The Privacy Policy Landscape After the GDPR

Abstract: Every new privacy regulation brings along the question of whether it results in improving the privacy for the users. The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is one of the most demanding and comprehensive privacy regulations of all time. Hence, a few months after it went into effect, it is natural to study its impact on the landscape of privacy policies online. In this work, we conduct the first longitudinal, in-depth, and at-scale assessment of privacy policies before and after the GDPR. We gauge the complete consumption cycle of these policies, from the first user impressions until the compliance assessment. We create a diverse corpus of 3,686 English-language privacy policies for which we fetch the pre-GDPR and the post-GDPR versions. Our user study, with 460 participants on Amazon MTurk, does not indicate a significant change in the visual representation of privacy policies from the users’ perspective. We also find that the readability of privacy policies suffers under the GDPR, due to almost a 23% more sentences and words, despite the efforts to reduce the reliance on passive sentences.

We further develop a new workflow for the automated assessment of requirements in privacy policies, building on automated natural language processing techniques. Using this workflow, we show that privacy policies cover more data practices, particularly around data retention, user choice, and specific audiences, and that an average of 16.5% of the policies improved across seven compliance metrics. Finally, we also assess how transparent the organizations are with their privacy practices by performing specificity analysis. In this analysis, we find evidence for positive changes triggered by the GDPR, with the specificity level, averaged over eight metrics, improving in over 19.4% of the policies.

1 Introduction

For more than two decades since the emergence of the World Wide Web, the “Notice and Choice” framework has been the governing practice for the disclosure of online privacy practices. This framework follows a market-based approach of voluntarily disclosing the privacy practices and meeting the fair information practices [18]. The EU’s recent General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) promises to change this privacy landscape drastically. As the most sweeping privacy regulation so far, the GDPR requires information processors, across all industries, to be transparent and informative about their privacy practices.

Researchers have conducted comparative studies around the changes of privacy policies through time, particularly in light of previous privacy regulations (e.g., HIPAA\(^1\) and GLBA\(^2\)) [1, 2, 4, 19]. Interestingly, the outcomes of these studies have been consistent: (1) the percentage of websites with privacy policies has been growing, (2) the detail-level and descriptiveness of policies have increased, and (3) the readability and clarity of policies have suffered.

The GDPR aims to address shortcomings of previous regulations by going further than any prior legislation. One of its distinguishing features is that non-complying entities can face hefty fines, the maximum of 20 million Euros or 4% of the total worldwide annual revenue. Companies and service providers raced to change their privacy notices by May 25\(^{th}\), 2018 to comply with the new regulations [7]. With the avalanche of updated privacy notices that users had to accommodate, a natural question follows: What is the impact of the GDPR on the landscape of online privacy policies?

Researchers have recently started looking into this question by evaluating companies’ behavior in light of the GDPR. Their approaches, however, are limited to a small number of websites (at most 14) [5, 23]. Concurrent to our work, Degeling et al. [7], performed the first large-scale study focused on the evolution of the cookie consent notices, which have been hugely reshaped by the GDPR (with 6,579 EU websites). They also touched upon the growth of privacy policies, finding that the percentage of sites with privacy policies has grown by 4.9%.

---

\(^1\) The Health Information and Portability Accountability Act of 1996.
\(^2\) The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act for the financial industry of 1999.
Methodology and Findings

Previous studies have not provided a comprehensive answer to our research question. In this paper, we answer this question by presenting the first on-scale, longitudinal study of privacy policies’ content in the context of the GDPR. We develop an automated pipeline for the collection and analysis of 3,686 English privacy policies by comparing pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions. These policies cover the privacy practices of websites from different topics and regions. We approach the problem by studying the change induced on the entire experience of the users interacting with privacy policies. We break this experience into five stages:

A. Presentation (Sec. 4). To quantify the progress in privacy policies’ presentation, we gauge the change in user perception of their interfaces via a user study involving 460 participants on Amazon Mechanical Turk. We also quantify the structural and visual changes in the policies by analyzing their HTML content. Our results do not show a significant improvement in the visual clarity and simplicity of the policies’ presentation from the users’ perspective. They do, however, show that policies are using more structured content than before.

B. Readability (Sec. 5). We study the change in the policies’ readability using six metrics that include standard readability (e.g., Flesch-Kincaid indicating an additional level of education required) and length metrics (e.g., number of words and sentences). Our readability assessment shows that reading privacy policies has become a more demanding task with the text featuring 24% more words and 23% more sentences on average. We observe, however, some evidence of policy language becoming less complicated according to standard readability metrics.

We devise an approach, inspired by goal-driven requirements engineering [20], to evaluate coverage, compliance and specificity in the privacy policies. While previous longitudinal studies either relied on manual investigations or heuristics-based search queries [11, 2, 7], we build on the recent trend of automated semantic analysis of policies. We develop a total of 24 advanced, in-depth queries that allow us to assess the evolution of content among the set of studied policies. We conduct this analysis by building on top of the Polisis framework (Sec. 6), a recent system developed for the automated analysis of privacy policies [8]. Following this approach, we perform a deeper level of semantic analysis that overcomes the limitations of keyword-based approaches.

