advertising Alliance, 93 percent of consumers stated that free content was important to the overall value of the Internet and more than 80 percent surveyed stated they prefer the existing ad-supported model, where most content is free, rather than a non-ad supported Internet where consumers must pay for most content.⁶ The survey also found that consumers estimate the personal value of ad-supported content and services on an annual basis to be \$1,403.88, representing an increase of over \$200 in value since 2016.⁷ Consumers are increasingly aware that the data collected about their interactions on the web, in mobile applications, and in-store are used to create an enhanced and tailored

Consumer Privacy Act, located at <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/privacy/oal-sub-45day-comments.pdf> at CCPA_2ND15DAY_00309 - 00313.

⁴ John Deighton, *Economic Value of the Advertising-Supported Internet Ecosystem* (2017), located at <https://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Economic-Value-Study-2017-FINAL2.pdf>.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Digital Advertising Alliance, *SurveyMonkey Survey: Consumer Value of Ad Supported Services – 2020 Update* (Sept. 28, 2020), located at https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA_files/Consumer-Value-Ad-Supported-Services-2020Update.pdf.

⁷ *Id.*

experience, and research demonstrates that they are generally not reluctant to participate online due to data-driven advertising and marketing practices.

Without access to ad-supported content and online services, many consumers would be unable or unwilling to participate in the digital economy. Indeed, as the Federal Trade Commission noted in its recent comments to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, if a subscription-based model replaced the ad-based model, many consumers likely would not be able to afford access to, or would be reluctant to utilize, all of the information, products, and services they rely on today and that will become available in the future.⁸ The ad-supported Internet therefore offers individuals a tremendous resource of open access to information and online services. Without the advertising industry's support, the availability of free and low-cost vital online information repositories and services would be diminished. We provide the following comments in the spirit of preserving the ad-supported digital and offline media marketplace that has provided significant benefit to consumers while helping to design appropriate privacy safeguards to provide appropriate protections for them as well.

II. The Regulations Should Support Consumers' Awareness of the Implications of Their Privacy Decisions, Not Hinder It in Violation of the First Amendment

The proposed online and offline modifications unreasonably limit consumers' ability to access accurate and informative disclosures about business practices as they engage in the opt out process. Ultimately, this restriction on speech would not benefit consumers or advance a substantial interest. The proposed rules state: "Except as permitted by these regulations, a business shall not require consumers to click through or listen to reasons why they should not submit a request to opt-out before confirming their request."⁹ This language unduly limits consumers from receiving important information as they submit opt out requests. It is also overly limiting in the way that businesses may communicate with consumers. As highlighted above, data-driven advertising provides consumers with immensely valuable digital content for free or low-cost, as well as critical revenue for publishers, by increasing the value of ads served to consumers. As the research cited above also confirms, consumers have continually expressed their preference for ad-supported digital content and services, rather than having to pay significant fees for a wide range of apps, websites, and internet services they use. However, as a result of the proposed modifications, consumers' receipt of factual, critical information about the nature of the ad-supported Internet would be unduly hindered, thereby undermining a consumer's ability to make an informed decision. A business should be able to effectively communicate with consumers to inform them about how and why their data is used, and the benefit that data-driven advertising provides as a critical source of revenue.

It is no secret that consumers greatly value the information they can freely access online from digital publishers. However, local news publishers, for instance, continue to struggle to get readers to pay subscription fees for their content, even though this content is highly valuable to consumers and society. Thus, most news publishers have become increasingly reliant on tailored advertising, because it provides greater revenue than traditional advertising. However, the proposed modifications, as drafted, could obstruct consumers from receiving truthful, important information by hindering a business' provision of a reasonable notice to consumers about the funding challenges opt outs pose to their business model.

The CCPA regulations should not prevent consumers from receiving and businesses from providing full, fair, and accurate information during the opt out process. The proposed modification would

⁸ Federal Trade Commission, *In re Developing the Administration's Approach to Consumer Privacy*, 15 (Nov. 13, 2018), located at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/advocacy_documents/ftc-staff-comment-ntia-developing-administrations-approach-consumer-privacy/p195400_ftc_comment_to_ntia_112018.pdf.

