

# LATE TESTIMONY



**Testimony of Michael Bagley  
Director of Public Policy for Verizon  
Before the  
Committee on Consumer Protection and  
Committee on Judiciary  
On H.B. 2047  
February 22, 2012**

The Honorable Robert Herkes  
Chair, Committee on Consumer Protection  
Hawaii Senate

The Honorable Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran  
Chair, Committee on Judiciary  
Hawaii Senate

**Re: *H.B. 2047 – Identity Theft***

Dear Chairmen Herkes and Keith-Agaran:

On behalf of Verizon, I am writing this testimony in opposition to H.B. 2047, legislation addressing identity theft prevention.

Verizon takes very seriously the obligation to protect the identity of its customers and ensure their privacy protection. We believe that this is something that any responsible business does in order to ensure the long-term reliability and viability of a secure and positive relationship with its customers. No business can survive if it doesn't have mechanisms and procedures in place to protect the privacy of customers.

Verizon therefore has already established national policies and protocols that are designed to keep personal information of our customers secure and confidential. These policies aren't named "identity theft" policies -- our interests are broader than that -- but as a byproduct of the protective measures we have in place, identity theft is one of the things our protective measures could help avoid.

That said, one issue with this legislation is that it requires businesses to train "all" employees. That is too broad a requirement. All our employees receive general privacy

# LATE TESTIMONY

practice-related training, but not all receive the specialized security-based training that those with access to highly secure information receive. The requirement would make sense if it were limited to employees who have access to the relevant data.

As drafted, H.B. 2047 is too over-reaching and burdensome. It assumes that there is a huge vacuum that needs to be filled with onerous mandates, and doesn't allow businesses the flexibility to demonstrate what they already do. Our business has spent millions of dollars on computer security and protection against identity theft. Legislation that requires a written policy and procedure to prevent identity theft makes no sense if companies already have such policies in place. Policies that cost a great deal of capital resources to develop and implement.

Worst still, H.B. 2047 seeks to dictate what the policy should include, again without giving companies credit for already having good policies in place. Similarly, as mentioned before, the training mandate is overly broad and overly burdensome. Especially during this recession, it sends the wrong signal to businesses to legislate that they do something in a specific manner like this at great cost, when they already have adequate policies in place to address reasonable concerns with regard to protection against identity theft.

H.B. 2047 goes too far and is burdensome and unnecessary. **We urge the Committee to vote "NO."**