



February 18, 2026

Arizona Senate
Senate Regulatory Affairs and Government Efficiency Committee
1700 W Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: SB 1747 – "Relating to Minors Access to Technology Content." (Oppose)

Dear Chair Bolick, Vice Chair Carroll and Members of the Senate Regulatory Affairs and Government Efficiency Committee:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), I write to respectfully oppose SB 1747. CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.¹ Proposed regulations on the intrastate provision of digital services therefore can have a significant, nationwide impact on CCIA members.

CCIA firmly believes that children are entitled to security and privacy online. Our members have designed and developed parental tools to individually tailor younger users' online use to their 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 allow parents to block specific sites entirely.² This is also why CCIA supports implementing digital citizenship curricula in schools, to not only educate children on proper social media use but also help teach parents how they can use existing mechanisms and tools to protect their children as they see fit.³

However, protecting children from harm online does not include a generalized power to restrict ideas to which one may be exposed. Lawful speech cannot be suppressed solely to protect young online users from ideas or images that a legislative body disfavors.⁴ While CCIA shares the goal of increasing online safety, this bill presents the following concerns.

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 Competitive Enterprise Institute, *Children Online Safety Tools*, <https://cei.org/children-online-safety-tools/> (last updated June 10, 2025).

³ Jordan Rodell, *Why Implementing Education is a Logical Starting Point for Children's Safety Online*, Disruptive Competition Project (Feb. 7, 2023), <https://project-disco.org/privacy/020723-why-implementing-education-is-a-logical-starting-point-for-childrens-safety-online/>.

⁴ *Erznoznik v. City of Jacksonville*, 422 U.S. 205, 212–14 (1975). See also *FCC v. Pacifica Found.* 438 U.S. 726, 749–50 (1978); *Pinkus v. United States*, 436 U.S. 293, 296–98 (1978).



The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly struck down laws containing speech restrictions intended to prevent harm to minors.

In 1997, the Supreme Court held that “the First Amendment does not tolerate” laws that “reduce[] the adult population ... to reading only what is fit for children.”⁵ Yet SB 1747 effectively does exactly this: in order to restrict access to content potentially harmful to children, the proposed bill would restrict both children and adults’ access to such content. The First Amendment applies to teens as well as adults.⁶

Nor do states have the authority to require parental consent for viewing such content; the Court has likewise rejected the argument that “the state has the power to prevent children from hearing or saying anything without their parents’ prior consent.”⁷ Accordingly, the proposed bills unconstitutionally undermine established free speech protections for users of all ages.

For these reasons, the vast majority of lower courts that have ruled on the issue have held that the First Amendment does not permit states to require age verification to access protected speech.⁸ Most recently, a Texas federal court recently blocked a similar mandate on First Amendment grounds, noting that since “nothing suggests Texas’s interest in preventing minors from accessing a wide variety of apps that foster protected speech (such as the Associated Press, the Wall Street Journal, Substack, or Sports Illustrated) is compelling,”⁹ such a law “fails strict scrutiny” and “would fail intermediate scrutiny as well.”¹⁰

The Court further held in 2024 that “regulating the content-moderation policies” of websites “to change the speech that will be displayed there... is a preference” that states “may not impose.”¹¹ However, SB 1747 determines which entities are covered based on their choices regarding how to display content, such as “seamless content”, “displays [of] personal interactive metrics”, etc. Accordingly, SB 1747 regulates businesses differently based on their chosen method of displaying protected speech to their users. By broadly controlling how services organize, present, and prioritize information to users, the bill creates impermissible content-based restrictions on speech.

⁵ *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 888 (1997) (cleaned up).

⁶ See, e.g., *id.* at 855-56.

⁷ *Brown v. Ent. Merchs. Ass’n*, 564 U.S. 786, 795 n. 3 (2011).

⁸ See, e.g., *CCIA v. Paxton*, No. 25-cv-01660, 2025 WL 3754045 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2025); *SEAT v. Paxton*, No. 25-cv-01662, 2025 WL 3731733 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2025); *NetChoice v. Griffin*, No. 5:25-CV-5140 (W.D. Ark. Dec. 15, 2025); *NetChoice v. Murrill*, No. 25-231, 2025 WL 3634112 (M.D. La. Dec. 15, 2025); *NetChoice v. Carr*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 1200 (N.D. Ga. 2025); *NetChoice v. Yost*, 778 F. Supp. 3d 923 (S.D. Ohio 2025); *NetChoice v. Griffin*, No. 23-cv-05105, 2025 WL 978607 (W.D. Ark. Mar. 31, 2025); *NetChoice v. Reyes*, 748 F. Supp. 3d 1105 (D. Utah 2024); *CCIA v. Paxton*, 747 F. Supp. 3d 1011 (W.D. Tex. 2024).

⁹ *CCIA v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3754045 at *12; *SEAT v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3731733 at *11.

¹⁰ *CCIA v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3754045 at *14-15; *SEAT v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3731733 at *14.

¹¹ *Moody v. NetChoice*, 144 S. Ct. 2383, 2408 (2024).

Age verification and parental consent requirements undermine user privacy for users of all ages.

SB 1747 contains many requirements that undermine privacy for all users. While well-meaning, age verification mandates inherently require collecting sensitive data about users and adults. Such policies run contrary to the data minimization principles underlying federal and international best practices for privacy protection.¹² Requiring individuals to share sensitive personal information with third parties, including IDs or biometrics, can make recipients a prime target for identity theft, cyberattacks, or other data breaches.¹³

Such dangers are far from hypothetical: several of the most devastating data breaches in recent years are directly attributable to age verification requirements.¹⁴ Furthermore, government officials could access this sensitive data through enforcement inquiries and processes. Compounding these problems, the bill requires covered online services to retroactively verify the ages of existing users as well as prospective ones, which unnecessarily increases the risk of malicious actors accessing the data submitted.

