



Draft date: 3/13/23 V2

*2023 Spring National Meeting
Louisville, Kentucky*

PRIVACY PROTECTIONS (H) WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, March 21, 2023

12:30 – 2:00 p.m.

Kentucky Convention Center—Ballroom C—Main Concourse Level

ROLL CALL

Katie C. Johnson, Chair	Virginia	Van Dorsey/Alexander Borkowski	Maryland
Cynthia Amann, Co-Vice Chair	Missouri	T.J. Patton	Minnesota
Chris Aufenthie, Co-Vice Chair	North Dakota	Molly Plummer	Montana
Chelsy Maller	Alaska	Martin Swanson	Nebraska
Gio Espinosa/Catherine O’Neil	Arizona	Teresa Green	Oklahoma
Damon Diederich	California	Raven Collins	Oregon
George Bradner/Kristin Fabian	Connecticut	Gary Jones	Pennsylvania
C.J. Metcalf/Erica Weyhenmeyer	Illinois	Frank Marnell	South Dakota
LeAnn Crow	Kansas	Carole Cearley	Texas
Ron Kreiter	Kentucky	Todd Dixon	Washington
Robert Wake/Benjamin Yardley	Maine	Lauren Van Buren/ Rachel Cissne Carabell /Timothy Cornelius	Wisconsin

NAIC Support Staff: Lois E. Alexander/Jennifer Neuerburg

AGENDA

1. Consider Adoption of its 2022 Fall National Meeting Minutes Attachment One
—*Katie C. Johnson (VA)*
2. Consider the Updated Workplan for 2023—*Katie C. Johnson (VA)* Attachment Two
3. Hear Updates on Federal and State Privacy Legislation
 - A. Federal—*Shana Oppenheim (NAIC)*
 - B. State—*Jennifer Neuerburg (NAIC)*



4. Receive and Discuss Comments on the Exposure Draft of the New NAIC Privacy Model #674—Katie C. Johnson (VA)
5. Discuss Any Other Matters Before the Working Group.
—Katie C. Johnson (VA)
6. Adjournment

Attachment Three

Draft Pending Adoption

Attachment One
Privacy Protections Working Group
3/21/23

Draft: 1/4/23

Privacy Protections (H) Working Group
Tampa, Florida
December 12, 2022

The Privacy Protections (H) Working Group of the Innovation, Cybersecurity, and Technology (H) Committee met in Tampa, FL, Dec. 12, 2022. The following Working Group members participated: Katie Johnson, Chair, represented by Don Beatty (VA); Cynthia Amann, Co-Vice Chair (MO); Chris Aufenthie, Co-Vice Chair (ND); Chelsy Maller (AK); Shane Foster (AZ); Damon Diederich (CA); George Bradner and Kristin Fabian (CT); Erica Weyhenmeyer and C.J. Metcalf (IL); LeAnn Crow (KS); Ron Kreiter (KY); Van Dorsey (MD); Robert Wake and Benjamin Yardley (ME); Martin Swanson (NE); Teresa Green (OK); Raven Collins represented by Numi Griffith (OR); Gary Jones (PA); Frank Marnell (SD); Todd Dixon (WA); and Lauren Van Buren, Rachel Cissne Carabell, and Timothy Cornelius (WI). Also participating were Sarah Bailey (AK); Glenda Haverkamp (KS); Kathleen A. Birrane (MD); John Arnold (ND); and Tanji J. Northrup (UT).

1. Adopted its Summer National Meeting Minutes and Noted an Updated Work Plan

Amann said the Working Group met Aug. 9.

Commissioner Birrane made a motion, seconded by Diederich, to adopt the Working Group's Aug. 9 minutes (see *NAIC Proceedings – Summer 2022, Innovation, Cybersecurity, and Technology (H) Committee, Attachment Four*). The motion passed unanimously.

Amann noted that an updated Nov. 11, 2022, work plan for the Working Group was posted to the Working Group's web page.

2. Heard Updates on State Privacy Legislation

Jennifer Neuerburg (NAIC) said there was little action on state privacy legislation, and both updated charts were posted to the Working Group's web page.

