

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

July 13, 2015

Ms. Yael Weinman
Vice President
Global Privacy and General Counsel
Information Technology Industry Council
1101 K Street, N.W. Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Ms. Weinman,


Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade on Wednesday, March 18, 2015, to testify at the hearing entitled "Discussion Draft of H.R. ____, Data Security and Breach Notification Act of 2015."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Monday, July 27, 2015. Your responses should be mailed to Kirby Howard, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to Kirby.Howard@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Michael C. Burgess
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade

cc: Jan Schakowsky, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Michael C. Burgess

1. We have heard a lot about the issues companies face complying with 47 different State data breach notification laws. How would your member companies navigate complying with 47 different State data security requirements? Does that change if the States include specific technical or process requirements?
2. Why is the draft bill's preemption of existing State laws important for both consumers and businesses?