The more data a service is forced to collect, the greater risk it poses to consumer privacy and small business sustainability.¹⁵ A recent Digital Trust & Safety Partnership (DTSP) report, *Age Assurance: Guiding Principles and Best Practices*, found that “smaller companies may not be able to sustain their business” if forced to implement costly age verification methods, and that “[h]ighly accurate age assurance methods may depend on collection of new personal data such as facial imagery or government-issued ID.”¹⁶

The Commission Nationale de l’Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL) analyzed several existing online age verification solutions but found that none of these options could satisfactorily meet three key standards: 1) providing sufficiently reliable verification; 2) allowing for complete coverage of the population; and 3) respecting the protection of individuals’ data, privacy, and security.¹⁷ Though the intention to keep kids safe online is commendable, this bill undermines that initiative by requiring more data collection about young people.

¹² See, e.g., *Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPs)*, Fed. Privacy Council, <https://www.fpc.gov/resources/fipps/>; *Principle (c): Data Minimisation*, U.K. Info. Comm’r Off., <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/data-protection-principles/a-guide-to-the-data-protection-principles/data-minimisation/>.

¹³ Shoshana Weissmann, *Age-Verification Legislation Discourages Data Minimization, Even When Legislators Don’t Intend That*, R St. Inst. (May 24, 2023), <https://www.rstreet.org/commentary/age-verification-legislation-discourages-data-minimization-even-when-legislators-dont-intend-that/>.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Mark Tsagas, *Online Age Checking Is Creating a Treasure Trove of Data for Hackers*, The Conversation (Nov. 11, 2025), <https://theconversation.com/online-age-checking-is-creating-a-treasure-trove-of-data-for-hackers-268586>.

¹⁵ Engine, *More Than Just a Number: How Determining User Age Impacts Startups* (Aug. 2024), <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/571681753c44d835a440c8b5/t/66ad1ff867b7114cc6f16b00/1722621944736/More+Than+Just+A+Number+-+Updated+August+2024.pdf>.

¹⁶ *Age Assurance: Guiding Principles and Best Practices*, Digital Trust & Safety Partnership (Sept. 2023) at 10, https://dtspartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DTSP_Age-Assurance-Best-Practices.pdf.

¹⁷ *Online Age Verification: Balancing Privacy and the Protection of Minors*, CNIL (Sept. 22, 2022), <https://www.cnil.fr/en/online-age-verification-balancing-privacy-and-protection-minors>.

Restricting access to the internet for younger users limits their access to information and supportive communities.

Requiring businesses to deny access to social networking sites or other online resources may also unintentionally restrict children’s ability to access and connect with like-minded individuals and communities. For example, since children of certain minority groups may not live in areas where they can easily connect with others who relate to their unique experiences, an online meeting place to share such experiences and find support can have positive impacts.¹⁸

Empirical findings regarding social media’s impact on young users are much more nuanced than SB 1747’s introductory legislative findings suggest. When the U.S. Surgeon General released the advisory entitled *Social Media and Youth Mental Health* referenced in these findings, many were quick to highlight only the harms and risks it detailed. However, the advisory is much more complex and also discusses many potential benefits of social media use among children and adolescents. It concludes, for instance, that social media provides young people with communities and connections with others who share identities, abilities, and interests.¹⁹ It can also provide access to important information and create spaces for self-expression. Research further details that social media can especially benefit marginalized youth, including racial, ethnic, sexual, and gender minorities, as online peer support can mitigate the stresses they face.²⁰ Indeed, as an Ohio court noted when striking down a law age-gating social media services last year, “nearly all of the research showing any harmful effects” for minors on social media “is based on correlation, not evidence of causation.”²¹

As explained above, CCIA believes that an alternative to solving these complex issues is to work with businesses to continue their ongoing private efforts to implement mechanisms such as daily time limits or child-safe searching so that parents can have control over their own child’s social media use.

To avoid restricting teens’ access to information, SB 1747 should regulate users under 13 rather than 16 in accordance with established practices.

Due to the nuanced ways in which children under the age of 18 use the internet, it is imperative to appropriately tailor such treatments to respective age groups. For example, if a 15-year-old is conducting research for a school project, it is expected that they would come across, learn from, and discern from a wider array of materials than a 7-year-old on the internet playing video games. We would suggest changing the scope of covered users to be minors under the age of 13 to align with the federal Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) standard.²²

¹⁸ *The Importance of Belonging: Developmental Context of Adolescence*, Boston Children’s Hospital Digital Wellness Lab (Oct. 2024), <https://digitalwellnesslab.org/research-briefs/young-peoples-sense-of-belonging-online/>.

¹⁹ Off. of the Surgeon Gen., U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, *Social Media and Youth Mental Health: The U.S. Surgeon General’s Advisory, Social Media Has Both Positive and Negative Impacts on Children and Adolescents* (2023), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK594763/>.

²⁰ *Id.*; see also Jennifer Marino et al., *Social Media Use and Health and Well-being of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth: Systematic Review*, J. Med. Internet Rsch. (Sept. 22, 2021), <https://www.imir.org/2022/9/e38449>.

²¹ *NetChoice v. Yost*, 778 F. Supp. 3d 923, 955 (S.D. Ohio 2025).

²² See 15 U.S.C. § 6501(1).



This would also allow for those over 13, who use the internet much differently than their younger peers, to continue to benefit from its resources.

* * * * *

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

Sincerely,

Aodhan Downey
State Policy Manager, West Region
Computer & Communications Industry Association