3. Heard a Presentation from a Consumer Perspective on General Market Practices Regarding the Use of Personal Information During the Insurance Process

Matthew J. Smith, Esq. (Coalition Against Insurance Fraud—CAIF) said the data onslaught is here, and insurance consumers need state insurance regulators to make sure they are protected. He said data, if used correctly, can be used in helping consumers with lower premiums; tailoring coverages; and making the insurance process of application, payment, and claims easier. However, he said regulatory oversight and accountability are crucial. He said there is support for the appropriate use of data in the world of insurance, and consumers are not data-ignorant according to "The Ethical Use of Data to Fight Insurance Fraud Study" commissioned by the CAIF and executed by Dynata with a recommendation from NAIC consumer representative, Brenda J. Cude (University of Georgia). He said this study was done to help guide state insurance legislators and regulators because it includes valuable insight to guide the proper oversight of data both in antifraud and beyond. He said the study had over 2,000 American respondents, with 67% of those responding being consumers; 17% insurance professionals; 6% federal and state legislators, regulators, or government agency respondents; and 10% from the legal or data service industry. He said the data collected was cross-analyzed and confirmed by data scientists as having no

Draft Pending Adoption

Attachment One
Privacy Protections Working Group
3/21/23

difference from consumers to companies to other respondents. The study showed that 85% of all American consumers are concerned about data fraud in insurance transactions. Smith said when consumers were asked about whom they trust with their personal data, 75% said they were okay with insurance companies using their data, but 61% wanted a national data protection standard enforced by state insurance departments, and 85% supported data laws and guidance for insurance companies' use of such data. He said disclosure regarding data usage and clarity—i.e., requiring companies to have a straightforward and easy-to-read privacy policy—are key to insurer data trust. He said when the premium is reduced to receive data, 61% of respondents said they had no expectations; however, 46% said they expected a 10% reduction in premium. He said when asked if insurers are properly overseeing personal data, insurance professionals said 47% of their companies had strong data protections in place, and 53% said their companies had little, not good, or no policy of personal data protection in place.

Smith recommended that state insurance regulators play a strong role by using the results of this study in consultation with data scientists to: 1) apply this data to their work both nationally and at the state level; 2) encourage others to undertake similar research; 3) address data usage at all parts of the insurance transaction; 4) create clear policies with accountability; 5) share information with other states; 6) control the use of personal data for marketing; 7) create standards for data use and retention after cancellation or non-renewal; 8) determine if data is being de-identified and, if so, by whom; 9) include third parties who aggregate or oversee programs for insurers; 10) track the shipping of data overseas; 11) address bias and prejudice; and 12) determine whether the misuse of personal data is intentional or unintended. In closing, he said the challenge moving forward is getting it right and right away, as there is no time to continue to simply wait and see what happens with the use of insurance consumers' personal data.

4. Heard a Presentation from a Company Perspective on General Market Practices Regarding the Use of Personal Information During the Insurance Process

Scott Fischer (Lemonade Insurance Company) said we all use data in our daily lives; however, a balance is needed for the necessary use of data and the consumers' need for privacy. He said insurance is unique with open questions that still need to be addressed. He said one question has to do with the best way to handle tradeoffs, because we need to ensure that users cannot manipulate data for fraud detection and how much transparency companies can provide. He said another question is regarding what level of control users can have, because users who choose to delete their data give up a less personalized experience. For auto insurance, he said allowing for consumer deletion of data would skew the company's perception of risk.

Fischer said the question includes determining the best way to provide users with the appropriate context; whether it should be through disclosures, terms of service, or privacy policies; as well as what such notices could or should look like. He said this unique insurance industry should think about privacy by its intentional collection and use of a user's data.

Fischer said companies should look at: 1) what type of data is being collected from users and why it is being collected; 2) who has access to that data and what they can use it for; 3) what users know about their data and what control they have; and 4) how it is collected.

Fischer said data that is sensitive and personal should come directly from the user; data that relates to user behavior in other domains, such as a house purchase, comes from third-party sources; user behavior data, like scrolling through the product online, is provided indirectly; and data about a user that is generated via machine learning (ML), such as whether the user has a swimming pool, is generated within the company itself.

Draft Pending Adoption

Attachment One
Privacy Protections Working Group
3/21/23

Fischer said user data ranges in its sensitivity from less sensitive data that is not user-identifiable, such as scrolling patterns, to more sensitive data that is considered sensitive personally identified information (SPII), such as one's Social Security Number (SSN) or biometrics that could cause significant harm if compromised, with the midpoint data being user identifiable and personal, such as video footage. He said the sensitivity of the data should be used to control how each category of data is collected, what user controls should exist, and who can access the data internally and externally. He said the more sensitive the data is, the more guarded access to the data should be and the more control and awareness users should have. He said less sensitive data can be indirectly collected and stored without explicit consent and provided more broad access and use across use cases and features. He said access to more sensitive data should be extremely limited internally and used only for a handful of purposes where no other data can be used and explicit user permission to collect or generate data must be sought, and it should allow users controls to be able to access and delete data. At the midpoint, he said limited access is allowed for purposes that are pre-defined for users, and it provides users with appropriate levels of awareness and control depending on the use case.