C. Coverage (Sec. 7). We evaluate the policies’ coverage of high-level privacy practices. We find a significant improvement in the policies’ coverage of topics, highly relevant to the GDPR, such as data retention (73%), handling special audiences (13%), and user choice (12%).

D. Compliance (Sec. 8). We design seven queries that codify several of the GDPR compliance metrics, namely those provided by the UK Information Commissioner (ICO). The GDPR’s effect is evident; we find a positive trend in complying with the GDPR’s clauses: substantially more companies improved (16.5% on average) on these metrics compared to those that worsened (5.8%).

E. Specificity (Sec. 9). Finally, we design eight queries capturing how specific policies are in describing their data practices. Our results show that providers are paying special attention to make the users aware of the specific data collection/sharing practices; 19.4% of the policies are more specific in describing their data practice. Other providers, however, are attempting to cover more practices in their policies at the expense of specificity; 15.7% are less specific than before.

2 GDPR Background

As the most comprehensive privacy regulation to date, the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679), passed on April 14, 2016 and enforced on May 25, 2018, is the European Union’s approach to online privacy. The GDPR, as stated in Article 3(2), “protects fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons and in particular their right to the protection of personal data”. In this context, the GDPR defines four entities: data subjects, data controllers, data processors, and third parties. The data subjects are the users of the information systems from which data is collected. The data controller is typically the service provider (e.g., website or mobile app) with a vested interest in receiving and processing the user data. A data controller might employ a processor to process the data on its behalf. Finally, the data controller might authorize a third party (e.g., analytics agency) to process some of the user’s data.

Chapter III of the GDPR describes the rights of the data subjects; the first (Article 12) is the right to be informed about the service provider’s privacy practices “in a concise, transparent, intelligible and easily accessible form, using clear and plain language.” The service provider has to communicate its practices regarding data collection and sharing (Articles 13 and 14) as well as the rights of users associated with data collection and processing (Articles 15-22).

Under the GDPR, the service provider has to inform the user about the contact information of the controller, the purposes for data collection, the recipients of shared data, the retention period and the types of data collected. Furthermore, the service provider has to notify the users about
We assemble a dataset of privacy policies, where for each policy we have a pre-GDPR and post-GDPR version. For simplicity, we focus on privacy policies in the English Language. We define a post-GDPR policy as one that was live after May 25th, 2018. A pre-GDPR policy is one that was live at some point between Jan. 1st, 2016 and Dec. 25th, 2017. We ignore the final six months preceding the first day of enforcement as we consider this time a transitional period. In the following, we describe our methodology to create a corpus of privacy policies as highlighted in Fig. 1.

### Website Selection
Our methodology aimed at selecting websites that exhibit a topical and geographical mix. We used the Alexa Website Information Service to obtain the top links, ranked by popularity, in each of the 16 Alexa categories, spanning different topics (e.g., Adult, Arts, Business, Regional). We amended these categories by considering 9 subcategories of the Regional category (e.g., North America, Middle East, Europe). For each of the 25 categories, we considered the top 1,000 visited websites. We decided not to limit our selection to the top websites in Europe, as the GDPR applies to any data subject in the EU, whether or not the actual data processing is performed there. This step resulted in a set of 25,000 URLs, of which we counted 22,114 unique URLs.

### Policy Finder
We automatically crawled the home page of each of the URLs identified in the previous stage. We crawled the HTML using the Selenium framework and a headless Chrome Browser. We identified a set of candidate privacy policy links on the home page based on regular expressions (e.g., the presence of words like privacy, statement, notice, or policy in the URL or the title). This stage resulted in a candidate set of 14,204 policy links. In a lot of cases, initially distinct URLs refer to the same privacy policy link due to the same company owning multiple websites (e.g., YouTube owned by Google or Xbox owned by Microsoft).

### Wayback Machine Retrieval
We used the Wayback Machine from the Internet Archive to create pairs of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR instances. We fetch the post-GDPR pages from the Wayback machine, instead of directly crawling them, to avoid potential bias from the difference in the crawling approach. For each candidate policy URL, we used the python library Waybackpack to download the raw HTML. WARC files. We kept only those candidate URLs for which there was an archived version between January 1st, 2016 and December 25th, 2017 (representing the pre-GDPR version) and another archived version after May 25th, 2018 (representing the post-GDPR version). This step resulted in a set of 7,576 pairs of candidate policy URLs. We examined the candidate URLs that did not pass this stage to find that either the candidate link had no archived versions in the pre-GDPR time frame, or the website had “robots.txt” configured to block indexing.

### File Sanitization
For each downloaded HTML file (of the 7,576 pairs) from the Wayback Machine, we only kept HTML pages with a size of 1KB or larger. This filtering step removed false positives, resulting in 5,450 pairs of policies. Then, we used Boilerpipe to get the cleaned HTML of the webpage, without the unnecessary components (e.g., headers and footers). We extracted the body text using the library Beautiful Soup.