⁹ Cal. Code Regs. tit 11, § 999.315(h)(3) (proposed Oct. 12, 2020).

impede consumers from receiving important information about their privacy choices, such as information about the vital nature of the ad-supported Internet as described in Section I, and, as explained in Section III, they may be contemporaneously receiving partial or misleading negative information about their opt out rights.

To ensure a fully informed privacy choice, consumers must have every ability to access information about business practices and the benefits of the digital advertising ecosystem. Providing ample and timely opportunities for consumers to gain knowledge about their choice to opt out is of paramount importance to avoid confusion and ignorance; this allows a consumer to be fully informed about the actual implications of their decision. By prohibiting a business from requiring a consumer to “to click through or listen to reasons why they should not submit a request to opt-out *before* confirming their request” the regulations do not safeguard against this concern. As presently written, the proposed modification appears to limit businesses’ ability to provide such vital information as a consumer is opting out, even if such information is presented in a seamless way. It is unclear what amount of information, or what method in which such information is presented, could constitute a violation of the rules. Instead of setting forth prohibitive rules that could reduce the amount of information and transparency available to consumers online, the OAG should prioritize facilitating accurate and educational exchanges of information from businesses to consumers. As a result, we ask the OAG to revise the text of the proposed modification in Section 999.315(h)(3) so that businesses are permitted to describe the impacts of an opt out choice while facilitating the consumer’s request to opt out.

Additionally, the restrictions created by this proposed modification infringe on businesses’ First and Fourteenth Amendment right to commercial speech. As written, Section 999.315(h)(3) restricts the information consumers can receive from businesses as they submit opt out requests by limiting the provision of accurate and truthful information to consumers. The Supreme Court has explained that “people will perceive their own best interest if only they are well enough informed, and . . . the best means to that end is to open the channels of communication, rather than to close them. . . .”¹⁰ Because this proposed regulation prescriptively regulates channels of communication, it violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

The state may not suppress speech that is “neither misleading nor related to unlawful activity” unless it has a substantial interest in restricting this speech, the regulation directly advances that interest, and the regulation is narrowly tailored to serve that interest.¹¹ The proposed regulation fails each part of the test:

- ***No substantial interest:*** Although there is no stated justification in the proposal, the most likely interest would be to streamline opt out requests by making it easier and faster to submit opt-outs. The OAG presumably wants nothing to impede consumers from opting out, but it is unclear because the OAG has not affirmatively stated its purpose for the proposed modification. Consumers should be made aware of the ramifications of their opt out decisions as they are opting out – not after confirming a request – so they do not make opt out choices to their detriment because they do not know the effect of such choices. For this reason, they should be able to receive information from businesses about the consequences of their opt out choices as they are submitting opt out requests. Providing information concerning the impact of an opt out is not an impediment to the process, but rather improves it.

¹⁰ *Virginia Pharmacy Board v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council*, 425 U. S. 748, 770 (1976).

¹¹ *Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York*, 447 U.S. 557, 564 (1980); *see also Individual Reference Services Group, Inc. v. F.T.C.*, 145 F. Supp. 2d 6, 41 (D.D.C. 2001).

- **No advancement of the interest:** If streamlining opt out requests to remove perceived impediments is the justification for the proposed rule, then the proposal does not advance that interest. The proposed regulation already includes many other specific requirements that facilitate speed and ease of opt-outs, including a requirement to use the minimal number of steps for opt-outs (and no more than the number of steps needed to opt in), prohibiting confusing wording, restricting the information collected, and prohibiting hiding the opt-out in a longer policy, all of which directly advance this interest without suppressing speech. The proposed rule limiting businesses from clicking through or listening to reasons would not make the opt out process easier for consumers, because it could result in consumers making uninformed choices if they are not notified of the consequences of their decision to opt out as they are making it. A “regulation may not be sustained if it provides only ineffective or remote support for the government’s purpose.”¹² This proposed regulation is both ineffective and provides no support for the government’s purpose.
- **Not narrowly tailored:** The proposed regulation is an overly broad and prescriptive restriction on speech that hinders accurate and educational communications to consumers about the consequences of a decision to opt-out. The regulations already include various other provisions that work to streamline the opt out process. “[I]f the governmental interest could be served as well by a more limited restriction on commercial speech, the excessive restrictions cannot survive.”¹³ As noted above, there are many ways to craft regulations to require simple and fast opt-out mechanisms that do not suppress lawful and truthful speech.