Fischer said state insurance regulators need to hold third-party sources accountable for clarity during collection; the purpose should be clear to users throughout the user experience for data obtained directly from users; indirect behavioral data should not contain any sensitive information, such as personally identified information (PII); and when users provide information for generation within the company, users should be informed of how data may be used, especially for more sensitive cases.

Fischer said companies should provide users with the proper context while the data is being collected; provide a common help center or space for users to understand what data is being collected, and for what purposes; clearly indicate to users that account deletion equals data deletion; and identify what data makes sense for a user to have control over in terms of deletion, access, and usage. He said there are technical innovations like differential privacy and federated learning in this space that are making it possible to add noise to or silo a user's data, while still providing access to train models. However, he said these innovations are not being used in the insurance space yet. It would provide a secure environment where personal data could be stored and subjected to a differentially private computation with access to analysts' queries via noisy results.

5. Discussed General Market Practices Regarding the Use of Personal Information During the Insurance Process from Both Perspectives

Eric Ellsworth (Consumers' Checkbook) said as a data scientist, he believes data becomes much more sensitive, as data is linked to other data; it is necessary to flag the linkage aspect and relevancy coalescent, as well as tangential relationships. Harry Ting (Health Consumer Advocate) said Smith's survey clearly indicates that state insurance regulators can and should regulate insurance companies' use of consumer data even though the Metas like Google are too big to fail and control. Wake said there is a strong push from the federal government to put together a list of things states can and cannot regulate. He said identity theft protection is not all there is to protect; there is also the universe of third parties to consider. He said federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)-like concessions are needed, with third parties agreeing to keep all data protected like it is under HIPAA. He said state insurance regulators need to think about the purposes for which data is to be used and the companies who do things behind the scenes to support insurance companies. He said there is a dichotomy between universally available data and non-public data. He said telematics are needed by auto insurance companies with things like coverage, uber, etc. included. Smith said according to the CAIF's study, car trackers are not all altruistic.

Draft Pending Adoption

Attachment One
Privacy Protections Working Group
3/21/23

Amann said the new *Insurance Consumer Privacy Protection Model Law* (#674) draft includes all lines of business. She said the drafting group discussed federal acts and focused on being technologically current. Commissioner Birrane said she has confidence in state insurance regulators to develop a model that all states can use to effectively regulate and serve consumers.

6. Discussed Other Matters

Amann reminded attendees about the upcoming exposure draft of Model #674 at the end of January for a two-month comment period to be followed by open meetings resuming in March to discuss all comments received in the coming months.

Having no further business, the Privacy Protections (H) Working Group adjourned.

SharePoint/NAIC Support Staff Hub/Member/H Cmte/Privacy/Minutes_2022 Fall National Meeting_PPWG

2023 PRIVACY PROTECTIONS (H) WORKING GROUP WORKPLAN

Activity	Date(s)	Date Finished
Regulator-only Meeting to Receive PPWG & IRs' Comments on Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	1/25/2023 - 2/1/2023	1/31/2023
Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674) Exposed for Comments	2/1/23	2/1/2023
One-on-One Meetings with Companies and Interested Parties to Discuss Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	2/1/23 - 3/10/2023	2/16; 3/1; 3/2; 3/7; 3/8; 3/9; 3/14
Regulator to Regulator Privacy Protections (H) Working Group Meeting	3/15/2023	
NAIC SPRING MEETING-Receive Comments	3/21/23	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	4/4/2023	Cancelled
One-on-One Meetings with Companies and Interested Parties to Discuss Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	4/5/2023 – 4/27/2023	4/5; 4/6; 4/12; 4/13
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	4/18/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	5/2/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	5/16/2023	
Open In-Person Meeting to Discuss Issues in the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	6/4/2023 - 6/6/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	6/27/2023	

NOTE: The workplan will be updated as the Working Group moves through the plan. Some open meetings may be cancelled if there is nothing to discuss.

