



March 11, 2025

Chair Rebecca Bauer-Kahan
Vice Chair Diane B. Dixon
Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection
California Assembly
Legislative Office Building
1020 N Street, Room 162
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: A.B. 566 (Lowenthal) – *SUPPORT*

Dear Chair Bauer-Kahan and Vice Chair Dixon,

The undersigned organizations and individuals write in strong support of A.B. 566, a bill that would require browsers and mobile operating systems to include a setting that enables a consumer to send an opt-out preference signal. While California consumers enjoy the right to send legally binding opt-out preference signals, major browsers like Chrome, Safari, and Edge, as well as the Android and iOS mobile platforms, have limited usage of this right by denying native opt-out preference signal functionality. This bill is vital to ensure that millions of Californians have a practical way to manage their privacy choices under the CCPA.

The CCPA made California the first state in the nation to require that covered businesses respond to opt-out preference signals, which a consumer may send via a “platform, technology, or mechanism.”¹ When enabled, the signal automatically communicates the consumer’s preference to opt-out of the sale or sharing of their personal information by each business with which the consumer interacts online.

Opt-out preference signals were a policy response to the suboptimal consumer rights formulation under the initial version of the CCPA, which required consumers to effectuate their opt-out requests individually with each business with which they interacted. That meant that consumers with a

¹ CCPA Sec. 1798.135(b)(1)

generalized preference not to allow the sharing or selling of their personal information would have had to contact hundreds, if not thousands, of businesses in order to satisfy that preference.

As Consumer Reports testing showed,² the individual opt-out structure was intensely cumbersome for consumers – many consumers struggled to complete an opt-out request on just a single data broker’s website – an arrangement that depresses the usage of consumer rights under the law. Opt-out preference signals were intended to relieve this burden and make it easier for consumers to express their privacy preferences.

Subsequent to the passage of CPRA’s amendments to the CCPA that created the opt-out preference signal requirement (as well the enactment of several other state privacy laws that create similar requirements),³ we’ve seen numerous privacy-conscious browser vendors, such as Brave, DuckDuckGo, and Firefox support the concept of opt-out preference signals. Most commonly, such browsers do so by enabling usage of Global Privacy Control,⁴ a technical specification that has been interpreted by the California Privacy Protection Agency⁵ and California Attorney General⁶ to serve as a permissible opt-out preference signal under the CCPA. These browsers typically either enable the GPC signal to be sent by default or make it a setting the user can easily toggle on or off.

However, the largest browser vendors (Apple Safari, Google Chrome, and Microsoft Edge, which cumulatively enjoy more than 90% of the browser share in the United States) currently do not provide native support for opt-out preference signals.⁷ Similarly, mobile platforms, which use the same HTTP standard as web browsers and could implement GPC with little effort, do not support it. Today, if a user wants to send an opt-out preference signal on Chrome, Safari, or Edge, they need to download a third-party extension to do so, while a mobile platform user cannot configure their device to send an opt-out preference signal at all. As a result, millions of Californians, while technically enjoying the right to send such a signal, likely have no idea that this right even exists and have no easy way of acting on it even if they did.

Browser and platform vendors could easily add universal opt-out functionality to their products. In 2011, in response to urging from the Federal Trade Commission, all major browsers added an option to send “Do Not Track” signals within a matter of months, despite the fact that “Do Not Track” had no clear meaning or legal effect. Compliance with universal opt-out mechanisms, on the

² Maureen Mahoney, California Consumer Privacy Act: Are Consumers’ Rights Protected, Consumer Reports (Oct. 1, 2020),

https://advocacy.consumerreports.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CR_CCPA-Are-Consumers-Digital-Rights-Protected_092020_vf2.pdf

³ Universal opt-out provisions are included in the California, Connecticut, Colorado, Delaware, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Oregon and Texas comprehensive privacy laws.

⁴ <https://globalprivacycontrol.org/>

⁵ Frequently Asked Questions, California Privacy Protection Agency, at 8. How to Submit Requests, <https://cppa.ca.gov/faq.html>.

⁶ Archive - Attorney General Becerra, Twitter.com, Jan. 28, 2021, <https://twitter.com/AGBecerra/status/1354850758236102656>.

⁷ United States Browsers Market Share, (February 2024), <https://www.similarweb.com/browsers/united-states/>

other hand, is currently mandated by California and will soon be mandated by at least eight other state privacy laws in the coming years (with more likely to be passed in the near future).

A.B. 566 will ensure that consumers have the ability to use their privacy rights by requiring that browser vendors and suppliers of devices (for example, a mobile device or “smart” TV) include an easy to locate and use setting that enables the consumer to send an opt-out preference signal. This bill’s approach will help reduce opt-out friction and make it easier for California residents to control their data, while also providing for flexibility by allowing the CPPA to adopt rules that will allow the law to keep pace with technology.

For the reasons listed above, we are proud to support A.B. 566 and urge the Legislature to pass it.

Sincerely,

Matt Schwartz
Policy Analyst
Consumer Reports

Justin Kloczko
Privacy Advocate
Consumer Watchdog

Caitriona Fitzgerald
Deputy Director
Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC)

Hayley Tsukayama, CIPP/US
Associate Director of Legislative Activism
Electronic Frontier Foundation

Nathalie Marechal
Co-Director, Privacy & Data Project
Center for Democracy and Technology

Jenn Hodges
Director of US Public Policy & Government
Relations
Mozilla

Brian Hofer
Executive Director
Secure Justice

Pete Snyder
Senior Privacy Researcher and Director of
Privacy
Brave Software

Jason Kint
CEO
Digital Content Next

Arielle Garcia
COO
Check My Ads

Emory Roane
Associate Director of Policy
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse

Sebastian Zimmeck
Assistant Professor of Computer Science
Wesleyan University

cc: The Honorable Members of the Assembly Committee on Privacy & Consumer Protection
Julie Salley, Chief Consultant
Assemblymember Josh Lownethal