

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 8, 2006 LB 876

determine that. But historically across the United States...California actually had passed a bill and what they have found is they had required notice the minute anything was missing. They would often find that it was still there in the office, it hadn't been breached by someone who was unauthorized, and in event notices were sent. It became like crying wolf, and people can stop paying attention to a notice when it arrives repeatedly, and then they find that their fears were unfounded. So this was put together, this type of language was put together on a national level to come up with a uniform standard that could be used in all 50 states so that companies that operate in multijurisdictions would have a uniform standard to meet, and this would meet that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So this is uniform...this is an attempt at a uniform approach.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Yes, it is.

SENATOR BEUTLER: The part of Section 4 that I was just talking about, that triggers the investigation if the information has been or will be used, "has been" seems clear. They can figure that out in some cases. How do they know if it will be used? And is that too high a standard? Should it be "could be" used? You know, it...I don't know how you would prove that it will be used, but it seems to me there's a danger oftentimes if it could be used; that is, they would know that information has escaped the system...

SENATOR REDFIELD: Well, I think that the company would...most easily determine whether that information could be/would be used by someone for an unauthorized purpose, first of all, in the fact that they're not authorized to have it. This is someone who should not have this data, has no right to it for a legitimate business purpose, and if in fact they do, the assumption is that there is a bad purpose intended. But there are also some times where it's an innocent party and someone left something up on their computer screen, another employee is nearby, perhaps they were not authorized to use it but had saw it, but there was no intent and certainly no danger that they were going to use it for a bad purpose.