



April 18, 2023

The Honorable Bob Lynn  
State House  
107 North Main Street  
LOB Room 208  
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Chair Lynn:

BSA | The Software Alliance<sup>1</sup> supports strong privacy protections for consumers and appreciates the Judiciary Committee's work to improve consumer privacy through Senate Bill 255 (SB255). In our federal and state advocacy, BSA works to advance legislation that ensures consumers' rights — and the obligations imposed on businesses — function in a world where different types of companies play different roles in handling consumers' personal data. At the state level we have supported strong privacy laws in a range of states, including consumer privacy laws enacted in Colorado, Connecticut, and Virginia.

BSA is the leading advocate for the global software industry. Our members are enterprise software and technology companies that create the business-to-business products and services to help their customers innovate and grow. For example, BSA members provide tools including cloud storage services, customer relationship management software, human resource management programs, identity management services, and collaboration software. Businesses entrust some of their most sensitive information — including personal data — with BSA members. Our companies work hard to keep that trust. As a result, privacy and security protections are fundamental parts of BSA members' operations, and their business models do not depend on monetizing users' data.

We appreciate the opportunity to share our feedback on SB255. Our recommendations below focus on BSA's core priorities in privacy legislation: clearly distinguishing between controllers and processors, creating workable universal opt-out mechanisms, and ensuring SB 255's interoperability with other state laws.

## **I. Distinguishing Between Controllers and Processors Benefits Consumers.**

---

<sup>1</sup> BSA's members include: Adobe, Alteryx, Atlassian, Autodesk, Bentley Systems, Box, Cisco, CNC/Mastercam, CrowdStrike, Databricks, DocuSign, Dropbox, Graphisoft, IBM, Informatica, Juniper Networks, Kyndryl, MathWorks, Microsoft, Okta, Oracle, Prokon, PTC, Salesforce, SAP, ServiceNow, Shopify Inc., Siemens Industry Software Inc., Splunk, Trend Micro, Trimble Solutions Corporation, TriNet, Twilio, Unity Technologies, Inc., Workday, Zendesk, and Zoom Video Communications, Inc.

We are writing to express our support for SB255's clear recognition of the unique role of data processors. Leading global and state privacy laws reflect the fundamental distinction between processors, which handle personal data on behalf of another company, and controllers, which decide when and why to collect a consumer's personal data. Every state to enact a comprehensive consumer privacy law has incorporated this critical distinction. In Colorado, Connecticut, Utah, and Virginia, state privacy laws assign important — and distinct — obligations to both processors and controllers.<sup>2</sup> In California, the state's privacy law for several years has distinguished between these different roles, which it terms businesses and service providers.<sup>3</sup> This longstanding distinction is also built into privacy and data protection laws worldwide and is foundational to leading international privacy standards and voluntary frameworks that promote cross-border data transfers.<sup>4</sup> BSA applauds Senator Carson for incorporating this globally recognized distinction into SB255.

Distinguishing between controllers and processors better protects consumer privacy because it allows legislation to craft different obligations for different types of businesses based on their different roles in handling consumers' personal data. Privacy laws should create important obligations for both controllers and processors to protect consumers' personal data — and we appreciate SB255's recognition that those obligations must reflect these different roles. For example, we agree with the bill's approach of ensuring both processors and controllers implement reasonable security measures to protect the security and confidentiality of personal data they handle. We also appreciate the bill's recognition that consumer-facing obligations, including responding to consumer rights requests and seeking a consumer's consent to process personal data, are appropriately placed on controllers, since those obligations can create privacy and security risks if applied to processors handling personal data on behalf of those controllers. Distinguishing between these roles creates clarity for both consumers exercising their rights and for companies implementing their obligations.

## **II. The Bill's Provisions Giving Controllers an Opportunity to Object to Processors' Use of Subcontractors Should be Revised.**

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Colorado's CPA Sec. 6-1-1303(7, 19); Connecticut DPA Sec. 1(8, 21); Utah CPA Sec. 13-61-101(12, 26); Virginia CDPA Sec. 59.1-575.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Cal. Civil Code 1798.140(d, ag).

<sup>4</sup> For example, privacy laws in Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Argentina distinguish between "data users" that control the collection or use of data and companies that only process data on behalf of others. In Mexico, the Philippines, and Switzerland, privacy laws adopt the "controller" and "processor" terminology. Likewise, the APEC Cross Border Privacy Rules, which the US Department of Commerce has strongly supported and promoted, apply only to controllers and are complemented by the APEC Privacy Recognition for Processors, which helps companies that process data demonstrate adherence to privacy obligations and helps controllers identify qualified and accountable processors. In addition, the International Standards Organization in 2019 published its first data protection standard, ISO 27701, which recognizes the distinct roles of controllers and processors in handling personal data. For additional information on the longstanding distinction between controllers and processors — sometimes called businesses and service providers — BSA has published a two-pager available [here](#).

While SB255 recognizes the important distinction between controllers and processors, we are concerned that some aspects of the bill could inadvertently limit processors' ability to provide consumers and businesses with the products and services they request, reduce their ability to safeguard those services, or even create privacy and security risks for consumers.