2023 PRIVACY PROTECTIONS (H) WORKING GROUP WORKPLAN

Activity	Date(s)	Date Finished
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	7/11/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	7/25/2023	
SUMMER NATIONAL MEETING-CONTINUE DISCUSSION of the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	8/13/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	9/12/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	9/26/2023	
Open Call to Discuss Changes to the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	10/10/2023	
Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674) Finalized and sent to Legal	10/20/2023	
Send Final Draft of Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	11/3/2023	
Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674) Vote by Privacy Protections (H) Working Group	11/7/2023	
Submit the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674) for posting on the PPWG's webpage	11/9/2023	
Post the Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674)	11/15/2023	
Draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Act (674) Presented to H Committee for Approval	NAIC Fall National Meeting 11/28/23 – 12/4/23	

NOTE: The workplan will be updated as the Working Group moves through the plan. Some open meetings may be cancelled if there is nothing to discuss.

March 3, 2023

NAIC Privacy Protections (H) Working Group
NAIC Central Office
1100 Walnut Street
Suite 1500
Kansas City, MO 64106

Attn: Lois Alexander, NAIC Market Regulation Manager
Via email: lalexander@naic.org

Dear Chair Johnson, Vice Chairs Amann and Aufenthie, and Members of the Privacy Protections Working Group:

The undersigned joint trades commend the Privacy Protections (H) Working Group (Working Group) for its ongoing commitment to the significant task of developing a new draft Consumer Privacy Protections Model Law (Model #674). Protecting consumer privacy is a serious matter for consumers, producers, and insurers alike. We appreciate the time, energy, and consideration already undertaken by members of the Working Group.

We are deeply engaged in the development of Model #674 and our organizations are diligently gathering feedback from our members. We plan to provide constructive and meaningful feedback in the coming weeks. However, we believe a model law addressing a topic as wide-reaching as consumer privacy, and which applies to all lines of insurance, deserves an opportunity for comprehensive substantive stakeholder engagement.

To that end, we respectfully propose the addition of an in-person stakeholder drafting session to provide regulators, industry, and consumer representatives an opportunity to discuss together all the important provisions within the draft model. The NAIC has hosted such meetings in the past, especially around critically important organizational priorities like this one.¹ Given the NAIC's recent announcement of its regulatory strategic priorities for 2023, which include privacy concerns, we believe this is an appropriate request.

We believe our organizations and the Working Group share the same overarching goal -- to ensure this important work is done collaboratively and efficiently. Our request is not intended to delay the process. We hope it demonstrates our commitment to constructive and thorough engagement with regulators and consumer advocates. We continue to prepare detailed comments to offer by the April 3 deadline, as well as during the upcoming Spring National Meeting. We believe the requested session could be held after sufficient time has passed for the Working Group to thoroughly consider initial stakeholder comments and prepare for constructive dialogue and engagement together. We believe this would be consistent with the spirit of the practical suggestions made in the Working Group's cover letter to the exposure draft of

¹ For example, stakeholder drafting sessions were held as the NAIC drafted the Group Capital Calculation Revisions to the Insurance Holding Company System Regulatory Act (#440), LTCI related revisions to the Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Association Model Act (#520), and best interest standard amendments to the Suitability in Annuity Transactions Model Regulation (#275).

Model #674 (see item (2)), respect the investment and dedication of the Working Group, and serve as a worthwhile forum to facilitate communication.

We, the undersigned organizations, want to express our deep appreciation to the Working Group for its leadership in developing the draft model. Thank you for your consideration of this request. Our organizations look forward to continued collaboration on this important issue.

Please do not hesitate to contact any of the organizations below with questions.

Sincerely,

American Council of Life Insurers

Kristin Abbott
202-624-2162
kristinabbott@acli.com

America's Health Insurance Plans

Bob Ridgeway
501-333-2621
bridgeway@ahip.org

American Property Casualty Insurance Association

Shelby Schoensee
202-828-7139
Shelby.schoensee@apci.org

Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America

Wes Bissett
202-302-1607
Wes.bissett@iiaba.net

National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies

Cate Paolino
508-431-0484
cpaolino@namic.org

National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors

Maeghan Gale
703-770-8192
mgale@naifa.org

National Association of Professional Insurance Agents

Lauren Pachman
202-431-1414
lpachman@pianational.org

Reinsurance Association of America

Tom Smith
202-783-8320
smith@reinsurance.org