---

**Fig. 1.** Our methodology of retrieving the policy URLs.

---

Is Policy Classification

We developed a custom Is Policy classifier to decide whether the text (of the 5,450 pairs) belongs to a valid English-language policy or not. The Is Policy classifier consists of two modules. The first is a language detection module, using `langid.py` that labels non-English websites as invalid. The second module is a one-layer Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) that takes as input a vector of tokenized words and outputs the probability that the input text belongs to a privacy policy. The data used to train the classifier was composed of (1) a set of 1,000 privacy policies labeled as valid from the ACL/COLING 2014 privacy policies’ dataset released by Ramanath et al. [21] and (2) an invalid set consisting of the text from 1,000 web pages, fetched from random links within the homepages of the top 500 Alexa websites. We ensured that the latter pages do not have any of the keywords associated with privacy policies in their URL or title. The data was split into an 80% training set and a 20% testing set, and the classifier yielded a 99.09% accuracy on the testing set. The details of the architecture can be found in Appendix A.

Out of the 5,450 pairs of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR candidate policies, the Is Policy classifier assigned a valid label (i.e., an English privacy policy) with a probability higher than 0.5 to a set of 3,686 pairs of English pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. The rejected texts corresponded to candidate links that either did not have privacy policies in them or had the privacy policy embedded within the longer terms of service. We considered these rejected cases to be either non-suitable or too noisy for our further automated analysis. Hence, we focus on the set of valid 3,686 unique pairs of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR privacy policy links that we successfully obtained.

Analyzed Dataset

Table 1 shows the distribution of the valid policy pairs in our corpus over the considered 25 categories (double-counting policies that apply to multiple sites). The table shows that our privacy policy corpus exhibits balanced coverage of all the website categories, except for some regional subcategories. These regional subcategories (Central America, South America, Middle East, Africa, and Caribbean) have the lowest number of valid policy pairs because many of these websites are not in English.

Fig.2 shows the cumulative distribution of the similarity between pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. We utilized a fuzzy string matching library that employs Levenshtein Distance to calculate the distance between two strings. It is evident that while 30% of the policies have not changed at all (similarity=100%), 40% of the policies have less than 60% textual similarity between their pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions.

4 Presentation Analysis

Our first step to understanding the evolution of the privacy policies is to test for changes in the presentation of the web pages. Because these documents are meant to be user-facing, we begin our examination with a user study. We follow by objectively analyzing the policies through their structural composition. Finally, we conclude our presentation analysis by testing for a correlation between the outcomes of our two preceding experiments.

4.1 User Study

We followed a within-subjects study design, with two conditions (pre-GDPR and post-GDPR). Our goal was to have
each participant evaluate how presentable a screenshot of a privacy policy is.

4.1.1 Hypothesis

Our null hypothesis for the user evaluation of privacy policies is that there is no significant difference in users’ perception of privacy policy appearance between the pairs of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies in our sample. We reject the null hypothesis for \( p < .05 \).

4.1.2 Study Setup

Recruitment: We recruited 460 participants (so that each snapshot receives at least ten different evaluations) from Amazon Mechanical Turk. We chose participants who had >95% HIT approval rate and achieved masters status. We paid each respondent $1.30 to fill the survey that lasted 7.5 minutes on average. Out of the respondents, 40% were female, 47% had a Bachelors degree, 29% did not have a degree, and 82% were from North America. The average age of the respondents was 38 years. We did not ask for any personally identifiable information.

Study Material: We chose a representative, random set of 400 unique privacy policies by sampling at least 20 policies from each of the 16 major Alexa categories. We also ensured that each of the Regional subcategories maintains a similar representation compared to the original corpus. We followed the approach used in previous studies around websites aesthetics \([13, 22]\) to assess the presentability by using screenshots of the webpages instead of live versions. This approach avoids any bias from webpage loading times, internet speed or localized versions. We used the “webkit2png” tool\(^9\) to capture a full screenshot of each of the 800 privacy policies, which were all hosted by the Wayback Machine and reachable via their (post-GDPR) and (pre-GDPR) URL links. As these 800 screenshots included the full policy scrolled to the bottom, we cropped \(612 \times 1028\) pixels from the text body of each screenshot to display for the respondents. Two of the authors manually inspected each of the images and corrected any screenshot that was incorrectly captured.

Survey Design: We presented each respondent with a random set of 20 screenshots from the total set of 800 images. The image order was randomized per participant to compensate for the effects of learning and fatigue. The respondents were not primed about the comparative nature of the study. On average, each screenshot received 11.5 evaluations. We explicitly asked the respondents not to read the content of each screenshot, but instead to give their assessment over the images’ look and feel. For each screenshot, the respondents indicated how much they agree/disagree with a set of three statements over a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neither (N), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA)). A snapshot of the survey is available in Fig. 11 of Appendix B. These statements, which are consistent follow the usability measurement questions in \([10]\), were as follows:

- \(s1\). This policy has an attractive appearance.
- \(s2\). This policy has a clean and simple presentation.
- \(s3\). This policy creates a positive experience for me.

Additionally, we placed two anchor questions that contain badly formatted “lorem ipsum” text. We used these questions to filter out respondents with low-quality answers. At the end of the survey, the respondents filled an optional demographics survey.

