




- State MicroBoTS would have three branches:
 - Pilot Projects: A community ombudsman to scale information sharing with local government + a (small) team to “future proof” the state tech economy with bottom-up community led projects solving real problems; “Build the Future” contests and other bottom-up efforts; a state-first, safety-first “State of Tomorrow” tech incubator; computer security infrastructure tiger teams to help updating and incident response.
 - Policy, Futures, and Rulemaking: Rulemaking focused on empowering market mechanisms, e.g. creating uniform public disclosures of baselines of safety and market information integrity; requiring security threat modeling and planning for data center deprecation and reuse. State MicroBoTS would nudge shared goals with expertise, mitigating tech staff shortages in agencies.
 - Enforcement: Tech safety enforcement to assist/collaborate with/supplement other agencies’ work as needed with additional tech expertise, filling tech safety gaps; fraud and deception enforcement in connection with State MicroBoTS’s

disclosure-based filings – State BoTS should have civil and criminal fining authority; tech safety whistleblower office.

- Two immediate priority areas: (1) data center public nuisance monitoring and mitigation and (2) computer security threat mitigation.
- Focus on tech safety, bottom-up tech competition enhancement, and tech fraud.
 - A different “friendly expert” agency model that scales – driven by bottom-up technology reality for local government and communities
 - Local governments do not have a fair shot of keeping up with Big Tech policy/ maneuvers
 - Peer collaboration and gap filling across existing agencies + a technology regulator of last resort;
 - Nimble, financially self-sustaining, entrepreneurial, and First Amendment sensitive by design;
 - A technology neutral approach that will scale alongside future tech.
 - Corrects unfair under-regulation of big tech compared to traditional industries. Compare (the necessary extent of) food safety regulation – tech has the same issues re: supply chain control, fragility, risk of physical harm. States such as PA have multiple agencies that consider food safety (plus AG), but zero for tech.
 - Addresses rampant technology fraud that is hurting market mechanisms and honest businesses. MicroBoTS would facilitate market recognition of safety-first tech companies.