Specifically, Section 507-H:7(II)(d) creates significant concerns. It requires contracts between a controller and processor give the controller an "opportunity to object" to the processor's subcontractors.

We recognize the need for a consumer's data to be protected regardless of whether the data are held by a processor or by the processor's subcontractor. However, we strongly recommend a different approach: requiring processors to notify a controller about the use of a subcontractor and pass on the processor's obligations to that subcontractor — but not requiring controllers have the opportunity to object to subcontractors. This issue is particularly important, because of the frequency with which processors engage subcontractors to provide services requested by controllers. In many cases, processors will rely on dozens (or more) of subprocessors to provide a single service and may need to replace a subcontractor quickly if the subcontractor is not able to perform a service due to operational, security, or other issues. Requiring that controllers have an opportunity to object slows down the delivery of services and products to consumers, without clear benefits to privacy. Indeed, if a processor needs to switch subcontractors quickly because of a security issue, the delay involved in providing a controller the opportunity to object to a new subcontractor may expose consumers' data to security and privacy risks.

Instead of creating an opportunity for controllers to object to a processor's subcontractors, we recommend revising SB255 to require a processor to notify a controller about subprocessors and pass on obligations to subcontractors via contract. This approach ensures consumers' personal data remains protected.

### **III. Consider Practical Issues Involved in Creating a System for Recognizing Universal Opt-Out Mechanisms.**

We believe that consumers should have clear and easy-to-use methods to exercise new rights given to them by any new privacy law. Like the state privacy laws enacted in Colorado and Connecticut, SB255 includes a clear requirement for controllers to honor a consumer's use of a universal opt-out mechanism to exercise new rights to opt out of targeted advertising or the sale of their personal data. Under Section 507-H:6(V)(a)(1)(B), controllers must honor these mechanisms no later than January 1, 2025.

If the bill retains this requirement, we strongly encourage you to focus on creating a universal opt-out mechanism that functions in practice. It is important to address how companies will understand which universal opt-out mechanism(s) meet SB255's requirements. One way to address this concern is by creating a clear process for developing a public list of universal opt-out mechanisms and soliciting stakeholder feedback as part of that process, similar to

the approach contemplated in Colorado's draft privacy regulations.<sup>5</sup> Focusing on the practical aspects of implementing this requirement can help companies develop strong compliance programs that align their engineering and other resources accordingly. We also encourage you to focus on recognizing a universal opt-out mechanism that is interoperable with mechanisms recognized in other states. Interoperability is essential in ensuring that any universal opt-out mechanism is workable and allows consumers to effectuate their rights across state lines.

We also appreciate that SB255 includes an effective date that recognizes the ongoing work surrounding the implementation of global opt-out mechanisms in Colorado and Connecticut. Ensuring that SB255's obligation to honor a universal opt-out mechanism does not take effect until after January 1, 2025, will help companies leverage that ongoing work to better serve consumers in New Hampshire — and help to ensure that consumers in New Hampshire can use opt-out mechanisms they may already be familiar with in other states.

Finally, as you consider how to ensure any universal opt-out mechanism works in practice, we recommend educating consumers about what universal opt-out mechanisms do in addition to their limitations. For example, if a consumer uses a browser-based mechanism to opt out of the sale or sharing of the consumer's personal information, the browser may be able to effectuate that request for activity that occurs within the browser, but not activity outside of the browser. Consumers should be aware of this and other limitations.

#### **IV. Promote an Interoperable Approach to Privacy Legislation.**

Finally, BSA appreciates Senator Carson's efforts to ensure that SB255 creates privacy protections that are interoperable with protections created in other state privacy laws. Privacy laws around the world need to be consistent enough that they are interoperable, so that consumers understand how their rights change across jurisdictions and businesses can readily map obligations imposed by a new law against their existing obligations under other laws

As an initial matter, we appreciate the harmonized approach Senator Carson has taken in aligning many of SB255's provisions with the Connecticut Data Privacy Act (CTDPA). BSA supported the Connecticut privacy law and consumer privacy laws adopted in Colorado and Virginia, which build on the same structural model of privacy legislation enacted in Connecticut. In particular, we support SB255's focus on protecting the privacy of consumers, and excluding employment data from the bill's scope and in its definition of "consumer." We also support SB255's approach to enforcement, which provides the Attorney General with exclusive authority to enforce the bill, which we believe will help promote a consistent and clear approach to enforcement. We commend Senator Carson for drafting SB255's provisions in a manner that is interoperable with protections included in other state privacy laws, which helps drive strong business compliance practices that can better protect consumer privacy.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Colorado Department of Law, Colorado Privacy Act Rules, Version 3 of Proposed Draft Rules (Jan. 27, 2023), *available at* [https://coag.gov/app/uploads/2023/01/CPA\\_Version-3-Proposed-Draft-Regulations-1.27.2023.pdf](https://coag.gov/app/uploads/2023/01/CPA_Version-3-Proposed-Draft-Regulations-1.27.2023.pdf).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective in establishing strong consumer privacy protections. BSA would be happy to provide further perspective on this legislation as it progresses through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matthew Lenz". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line striking through the middle of the name.

Matthew Lenz  
Senior Director and Head of State Advocacy