4.1.3 Results

The distribution of scores can be seen in Table 2. To compare the discrete outcomes of the user study, we apply the Chi-Squared Test between the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR distributions. For the first two questions, we fail to reject the null hypothesis for \( p = 0.05 \) with scores of: \( s1 \) \( (p = 0.147) \) and \( s2 \) \( (p = 0.107) \). However, for the final question, \( s3 \), we observe a value of \( (p = 0.033) \). Even in that case, the distributions still suggest that little visual improvement has occurred overall from the user’s perspective.

Category-based Analysis

While designing the experiment, we also planned to investigate the websites grouped on a category basis. This breakdown enables us to understand the website categories where the change in presentation and appeal may be significant. We did not correct for multiple hypothesis testing because the answers to the questions for each category are disjoint. For the majority of the categories, we did not...
find evidence of a significant difference. However, for \( s_1 \), \textit{Kids and Teens} \((p=6.17e-4)\), \textit{N. America} \((p=0.038)\) and \textit{Regional} \((p=0.031)\) all reject the null hypothesis \((p=0.05)\). For \( s_2 \), \textit{Recreation} \((p=0.014)\) is significant. Finally, for \( s_3 \), \textit{Caribbean} \((p=0.033)\) and \textit{Home} \((p=0.034)\) are significant as well. One of the standoutsof this subset is \textit{Kids and Teens} as the GDPR makes a conscious effort to further protect the rights and privacy of minors. Hence, our experiment serves as an indicator that some positive steps have been made to improve the appearance of such websites’ policies.

### 4.2 HTML Layout Analysis

We study the HTML composition of privacy policies as another indicator of their presentation. We target two major types of HTML tags: \textit{structural} and \textit{style} tags. Structural tags, such as those corresponding to tables (<table>) and lists (<ul>,<ol>) allow the text on a web-page to be formatted in an itemized (and potentially more reader-friendly) manner. On the other hand, style tags, such as bold (<b>, <strong>) and italic (<i>, <em>) can potentially improve the overall experience as readers can easily distinguish key terms from the supporting text. We also study the HTML composition of the home pages of the policies to study whether changes in HTML during the studied timeframes are local to policies or site-wide phenomena.

#### 4.2.1 Hypothesis

Our null hypothesis for the HTML composition of privacy policies and homepages, for both \textit{structural} and \textit{style} tags is that there does not exist a significant difference in the number of (1) \textit{structural} or (2) \textit{style} tags between corresponding pairs of policies/homepages in the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR sets. We reject the null hypothesis for \( p < .05 \). We do not perform multiple hypothesis correction because the HTML tags for each test are independent.

#### 4.2.2 Methodology

We analyzed the simplified HTML pages of the policies described in Sec. 3. Additionally, for each pair of policies, we extracted the corresponding set of homepages from the Wayback Machine. We applied the same HTML reduction techniques as earlier to examine more comparable results. Fig. 4a plots the average number of the \textit{structural} and \textit{style} tags for the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies, and Fig. 4b plots the average number of \textit{structural} and \textit{style} tags for the corresponding homepage sets.

#### 4.2.3 Findings

For each type of HTML page, we found that the HTML tag counts follow non-normal distributions, so we applied Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test to study the differences between the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR timeframe pairs. The results of our statistical testing on both homepages and privacy policies are similar. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test for our privacy policy corpus yields \( p=1.07e-126 \) for \textit{structural} HTML tags and \( p=1.83e-59 \) for \textit{style} tags. For our comparable homepage set, we note that \( p=9.86e-11 \) for \textit{structural} HTML tags and \( p=3.11e-6 \) for \textit{style} tags. Thus, both privacy policies and homepages demonstrate a significant change in their HTML compositions between the two timeframes. We observe, however, that the per-
4.2.4 Association with User Study

We investigate whether the change in HTML counts of structure and style tags for privacy policies can be correlated to the change in that policy’s average user study score for each question. Our null hypothesis is that no significant correlation exists between (1) the difference in the average pre-GDPR and post-GDPR scores of each of the 400 policies included in the user study, and (2) the difference in the HTML counts for structure and style tags between each pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policy included in the study. We reject the null hypothesis for $p<.05$. Once more, as the distributions of HTML tag counts are non-normal, we test using the nonparametric Spearman rank correlation coefficient, $\rho$. Across all policies, we are not able to reject the null hypothesis that no significant correlation exists; the minimum $p$-value observed is $p=0.278$ among all six combinations (3 questions $\times$ 2 HTML tag types).

In conclusion, we find that this analysis provides no evidence of a significant correlation between the changes in HTML composition and the user study scores. This observation is consistent with our choice to run a user study to analyze the appeal and presentation of the privacy policies. Other factors contribute to the look and feel of a privacy policy, such as CSS tags, which we do not investigate because they are not standardized.

5 Readability Analysis

One of the goals of the GDPR is to increase users’ comprehension of websites’ data-processing. While the visual appearance of a policy is important, one of crucial features contributing to understanding a body of text is its readability.

5.1 Hypothesis

In the following, we use the extracted text from the two groups of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies, and apply six common readability metrics to the documents. For each test we conduct: we evaluate the null-hypothesis that there does not exist a significant change in readability between pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policy pairs. Since we run six tests on the same policy samples, we apply the Bonferroni correction [20]. Below, the null hypothesis is rejected when the $p$ value of the test is less than $0.05$.

