

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION
NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 2023
VOL. 9 NO. 9

PRATT'S
**PRIVACY &
CYBERSECURITY
LAW**
REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: PRIVACY IS A WORLDWIDE CONCERN - AND PARTS OF THE WORLD ARE DOING SOMETHING ABOUT IT

Victoria Prussen Spears

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION LOOKS AT HARMONIZING CYBER REGULATIONS AMIDST FLURRY OF NEW ACTIVITY

Megan L. Brown, Kevin B. Muhlendorf,
Kara M. Sacilotto, Kathleen E. Scott,
Jacqueline F. "Lyn" Brown and Lauren N. Johnson

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION KICKS OFF VOLUNTARY IOT SECURITY LABEL PROGRAM WITH BIG NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Sara M. Baxenberg, Megan L. Brown,
Kathleen E. Scott, Joshua S. Turner and
Boyd Garriott

CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY RELEASES INITIAL DRAFT PROPOSED RULES FOR RISK ASSESSMENTS AND CYBERSECURITY AUDITS

Madeleine Findley and Daniel R. Echeverri

WHAT CONNECTICUT BUSINESSES NEED TO KNOW NOW THAT THE DATA PRIVACY ACT HAS TAKEN EFFECT: THE 6 BIGGEST QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Monica Snyder Perl

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO FLORIDA'S PRIVACY, BREACH NOTIFICATION AND TELEMARKETING LAWS

Steven G. Stransky, Brenna Fasko and
Marla M. Izbicky

THE EU-U.S. "DATA PRIVACY FRAMEWORK": A NEW SOLUTION FOR THE FREE FLOW OF PERSONAL DATA

Steven Farmer, Rafi Azim-Khan,
Catherine D. Meyer, Scott Morton and
Mark Booth

UPCOMING EU RULES ON DIGITAL OPERATIONAL RESILIENCE

Lee Rubin, Steven Farmer, Mark Booth and
Johanna Lipponen

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 9

NUMBER 9

November - December 2023

| | |
|--|-----|
| Editor's Note: Privacy Is a Worldwide Concern – and Parts of the World Are Doing Something About It Victoria Prussen Spears | 291 |
| Biden Administration Looks at Harmonizing Cyber Regulations Amidst Flurry of New Activity Megan L. Brown, Kevin B. Muhlendorf, Kara M. Sacilotto, Kathleen E. Scott, Jacqueline F. "Lyn" Brown and Lauren N. Johnson | 293 |
| Federal Communications Commission Kicks Off Voluntary IoT Security Label Program With Big Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Sara M. Baxenberg, Megan L. Brown, Kathleen E. Scott, Joshua S. Turner and Boyd Garriott | 300 |
| California Privacy Protection Agency Releases Initial Draft Proposed Rules for Risk Assessments and Cybersecurity Audits Madeleine Findley and Daniel R. Echeverri | 309 |
| What Connecticut Businesses Need to Know Now That the Data Privacy Act Has Taken Effect: The 6 Biggest Questions Answered Monica Snyder Perl | 314 |
| Significant Changes to Florida's Privacy, Breach Notification and Telemarketing Laws Steven G. Stransky, Brenna Fasko and Marla M. Izbicky | 317 |
| The EU-U.S. "Data Privacy Framework": A New Solution for the Free Flow of Personal Data Steven Farmer, Rafi Azim-Khan, Catherine D. Meyer, Scott Morton and Mark Booth | 323 |
| Upcoming EU Rules on Digital Operational Resilience Lee Rubin, Steven Farmer, Mark Booth and Johanna Lipponen | 328 |

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:
Alexandra Jefferies at (937) 560-3067

Email: alexandra.jefferies@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

LexisNexis® Support Center <https://supportcenter.lexisnexis.com/app/home/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print)

ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number]

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [1] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [82] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt Publication

Editorial

Editorial Offices

630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2023-Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

California Privacy Protection Agency Releases Initial Draft Proposed Rules for Risk Assessments and Cybersecurity Audits

*By Madeleine Findley and Daniel R. Echeverri**

In this article, the authors discuss rules recently proposed by the California Privacy Protection Agency for privacy risk assessments and cybersecurity audits.