In sum, the regulation violates each and every prong of the framework for evaluating commercial speech. “As in other contexts, these standards ensure not only that the state’s interests are proportional to the resulting burdens placed on speech but also that the law does not seek to suppress a disfavored message.”¹⁴ The proposed regulation would do exactly that. Thus, it is a content-based restriction on speech, subject to heightened scrutiny. The OAG should revise the text of the proposed modification in Section 999.315(h)(3) to avoid running afoul of the First and Fourteenth Amendments and to ensure consumers may receive information about the impacts of an opt out request as they engage in the opt out process with a business.

III. The Proposed Modifications Should Impose the Same Notice Requirements on Authorized Agents as They Impose on Businesses

The proposed modifications to the CCPA regulations would require a business to ask an authorized agent for proof that a consumer gave the agent signed permission to submit a rights request.¹⁵ Although this provision helps ensure businesses can take steps to verify that authorized agents are acting on the true expressed wishes of consumers, the proposed modifications do not offer consumers sufficient protections from potential deception by authorized agents. For example, while the proposed modifications would impose additional notice obligations on businesses,¹⁶ those requirements do not extend to authorized agents. Authorized agents consequently have little to no guidelines or rules they must follow with respect to their communications with consumers, while businesses are subject to onerous, highly restrictive requirements regarding the mode and content of the information they may provide to Californians. The asymmetry between the substantial disclosure obligations for businesses and the lack thereof for authorized agents could enable (and, in fact, could incentivize) some agents to give consumers misleading

¹² *Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York*, 447 U.S. 557, 564 (1980).

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 564 U.S. 572, 565 (2011).

¹⁵ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.326(a) (proposed Oct. 12, 2020).

¹⁶ *Id.* at § 999.315(h)(3).

or incomplete information. We encourage the OAG to take steps to modify the proposed modifications to the CCPA regulations in order to equalize the notice requirements placed on businesses and agents, thus ensuring consumers can act on an informed basis under CCPA. In Section II of this submission, we discuss related First Amendment and communications fairness issues implicit in a balanced consumer privacy notice regime.

IV. Proposed Modifications to the CCPA Regulations Should Enable Flexibility in Methods of Providing Offline Notice

The proposed modifications to the CCPA regulations related to offline notices present a number of problems for consumers and businesses. As written, the CCPA implementing regulations already provide sufficient guidance to businesses regarding the provision of offline notice at the point of personal information collection in brick-and-mortar stores.¹⁷ The proposed modifications are more restrictive and prescriptive than the current plain text of the CCPA regulations, would restrict businesses' speech, would remove the flexibility businesses need to effectively communicate information to their customers, and would unnecessarily impede business-consumer interactions. We therefore ask the OAG to update the proposed modifications to: (1) remove the proposed illustrative example associated with brick-and-mortar stores, and (2) explicitly enable businesses communicating with Californians by phone to direct them to an online notice where CCPA-required disclosures are made to satisfy their offline notice obligation, a medium which is more familiar to consumers for these sorts of disclosures along with having the added benefit of being able to present additional choices to the consumer.

The proposed modifications would require businesses that collect personal information when interacting with consumers offline to "provide notice by an offline method that facilitates consumers' awareness of their right to opt-out."¹⁸ The proposed modifications proceed to offer the following "illustrative examples" of ways businesses may provide such notice: through signage in an area where the personal information is collected or on the paper forms that collect personal information in a brick-and-mortar store, and by reading the notice orally when personal information is collected over the phone.¹⁹ While the illustrative examples set forth limited ways businesses can give notice in compliance with the CCPA, they are more restrictive than existing provisions of the CCPA regulations and detract from the flexibility businesses need to provide required notices that do not burden consumers or cause unreasonable friction or frustration during the consumer's interaction with the business.

