April 27, 2026
Senate Commerce and Consumer Protection
Minnesota Senate Building
95 University Avenue W.
Saint Paul, MN 55155

mntech
Minnesota Technology Association

Dear Chair Klein and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Minnesota Technology Association (MnTech) and our member companies, we write regarding S.F. 4696. MnTech and our members share the committee's commitment to ensuring that all Minnesotans—especially young people—are able to engage with technology in meaningful, ethical, and safe ways. However, as drafted, the bill relies on mechanisms that are technically unworkable, create incentives that may expand rather than limit the collection of personal data about Minnesotans, and impose disproportionate litigation exposure without corresponding gains in child safety. While the bill's direct obligations apply to platforms with more than $1 billion in global advertising revenue, its downstream effects would be felt across Minnesota's technology ecosystem. This includes many MnTech member companies that build on, integrate with, or depend on those platforms, as well as the Minnesotans—families, educators, and students—who rely on these services every day.

Our concerns with the language fall into three primary areas:

First, the bill's age-estimation framework creates strong incentives for covered platforms to expand behavioral profiling of users in Minnesota. To meet the bill's confidence thresholds while minimizing statutory liability, platforms will be pushed toward analyzing additional behavioral and usage signals, not fewer. Although the bill is framed as a privacy-enhancing measure, its practical effect would likely be to encourage broader and more intensive data collection, running counter to that stated goal.

Second, the bill's core technical standards are undefined and not auditable. Terms such as "80 percent confidence" and "reasonable means" lack accepted industry definitions and would ultimately be interpreted after the fact by courts. When combined with a $10,000 statutory damages floor, a private right of action, tolling until an account holder turns 18, and the possibility of punitive damages, this structure invites opportunistic litigation. It also leaves covered platforms—and the Minnesota businesses whose products and services depend on them—without a clear or predictable path to compliance from the outset.

Finally, the bill's categorical prohibitions sweep in neutral and beneficial design features. Tools such as push notifications, autoplay, and recognition features are widely used across educational applications, accessibility tools, and youth-focused programs that parents and educators actively rely on. Many of these products reach young Minnesotans through covered platforms. A blanket prohibition fails to distinguish between design patterns that may cause harm and those that provide clear educational, accessibility, or safety benefits, with real consequences for Minnesota developers and families.

MnTech recognizes that online harms to young people are real, and we are committed to working with the author and the committee on a framework that is narrowly tailored, technically measurable, and aligned with federal law. We respectfully urge the committee not to advance S.F. 4696 in its current form and welcome the opportunity to engage on an alternative approach that better achieves shared child safety goals without unintended consequences.

Respectfully,

Joel Crandall
President, Minnesota Technology Association