5.2 Readability Metrics

We consider the following metrics:

1. **Lexicon Count**: gives the number of words available in the text: #words
2. **Syllables Count**: gives the total number of syllables available in the text: #syllables
3. **Sentence Count**: gives the number of sentences present in a text: #sentences
4. **Passive Voice Index**: gives the percentage of sentences that contain passive verb forms. To compute this score, we tokenize the text into sentences and perform dependency parsing on each sentence using the Spacy library[10]. We consider a sentence to contain a passive voice if it follows the pattern of: nsubjpass (that is Nominal subject (passive)), followed by aux (Auxiliary), and then followed by auxpass (Auxiliary (passive)). This pattern would match sentences similar to “Data is collected.”
5. **Flesch Kincaid Grade** [10]: measures the readability by accounting for the number of words per sentence and the number of syllables per word. It is presented as a U.S. grade level.
6. **Dale-Chall Readability Score** [6]: uses a white-list of 3000 words that groups of fourth-grade American students could reliably understand, declaring all the other words not on that list to be difficult.

5.3 Findings

We compute the value of each readability metric for the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions of each policy. Given the high variability in the text content of policies, we avoid using statistics requiring normal-distributions. Instead, we use the Wilcoxon signed rank test, the same statistic seen earlier in Sec. [4] to compare the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR pairs of text for each metric. Table 3 describes the key statistics of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>pre-GDPR $\mu$ (std)</th>
<th>post-GDPR $\mu$ (std)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Words</td>
<td>1697.83 (1602.90)</td>
<td>2114.42 (1992.42)</td>
<td>9.31e-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Syllables</td>
<td>2969.57 (2955.00)</td>
<td>3756.83 (4033.70)</td>
<td>9.07e-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Sentences</td>
<td>47.68 (42.01)</td>
<td>58.50 (53.59)</td>
<td>1.08e-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Passive</td>
<td>12.45 (7.93)</td>
<td>12.67 (7.28)</td>
<td>2.50e-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale-Chall</td>
<td>8.38 (3.17)</td>
<td>8.23 (2.67)</td>
<td>4.57e-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flesch-Kinc.</td>
<td>22.44 (25.70)</td>
<td>22.09 (22.00)</td>
<td>1.38e-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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All of the above metrics, except the Flesch-Kincaid Grade, reject the null hypothesis even after applying multiple-test corrections. Thus, the change in readability between our pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies is significant. Upon first glance, this may appear peculiar, as the mean and standard deviation of some metrics, such as the Dale-Chall Readability Score, appear to be nearly equal between pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. However, upon viewing the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of these metrics, it becomes apparent that the distributions of the policies’ readability scores have changed. For example, the Dale-Chall Readability Score CDF shows that approximately 20% of pre-GDPR policies have a lower score (hence making them more readable) than their post-GDPR counterparts. Conversely, 30% of the pre-GDPR policies have a higher score than their post-GDPR complement. The remaining 50% of policies exhibit approximately identical scores, which is consistent with our fuzzy-matching-based comparison findings presented earlier in Sec. 3.

While our analysis solely focuses on identifying the presence of a significant change in policy readability between our two sets, empirically the statistics suggest that service providers, possibly in the aim for higher transparency (and compliance), seem to be moving towards longer policies. Additionally, there is some evidence of policy language becoming less complicated as the Dale-Chall Readability Score, which is the metric least influenced by text length, showed an overall improvement for post-GDPR policies.

### 6 Automated Requirement Analysis

While the readability analysis captures whether the privacy policies are reader-friendly, the metrics are domain-agnostic. These metrics cannot quantify the complexity of the privacy policies. Hence, we follow a different methodology to delve deeper and assess the coverage, the compliance, and the specificity angles in the following sections.

#### 6.1 Methodology Overview

Our methodology starts by defining a set of goals or requirements. These goals are high-level and are independent of the implementation methodology. Then, we code these goals by extending a technique called structured querying over privacy policies, introduced by Harkous et al. [8]. This technique builds two levels of abstraction on top of the raw privacy policy as demonstrated in Fig. 5.

On the first level, a privacy policy is converted from a set of text segments written in natural language to a set of automatic labels that describe the embedded privacy practices. For instance, one label can indicate that the segment discusses “third-party” sharing and another can indicate that the sharing purpose is “advertising.” These labels are assigned by a set of machine-learning text classifiers trained on human annotations.

On the second level, a first-order logic query is constructed to reason about the set of labels across segments. For example, if one were to query the level of specificity of a policy describing the purpose of data collection, they would list the segments that have a purpose label. Then, they would count how many of these segments do not have the purpose label equal to “unspecified.” We further formalize the querying logic in this work by splitting the querying into two steps. The first step is filtering, where the first-order logic query is used to filter the total set of segments into a subset of relevant segments. The second step is scoring, where a scoring function is computed based on the relevant segments. We provide an example in Fig. 5 where the filtering step is used to decide on the subset of segments discussing third-party sharing with specified purposes and the scoring step assigns a score of 1 if this subset is not empty. We follow the spirit of this filtering-scoring approach for our in-depth analysis in the following sections.