The illustrative example related to brick-and-mortar store notification sets forth redundant methods by which businesses may provide notices in offline contexts. The CCPA regulations already address such methods of providing offline notice at the point of personal information collection by stating, "[w]hen a business collects... personal information offline, it may include the notice on printed forms that collect personal information, provide the consumer with a paper version of the notice, or post prominent signage directing consumers to where the notice can be found online."²⁰ The proposed modifications regarding notice of the right to opt out in offline contexts are therefore unnecessary, as the regulations already address the very same methods of providing offline notice and offer sufficient clarity and flexibility to businesses in providing such notice.

In addition, the proposed modifications related to brick-and-mortar store notification are overly prescriptive. They include specific requirements about the *proximity* of the offline notice to the area where personal information is collected in a store. The specificity of these illustrative examples could result in

¹⁷ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.305(a)(3)(c).

¹⁸ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.306(b)(3) (proposed Oct. 12, 2020).

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.305(a)(3)(c).

over-notification throughout a store as well as significant costs. For example, the proposed modification could be interpreted to require signage at each cash register in a grocery store, as well as signage at the customer service desk, in the bakery area of the store where consumers can submit requests for cake deliveries, and in any other location where personal information may be collected. They also do not account for different contexts of business interactions with consumers. A business operating a food truck, for instance, would have different offline notice capabilities than an apparel store. A single displayed sign in a brick-and-mortar store, or providing a paper version of notice, would in most instances provide sufficient notice to consumers of their right to opt out under the CCPA. Bombarding consumers with physical signs at every potential point of personal information collection could be overwhelming and would ultimately not provide consumers with more awareness of their privacy rights. In fact, this strategy is more likely to create privacy notice fatigue than any meaningful increase in privacy control, thus undercutting the very goals of the CCPA.

Additionally, the proposed modifications' illustrative example of providing notice orally to consumers on the phone appears to suggest that reading the full notice aloud is the only way businesses can provide CCPA-compliant notices via telephone conversations. Reading such notice aloud to consumers would unreasonably burden the consumer's ability to interact efficiently with a business customer service representative and would likely result in consumer annoyance and frustration. Requiring businesses to keep consumers on the phone for longer than needed to address the purpose for which the consumer contacted the business would introduce unneeded friction into business-consumer relations. Instead, businesses should be permitted to direct a consumer to an online link where information about the right to opt out is posted rather than provide an oral catalog of information associated with particular individual rights under the CCPA.

The proposed modifications' addition of illustrative examples regarding methods of offline notice is unnecessary, redundant, and inflexible. These modifications would result in consumer confusion, leave businesses wondering if they may take other approaches to offline notices, and if so, how they may provide such notice within the strictures of the CCPA. We therefore ask the OAG to remove the proposed illustrative example associated with brick-and mortar stores as well as clarify that businesses communicating with consumers via telephone may direct them to an online website containing the required opt out notice as an acceptable way of communicating the right to opt out.

* * *

Thank you for the opportunity to submit input on the content of the proposed modifications to the CCPA regulations. Please contact Mike Signorelli of Venable LLP at masignorelli@venable.com with any questions you may have regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Dan Jaffe
Group EVP, Government Relations
Association of National Advertisers

Alison Pepper
Executive Vice President, Government Relations
American Association of Advertising Agencies, 4A's

Christopher Oswald
SVP, Government Relations
Association of National Advertisers

David Grimaldi
Executive Vice President, Public Policy
Interactive Advertising Bureau

David LeDuc
Vice President, Public Policy
Network Advertising Initiative

Clark Rector
Executive VP-Government Affairs
American Advertising Federation

Lou Mastria
Executive Director
Digital Advertising Alliance