The California Privacy Protection Agency (CPPA) recently released an initial draft of proposed rules for privacy risk assessments and cybersecurity audits for discussion at a meeting of the CPPA board. These proposals reflect progress on long-awaited guidance from the agency on the requirements for risk assessments and cybersecurity audits required under the California Privacy Rights Act (CPRA). The proposals are not yet fully drafted and the CPPA has not started the formal rulemaking process. Notably, each proposal contains options for board consideration.

The drafts nonetheless give insight into the highly detailed and prescriptive approach the agency is considering and the significant obligations it will impose on businesses, including requirements for auditors, additional requirements for processing involving artificial intelligence (AI) or automated decisionmaking technology (ADT), and submission of certifications from senior business leadership. These discussion drafts offer an opportunity to identify issues for comment once the CPPA begins the formal rulemaking. The proposals are summarized below.

PROPOSED DRAFT REGULATIONS

Draft Risk Assessment Regulations

The Draft Risk Assessment Regulations establish the requirements to conduct a risk assessment for businesses whose processing of personal information poses a “significant risk to consumers’ privacy.” The proposal is similar to guidance for data protection assessments under the Colorado Privacy Act and the GDPR but would impose numerous specific reporting and compliance requirements.

“Significant Risk” Triggers Risk Assessment

Before beginning any processing that would present a “significant risk” to consumers’ privacy, a covered business must conduct a risk assessment.¹ “Significant risks” include

* The authors, attorneys with Jenner & Block LLP, may be contacted at mfindley@jenner.com and decheverri@jenner.com, respectively.

¹ Draft Risk Assessment Regulations § 7150(a).

selling or sharing of personal information and processing sensitive personal information. The proposal includes several further “significant risks” for CPPA consideration, including using ADT to provide or deny certain services or opportunities, processing personal information of minors, workplace and education monitoring, processing personal information of consumers in publicly accessible places, or processing personal information to train AI or ADT.² The draft proposes definitions for AI and ADT.

Content of Risk Assessment

The proposal requires a risk assessment to include “at minimum” a list of between 10 and 14 elements, depending on how the CPPA chooses among draft options. For example, an assessment must provide:

- A summary of the processing that presents significant risk to consumers’ privacy, and a description of how the business will collect, use, disclose, and retain personal information;
- Categories of personal information to be processed, including sensitive personal information;
- Context of the processing activity;
- Consumers’ reasonable expectations regarding the purpose of the processing;
- The operational elements of the processing (including data minimization, data retention, technology used, and names or categories of service providers, contractors, or third parties); and
- Purposes of processing.

Additionally, the assessment must describe the benefits and the negative impacts of the processing, including potential constitutional, discrimination, economic, physical, reputational, and psychological harms, and any safeguards the business has implemented as a result. The risk assessment must determine whether negative impacts outweigh the benefits of the processing.³ If the assessment determines that the risks outweigh the benefits, the business may not engage in the processing.⁴

The draft also proposes additional requirements for CPPA consideration, including identification of internal and external contributors to the assessment, any internal or external audit conducted in connection with the assessment, and – in one option –

² Id. § 7150(b)(1)–(2).

³ Id. § 7152(a)(1)–(10).

⁴ Id. § 1755.

a signed certification from the highest-ranking executive responsible for oversight of risk-assessment compliance that they have reviewed, understood, and approved the assessment.⁵

A business may rely on a risk assessment conducted under another similar privacy law, to the extent that assessment satisfies the requirements of the regulations. The business may supplement the prior assessment to address any gaps between regulatory frameworks.

Additional Requirements for Artificial Intelligence and Automated Decisionmaking Technology

Businesses that process personal information in connection with AI or ADT would be required to comply with additional detailed requirements, including providing plain language explanations of the purpose for using AI or ADT, the outputs of the processing, evaluations of AI or ADT for validity, reliability, and fairness, and any human involvement. If the business uses personal information to train AI or ADT and makes that AI or ADT available to other businesses or customers, the assessment must also explain how the business provides, to those other persons, the appropriate purposes for which the AI or ADT may be used, and safeguards it has implemented to ensure the AI or ADT is used for appropriate purposes.⁶

Timing and Compliance

Businesses would be required to conduct risk assessments before undertaking new processing activities, and would have 24 months to assess ongoing processing.⁷ Risk assessments would have to be updated whenever there is a “material change” to the processing, and at intervals of one to three years, depending which option the CPPA selects.⁸

The proposal includes only a summary description of required compliance submissions to the agency. Proposed regulations not yet drafted would require businesses to make risk assessments available to the CPPA and the California Attorney General upon request. Businesses also would need to annually submit to the CPPA an “abridged form” of the risk assessments and a certification from a designated executive that the business has complied with the assessment requirements.⁹ The content of these abridged risk assessments will likely be the subject of further drafting and significant stakeholder interest.

