Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Buffy Wicks, Chair
SB 898 (Weber Pierson) – As Amended June 25, 2026

Policy Committee:	Privacy and Consumer Protection	Vote:	11 - 4
	Judiciary		8 - 3

Urgency: No	State Mandated Local Program: No	Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill requires a manufacturer of a connected consumer product to establish and disclose a minimum guaranteed support timeframe for the product, to provide notice before and upon the product reaching its end of life, and makes a violation a deceptive act or practice enforceable under the Unfair Competition Law (UCL).

Specifically, this bill:

1) Requires a manufacturer to clearly and conspicuously disclose a connected consumer product's minimum guaranteed support timeframe to a prospective buyer at the point of internet sale, on the product packaging, and on the manufacturer's website, to the extent each is technically feasible.

2) Prohibits a manufacturer from reducing a disclosed minimum guaranteed support timeframe unless the manufacturer demonstrates that providing support is not feasible due to enumerated unforeseeable circumstances beyond the manufacturer's reasonable control, including bankruptcy, loss of a necessary third-party dependency, illegality, or an unremediable safety or security condition.

3) Requires a manufacturer to set the minimum guaranteed support timeframe consistent with the reasonable expectations of a consumer, based on the nature and price of the product, how the product is marketed, and the support timeframes of comparable products.

4) Requires a manufacturer to provide a standalone notice to the public and to any owner, both six months before and upon the product reaching its end of life, describing steps to continue using the product and the features, security risks, and other changes resulting from end of life.

5) Requires a business that leases or provides a connected consumer product as part of a service to promptly apply security patches to the extent technically feasible and, upon end of life, to notify the customer and replace the product at no additional cost with a comparable supported product if one is reasonably available.

6) Provides that a violation of the chapter constitutes a deceptive act or practice under the UCL, and defines "connected consumer product," "end of life," "manufacturer," "minimum guaranteed support timeframe," and "ordinary use."

FISCAL EFFECT:

1) Possible costs to the Department of Justice (DOJ) of an unknown amount (Unfair Competition Law Fund) to investigate and prosecute violations of the bill. Actual costs will depend on whether the Attorney General pursues enforcement actions for violations of the bill's disclosure, notice, and support requirements. UCL enforcement is discretionary, and the Attorney General, district attorneys, and specified city attorneys already possess UCL enforcement authority.

2) Cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the courts to adjudicate any additional filings. Violations of the bill are enforceable under the UCL by public prosecutors and by private plaintiffs who have suffered injury in fact and lost money or property, and opposition contends the enforcement mechanism could generate large-scale, attorney-driven litigation, including class actions, based on technical violations. Actual costs will depend on the number of cases filed and the amount of court time needed to resolve each case. It generally costs approximately $1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The state budget provides annual General Fund backfills to the Trial Court Trust Fund to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately $117.3 million in 2025-26.

COMMENTS:

1) **Purpose**. The author contends that connected "smart" products increasingly rely on ongoing software support, and that consumers should know in advance and on the date a manufacturer stops providing critical updates, because products may lose features, become vulnerable to security risks, or stop working altogether. The author cites a Federal Trade Commission staff report finding that nearly 90% of surveyed manufacturers' webpages failed to disclose how long products would receive software updates, and states that the bill establishes a transparency framework so consumers can make informed purchasing decisions. This bill is supported by Consumer Reports and other consumer protection organizations.

2) **Background**. Connected consumer products often depend on manufacturer software support to function as advertised, and when support ends a device may lose features, become insecure, or stop working despite remaining physically intact. Existing law requires connected devices to include reasonable security features but does not require manufacturers to disclose how long a device will receive updates or support. This bill establishes disclosure and notice requirements and, rather than a fixed minimum support period, requires the support timeframe to be consistent with reasonable consumer expectations. The bill compels manufacturers to make specified commercial disclosures, which implicates commercial speech under the First Amendment. The policy committee analyzed the disclosure requirement and concluded the bill likely does not raise First Amendment concerns. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

3) **Support and Opposition**. This bill is supported by Consumer Reports, CALPIRG, the Secure Resilient Future Foundation, and other consumer and cybersecurity organizations, which argue the bill helps consumers make informed purchases, improves cybersecurity by reducing the number of unsupported connected devices, and reduces electronic waste. The bill is opposed by the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, the Consumer Technology

Association, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, the California Chamber of Commerce, the Civil Justice Association of California, and other industry groups. Opponents contend that the definition of "connected consumer product" is overly broad and may sweep in motor vehicles and other products with distinct lifecycles, that the leasing replacement requirement is impractical as applied to vehicles, and that the UCL enforcement mechanism exposes manufacturers to disproportionate litigation risk, including for inadvertent or technical violations.

Analysis Prepared by: Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081