

February 24, 2026

The Honorable Pam Beidle
Chair
Senate Finance Committee
Maryland Senate
3 East Miller Senate Office Building
11 Bladen Street
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: SB 616 (Hester) - Business Regulation - Data Broker Registry – Unfavorable

Dear Chair Beidle and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of TechNet, I'm writing to share concerns on SB 616.

TechNet is the national, bipartisan network of technology CEOs and senior executives that promotes the growth of the innovation economy by advocating a targeted policy agenda at the federal and 50-state level. TechNet's diverse membership includes 103 dynamic American businesses ranging from startups to the most iconic companies on the planet and represents five million employees and countless customers in the fields of information technology, artificial intelligence, e-commerce, the sharing and gig economies, advanced energy, transportation, cybersecurity, venture capital, and finance.

Our member companies consistently place a high priority on consumer privacy, and the technology industry is committed to privacy and security. However, we are concerned about SB 616 for several reasons. In our view, this bill is overbroad. As defined, a "Data Broker" appears to include any business that collects data, which would effectively encompass nearly all businesses. The definitions are difficult to interpret because the definition of "Data Brokering" appears inconsistent with the definition of "Brokered Personal Data". Moreover, each of these terms use other terms that remain undefined in the bill, such as "sale". Additionally, many of the terms in SB 616 do not match up with the Maryland Online Data Privacy Act. For example, SB 616 references "Biometric Information" while the Maryland privacy law references "Biometric Data", and the two definitions differ. Additionally, the two frameworks take different approaches to defining "Personal Data".

The bill contains several exemptions, but they also do not align with the state's privacy law, which creates conflicting requirements. Additionally, should this bill advance, we believe that the state, a unit of the state, local governments, and/or a business entity doing work with the state should also be subject to SB 616's requirements under the public registry provision to ensure a level playing field.

Governments have a vast amount of consumer data and should be subject to similar regulations.

For these reasons, we believe that adopting Oregon's data broker law would be a better approach as it establishes a registry that is properly calibrated to include the companies that are actually data brokers, while ensuring that the rest of the business community is covered by their comprehensive data privacy law as required. TechNet has linked a copy of that language [here](#).

Lastly, we note that our membership is comprised of companies who are both included as data brokers under Oregon, as well as companies who are not included within that law, and there is agreement that the Oregon law is an acceptable path forward.

Data providers benefit the public and government by providing valuable and cost-effective access to data, which provide value-added services. Data providers help with public safety, reduce costs, and facilitate commerce. For the reasons stated above, TechNet is opposed to SB 616 in its current form. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Sincerely,



Margaret Durkin
TechNet Executive Director, Pennsylvania & the Mid-Atlantic