⁵ Id. § 7153(a)(11)–(14), Option I and II.

⁶ Id. §§ 7153–7154.

⁷ Id. § 7156(c).

⁸ Id. § 7156(a)(3)(A)–(O).

⁹ Id. § 7158.

Cybersecurity Audits

The Draft Cybersecurity Audit Regulations set out the specifications for completing a required annual cybersecurity audit.

“Significant Risk to Consumers’ Security”

Any business that processes personal information in a manner presenting “significant risk to consumers’ security” would be required to conduct an annual cybersecurity audit.¹⁰ The draft would deem data brokers to pose a “significant risk.” It also presents options for CPPA consideration about other businesses or business practices that constitute a “significant risk,” including businesses:

- Processing personal information, sensitive personal information, or personal information of known minors above certain thresholds of consumers;¹¹
- With annual gross revenues above an unspecified threshold;¹² and
- With more than an unspecified number of employees.¹³

Requirements of Cybersecurity Program

Any cybersecurity program would be required to contain specified elements or explain in writing why the element is not needed.¹⁴ Among other things, the audit must describe how the business addresses 17 safeguards “to protect personal information from internal and external risks to the security, confidentiality, integrity, or availability of personal information,”¹⁵ including (among others) authentication, encryption, account management, vulnerability scans, network monitoring and defense, cybersecurity training, oversight of service providers and third parties, retention schedules and incident response plans.¹⁶ Additionally, the audit must identify and describe any breach notifications to regulators or consumers, and remediation measures taken.

Independent Auditor

The draft proposal would require businesses to use a “qualified, objective, independent” auditor.¹⁷ An auditor can be internal but must be independent and shall report “directly

¹⁰ Draft Cybersecurity Audit Regulations §§ 7001(i), 7120(a).

¹¹ Id. § 7120(b)(2), Option I.

¹² Id., Option II.

¹³ Id., Option III.

¹⁴ Id. § 7123(c)(1).

¹⁵ Id. § 7123(c)(2).

¹⁶ See id. § 7123(c)(2)(A)–(R).

¹⁷ Id. § 7122(a).

to the business’ board of directors or governing body, not to business management” overseeing the cybersecurity program.¹⁸

Contents of Cybersecurity Audit

The proposal would require the cybersecurity audit to:

- (1) Assess, document, and summarize each component of the business’ cybersecurity program;
- (2) Identify any gaps or weaknesses;
- (3) Address the status of any previously identified gaps or weaknesses; and
- (4) Identify any corrections or amendments to prior cybersecurity audits.¹⁹

The audit should also identify the auditor and all employees responsible for the cybersecurity program.²⁰

The draft proposes two options on how an audit should assess and document the business’ cybersecurity program. The first would look at how the business considers and protects against six specific types of negative impact to consumer security, including security incidents, economic, physical, psychological or reputational harms.²¹ The second would assess and document risks from cybersecurity threats that have or are reasonably likely to materially affect consumers.²²

Timing & Compliance

Businesses would have 24 months to conduct their first cybersecurity audit, and then annually thereafter.²³ Additionally, a member of the business’ board or governing body, or its highest-ranking executive would be required to submit a written certification of compliance to the CPPA that the business has complied with the audit requirements or, if not, that identifies which provisions have not been addressed and a remediation timeline.²⁴

NEXT STEPS

CCPA staff will likely revise the drafts based on CPPA board discussions, and present updated drafts to start a formal rulemaking at an upcoming meeting.

¹⁸ Id. § 7122(a)(2).

¹⁹ Id. § 7122(e).

²⁰ Id. §§ 7122(f), 7123(c)(1)(A)(i).

²¹ Id. § 7123(b), Option I.

²² Id., Option II.

²³ Id. § 7121.

²⁴ Id. § 7124.