This structured querying technique offers an advantage over approaches based on heuristics and keyword analysis (e.g., [3, 7]); it allows us to better cover text with varying wordings but similar semantics. Further, this technique avoids the shortcomings of the other approaches that directly use machine learning to quantify the goals (e.g., [5, 12, 13]); it is more flexible for adapting the goals (i.e., queries) as needed, without having to create new labeling data for each new goal.

In this work, we are the first to conduct a comprehensive analysis of privacy-related goals using structured querying. Our main contributions lie in the goals’ definition, the translation of these goals into queries, the volume of goals we measure, and the comparative nature of this study.

#### 6.2 Polisis

We utilize the Polisis system described by Harkous et al. [8] to generate the automated labels described within structured querying.
Polisis pre-processes a privacy policy and breaks it into a set of smaller segments (one example of such a segment is in Fig. 5). A segment is a set of consecutive sentences of a privacy policy that are semantically coherent. Polisis passes each segment through a set of classifiers to assign automatic labels describing the embedded privacy practices. These classifiers have been trained on the OPP-115 dataset created by Wilson et al. 27. The dataset consists of 115 privacy policies (267K words) with manual annotations for 23K fine-grained data practices. The privacy-policy taxonomy used for the annotation task is depicted in (Fig. 6).

Polisis labels each segment with high-level privacy categories (blue labels in Fig. 5) as well as values for lower-level privacy attributes (green labels in Fig. 5).

In particular, Polisis assigns a segment s, of a privacy policy, a set: \textit{category}(s). This set is a subset of the nine high-level privacy categories which are dark shaded in Fig. 6. Also, Polisis labels each segment with a set of values, corresponding to 20 lower-level privacy attributes (light-shaded in Fig. 5). The values corresponding to each attribute are shown as tables in Fig. 5. For example, the attribute “purpose” indicates the purposes of data processing and is represented by the set \textit{purpose}(s). If \textit{category}(s) = \textit{first-party-collection-use} and \textit{purpose}(s) = \{basic-feature, personalization, marketing\}, we conclude that the segment s describes multiple purposes for first-party data collection, which are to provide basic features, personalize the service, and use data for marketing. In addition to the labels, Polisis returns a probability measure associated with each label. Elements of the sets mentioned above are the ones classified with a probability larger than 0.5.

Following guidelines from the developers of Polisis, we retrained its classifiers so that they can execute locally. We refer the reader to the work of Harkous et al., 8 for a breakdown of the accuracy of the high-level and each of the low-level classifiers. Also, a detailed description of all the taxonomy attributes and their values is present within the OPP-115 dataset (https://usableprivacy.org/data).

7 Coverage Analysis

As the first step in the context-based analysis of privacy policies, we study the policies’ coverage of the high-level privacy categories described in Table. 4. This analysis highlights the difference in category coverage between pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. It also captures how the information content present in the policies has evolved.
The methodology for the analysis is as follows: There is a query for each category $c_j$ in which the filtering step consists of selecting the set $S$ of segments, such that $c_j \in \text{category}(s_i), \forall s_i \in S$. This is done for all policies and the score for a policy is taken to be 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0.

Fig. 7. Category Coverage for policies before and after the GDPR; $p$ values are derived from applying the Chi-Square test.

Fig. 7 displays the fraction of policies with coverage score of 1 for each of the high-level privacy categories for the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. We observe that coverage increases across all the nine categories that were considered with the largest increase being in Data Retention. This positive trend of the policies covering more privacy practices is consistent with the GDPR requirements. The GDPR emphasizes that the policies should be transparent on their practices including, but not limited to, data retention periods (Article 13(2.a)), safeguarding the user data, and providing the users with the options to access and rectify their information (Sec. 2).

For the analysis, we consider the hypothesis that there is no change in the category coverage of privacy policies after the GDPR came into effect. We use the Chi-Squared test to evaluate this hypothesis. However, since we are doing multiple tests on the same labeled data set, we apply Bonferroni correction and reject the null hypothesis only when the $p$ value is less than 5.5e$-3$. The $p$ values for each category are shown in Fig. 7. We observe that even with the reduced threshold, there is a statistically significant change in all but two categories, one of which, First Party Collection Use, already had almost full coverage in pre-GDPR policies. The null hypothesis is rejected for seven of the nine categories, suggesting that there has been a significant change in category coverage in policies in the post-GDPR period. This result indicates that policies are making an effort to be more informative.

Comparison to Manual Annotations

As mentioned in Sec. 6, this context-based analysis uses Polisis as the core querying engine. A question that comes to mind is: How well does Polisis work with these queries? To better understand how Polisis behaves at the query level, we decided to compare its results with Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). We leverage the raw annotations of the OPP-115 dataset in which each policy has been annotated by three SMEs.

After consulting with the authors of Polisis, we selected a set of 15 policies outside the training and validation sets of Polisis. We then generated the automatic labels for these policies. Therefore, we ended up with four annotations of the same policy: three by SMEs and one by Polisis.

We then passed these annotations through the querying engine to get the query results. Next, we computed the level of disagreement in these results among SMEs themselves and between Polisis and SMEs. The disagreement rate per policy is quantified by the ratio of (the number of queries with different scores between the two groups) to (the total number of queries). We then average this rate across policies.

