



January 23, 2024

House Communications, Technology and Innovation: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation
Room 206, General Assembly Building
201 North Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219

RE: HB 562 - “Commercial entity offering social media accounts; restricted hours for minors, civil liability” (Oppose)

Dear Chair Hayes and Members of the House Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), I write to raise several concerns regarding HB 562. CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.¹ Proposed regulations on the interstate provision of digital services therefore can have a significant impact on CCIA members. In recent sessions, there has been a notable surge in state legislation concerning children’s online safety.

CCIA holds a firm conviction that children are entitled to a higher level of security and privacy in their online experiences. Presently, our members are actively engaged in various initiatives to integrate robust protective design features into their websites and platforms.² CCIA’s members have been leading the effort to implement settings and parental tools to individually tailor younger users’ online use to the content and services that are suited to their unique lived experience and developmental needs. For example, various services allow parents to set time limits, provide enhanced privacy protections by default for known child users, and other tools to allow parents to block specific sites entirely.³ Every family has a different approach to how they use technology and the internet — children and families have the ability to learn, explore interests, and maintain connections with family and friends. The outright ban on accessing accounts between 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. is a large departure from how parents can currently choose how they manage their own home.

This is also why CCIA supports the implementation of digital citizenship curriculum in schools, to not only educate children on proper social media use but also help educate parents on what mechanisms presently exist that they can use now to protect their children the way they see fit and based on their family’s lived experiences.⁴ In fact, the Virginia General Assembly passed HB 1575 in 2023 establishing the Internet Safety Advisory Council for the purpose of advancing the goal of safe use of media and technology by students and teachers in public elementary and secondary schools in the Commonwealth. Among other duties, the Council must develop instructional content on the risks of transmitting personal information on the internet and the importance of privacy protection.

It should also be recognized that protecting children from harm online does not include a generalized power to restrict ideas to which one may be exposed. Speech that is neither obscene to young people

¹ For more than 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than \$100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at <https://www.ccianet.org/members>.

² Jordan Rodell, *Why Implementing Education is a Logical Starting Point for Children’s Safety Online*, Disruptive Competition Project (Feb. 7, 2023), <https://www.project-disco.org/privacy/020723-why-implementing-education-is-a-logical-starting-point-for-childrens-safety-online/>.

³ Competitive Enterprise Institute, *Children Online Safety Tools*, <https://cei.org/children-online-safety-tools/>.

⁴ See *supra* note 2.

nor subject to other legitimate laws cannot be suppressed solely to protect young online users from ideas or images that a legislative body disfavors. Proposals to keep children safe online should be established through a risk-based approach to developing protections for different ages of users and by focusing on tangible harm. While CCIA shares the goal of increasing online safety, this bill presents the following concerns.

1. This legislation could lead to the cessation of services for younger users, impeding teens' access to the internet and, consequently, limiting their First Amendment right to information. This includes access to supportive online communities that might not be available in their physical location.

The Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) and associated rules at the federal level currently regulate how to address users under 13, a bright line that was a result of a lengthy negotiation process that accounted for the rights of all users, including children, while also considering the compliance burden on businesses. To avoid collecting data from users under 13, some businesses chose to shut down various services when COPPA went into effect due to regulatory complexity – it became easier to simply not serve this population. Younger users could face a similar fate as HB 562 would implement more complex vetting requirements tied to parental consent for minors.

When businesses are required to deny access to social networking sites or other online resources, such as Wikipedia or messaging services offered through social media platforms, this may also unintentionally restrict children's ability to access and connect with like-minded individuals and communities. For example, in instances where children may be in unsafe households, this could create an impediment for children seeking communities of support or resources to get help.

Serious concerns also arise when verifying whether a "parent or guardian" is in fact a minor's legal parent or guardian. Many parents and legal guardians do not share the same last name as their children due to remarriage, adoption, or other cultural or family-oriented decisions. If there is no authentication that a "parent or guardian" is actually a minor's legal parent or guardian, this may incentivize minors to ask other adults who are not their legal parent or guardian to verify their age on behalf of the minor to register for an account with a "commercial entity offering social media accounts." It is also unclear who would be able to give consent to a minor in foster care or other nuanced familial situations, creating significant equity concerns. Further, scenarios where a legal parent or guardian is not located in Virginia or is not a resident of the state creates significant confusion for consumers and businesses.

The hyperconnected nature of social media has led many to allege that online services may be negatively impacting teenagers' mental health. However, some researchers argue that this theory is not well supported by existing evidence and repeats a "moral panic" argument frequently associated with new technologies and new modes of communication. Instead, social media effects are nuanced,⁵ small at best, reciprocal over time, and gender-specific. Additionally, a study conducted by researchers from Columbia University, the University of Rochester, the University of Oxford, and the University of Cambridge found that there is no evidence that associations between adolescents' digital

⁵ Amy Orben *et al.*, *Social Media's enduring effect on adolescent life satisfaction*, PNAS (May 6, 2019), <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1902058116>.



technology engagement and mental health problems have increased.⁶ Particularly, the study shows that depression’s relation to both TV and social media use was practically zero. The researchers also acknowledged that it is possible, for example, that as a given technology becomes adopted by most individuals in a group, even individuals who do not use that technology could become indirectly affected by it, either through its impacts on peers or by them being deprived of a novel communication platform in which social life now takes place.

2. Parental consent requirements for online businesses are currently being litigated in several jurisdictions.

Ohio and Arkansas recently enacted legislation that would implement online parental consent requirements — each law is currently facing a legal challenge due to constitutional concerns, and judges recently put both laws on hold until these challenges can be fully reviewed. The fate of a similar law in Utah is also in jeopardy as it is also facing legal challenges.⁷ CCIA recommends that lawmakers permit this issue to be more fully examined by the judiciary before burdening businesses with legislation that risks being invalidated and passing on expensive litigation costs to taxpayers. The bill also raises questions surrounding what would be considered adequate “permission” from a parent or guardian to allow their child to be granted access during the bill’s proposed prohibited hours.

* * * * *

We appreciate the Committee’s consideration of these comments and stand ready to provide additional information as the General Assembly considers proposals related to technology policy.

Sincerely,

Khara Boender
State Policy Director
Computer & Communications Industry Association

⁶ Amy Orben, Andrew K. Przybylski, Matti Vuorre, *There Is No Evidence That Associations Between Adolescents’ Digital Technology Engagement and Mental Health Problems Have Increased*, Sage Journals (May 3, 2021), <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2167702621994549>.

⁷ *NetChoice, LLC v. Griffin* (W.D. Ark. 5:23-cv-05105); *NetChoice, LLC v. Yost* (S.D. Ohio 2:24-cv-00047); *NetChoice, LLC v. Reyes* (D. Utah 2:23-cv-00911); *Zoulek et al. v. Hass & Reyes* (D. Utah 2:24-cv-00031).