We find that the disagreement rate for Polisis-SMEs was 0.10, which is only slightly worse than the SME-SME disagreement rate of 0.07. This observation indicates that we can rely on Polisis’ annotations as a reasonable proxy to what human annotators produce. It is important to note here that the disagreement rate is not equivalent to the error rate as the latter assumes the existence of a ground truth.

8 Compliance Analysis

Next, we study the content of the policies in light of the compliance requirements introduced by the GDPR. We rely on the UK’s Information Commissioner’s officer’s (ICO) guide to the GDPR which contains a set of guidelines for organizations to meet the provisions set in the GDPR. In particular, it includes a checklist for organizations to inform users of their rights. The guide also provides an official and structured interpretation of the GDPR, which obviates the need for our customized interpretation of the law. We translate these requirements via the filtering-scoring approach of Sec. 6 in a way that allows us to compare the privacy practices of the service providers before and after the introduction of the GDPR.

Table 5 shows the ICO checklist items, their descriptions, and their corresponding filtering and scoring logic. Since the taxonomy employed in Polisis precedes the GDPR, some of the items in the ICO’s checklists are incompatible.
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Table 5. The list of the queries derived from ICO’s GDPR checklists. ICO-Q1 – ICO-Q7 are from the “Right to be Informed” checklist. ICO-Q8 is from the “Right of Access” checklist. $S_{actions} = \{\text{collect-from-user-on-other-websites, receive-from-other-parts-of-company-}\
\text{affiliates, receive-from-other-service-third-party-named, receive-from-other-service-third-party-unnamed, track-user-on-other-websites} \}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICO Checklist Item</th>
<th>GDPR Ref.</th>
<th>Filtering Logic</th>
<th>Scoring Func.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ICO-Q1: “The purposes of processing user data.”         | 13(1.c)   | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{first-party}\} \\
\text{purpose}(s_i) &\neq \emptyset \text{ and unspecified } \notin \text{purpose}(s_i) \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q2: “The categories of obtained personal data (if personal data is not obtained from the individual it relates to).” | 14(1.d)   | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{first-party}\} \\
\text{action-first-party}(s_i) &\subset S_{actions} \\
\text{unspecified} &\notin \text{info-type}(s_i) \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q3: “The recipients of the user’s personal data.”   | 14(1.e)   | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{third-party}\} \\
\text{unspecified} &\notin \text{third-party-entity}(s_i) \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q4: “The right for the user to withdraw consent from data processing.” | 17(1.b)   | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &\in \{\text{first-party, user-choice-control}\} \\
\text{choice-type}(s_i) &= \{\text{op-out-link, op-out-via-contacting-company}\} \\
\text{choice-scope}(s_i) &= \{\text{first-party-use}\} \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q5: “The source of the personal data (if the personal data is not obtained from the individual it relates to).” | 15(1.g)   | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{first-party}\} \\
\text{action-first-party}(s_i) &\subset S_{actions} \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q6: “If we plan to use personal data for a new purpose, we update our privacy information and communicate the changes to individuals before starting any new processing.” | 13(3)     | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{policy-change}\} \\
\text{type-of-policy-change}(s_i) &= \{\text{privacy-relevant-change}\} \\
\text{unspecified} &\notin \text{how-notified}(s_i) \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |
| ICO-Q7: “Individuals have the right to access their personal data.” | 15(1)     | Consider the set $S = \{s_i\}$ such that\n\begin{align*} \text{category}(s_i) &= \{\text{user-access-edit-deletion}\} \\
\text{access-type}(s_i) &\in \{\text{view, export, edit-information}\} \end{align*} | Score = 1 if $|S| > 0$ else 0 |

with the framework, i.e. they cover newer concepts and are not quantifiable in the current framework.

We consider the compliance evidence for all the checklist items as a binary metric denoted by the existence of a segment satisfying the associated clause. An astute reader might notice that the requirements ICO-Q1, ICO-Q2, ICO-Q3, and ICO-Q5 are different than the rest as they require the policy to list purposes, categories and sources of data while the other requirements only require the policy to mention user rights such as withdrawing consent or receiving privacy updates. It may make sense to try to quantify how much information policies are providing regarding ICO-Q1, ICO-Q2, ICO-Q3, and ICO-Q5, but in the current framework, that introduces the bias of segmentation by Polisis. To make sure that the results are framework agnostic, we score and evaluate all the requirements with a binary metric.

To assess the change of compliance for each policy, according to these seven requirements, we compare their scores for pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions by breaking down the change for each requirement into four cases:

- **Requirement Worsened:** A policy used to cover the requirement in pre-GDPR version, but does not cover it in post-GDPR version i.e., score drops from 1 to 0.
- **Requirement Still Missing:** A policy did not cover the requirement in both pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions i.e., the score = 0 for both the versions.
- **Requirement Still Covered:** A policy continues to cover the requirement in both the versions i.e., the score = 1 for both the versions.
- **Requirement Improved:** A policy did not cover the requirement in the pre-GDPR version, but does cover it in the post-GDPR version, i.e., the score rises from 0 to 1.

Figure 8 shows the percentage of policies falling into each of the four cases for each ICO requirement. Similar to the methodology described in Sec. 7, we computed the disagreement rate between queries built on automated labels of Polisis and those built on annotations of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from the OPP-115 dataset [27]. The disagreement rate averaged across 15 policies for Polisis-SMEs was found to be 0.21, which is comparable to the SME-SME disagreement rate of 0.19. We note that the dis-
agreement rate is higher than that of coverage because of the added level of classification involved in the ICO queries.

![Fig. 8. The comparison of ICO scores of policies before and after the GDPR. The queries for the ICO checklist can be found in Table 5.]

**Case 1: Requirements Worsened**

For the vast majority of the policies, there has not been a noticeable decline in the covered ICO requirements. This decline has been limited to less than 10% for most of the policies. We observe that ICO-Q3 and ICO-Q5, referring to recipients of collected data and users’ right to withdraw consent from data processing, to exhibit the highest decline among the seven requirements.

**Case 2: Requirements Still Missing**

Despite the GDPR’s emphasis on the right of the users to be informed, we find that many privacy policies are not compliant with its requirements, with the notable exception of ICO-Q3, which only 8% of the policies fail to comply with. The GDPR makes a distinction for the source of the personal data. The service provider has to specify the sources and categories of personal data that are not obtained directly from the users. While privacy policies generally articulate the information they directly collect (e.g., through mobile app or website) about the users, they do not address the data they obtain about their users from other sources (e.g., other companies). This is captured in ICO-Q2 for which about 56% of the policies are still not compliant with. Not all policies are expected to get such data indirectly, but these numbers are large enough to monitor in future benchmarks. We also observe that about 46% of the policies are not compliant with ICO-Q1 which covers the purpose of processing user data. This suggests that despite an overall improvement in compliance with ICO requirements, most of the policies are still not being forthcoming regarding their data collection methods and purposes.

**Case 3: Requirements Still Covered**

From Figure 8 we observe that except for ICO-Q1 and ICO-Q2, a healthy portion of policies were, and are still compliant with the ICO requirements. This suggests that the policies are still being forthcoming with their practices, especially for ICO-Q3, 4, 6, and 7, which require the policy to talk about user choice, notification, and recipients of collected data.

**Case 4: Requirements Improved**

Finally, a considerable portion of policies have improved their coverage of the ICO requirements. ICO-Q1, ICO-Q3, and ICO-Q5 have seen the highest improvement among the policies in our dataset. We observe that only a minority of the policies (mostly from the more popular websites) have started addressing the previously missing requirements (such as ICO-Q4, ICO-Q6). For example, NYTimes has added a new clause to address the requirement about notifying users about changes to the privacy policies: “We evaluate this privacy policy periodically in light of changing business practices, technology, and legal requirements. As a result, it is updated from time to time. Any such changes will be posted on this page. If we make a significant or material change in the way we use or share your personal information, you will be notified via email and/or prominent notice within the NYT Services at least 30 days prior to the changes taking effect.”

**Conclusion**

Similar to the coverage analysis, we find privacy policies to be increasingly inclusive of the GDPR’s privacy requirements. Nearly 82% of the policies list the recipients of the user’s data while 70% of the policies explicitly talk about notifying users of a change in policy. While many of the privacy policies are still missing several of the GDPR’s new requirements, others have complied. For example, 68% of the policies provide users with options to access their data. We also note that though the trend has been positive, the policies are still not being forthcoming regarding their data collection methods and purposes.

**9 Specificity Analysis**

Compliance and coverage describe whether a policy mentions a privacy practice. Merely mentioning a privacy practice, however, does not fully satisfy transparency; it is not clear whether these practices are covered in general or
Table 6. Table of the specificity queries applied to each pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policy. Note the separate scoring Function for Q6 and Q7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filtering Logic</th>
<th>Scoring Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates how the first party is obtaining user data.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{first-party} } ] [ \text{action-first-party}(s_i) \neq \emptyset ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{action-first-party}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates how the third party is collecting user data.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{third-party} } ] [ \text{action-third-party}(s_i) \neq \emptyset ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{action-third-party}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates the type of information accessed by the first party.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{first-party} } ] [ \text{info-type}(s_i) \neq \emptyset ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{info-type}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates the type of information shared with the third party.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{third-party} } ] [ \text{info-type}(s_i) \neq \emptyset ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{info-type}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates how the third party is receiving user information.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{third-party} } ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{third-party-entity}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: Quantify how specifically the policy covers first party collection purposes relative to all possible purposes in our taxonomy.</td>
<td>Let $P$ be the set of all purposes. [ \text{Let } P_s \text{ be the set of all purposes } p \text{ such that } \exists \text{ a segment } s_i \text{ with:} ] [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{first-party} } ] [ p \in \text{purpose}(s_i) ]</td>
<td>The specificity score is $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: Quantify how specifically the policy covers third party sharing purposes relative to all possible purposes in our taxonomy.</td>
<td>Let $P$ be the set of all purposes. [ \text{Let } P_s \text{ be the set of all purposes } p \text{ such that } \exists \text{ a segment } s_i \text{ with:} ] [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{third-party} } ] [ p \in \text{purpose}(s_i) ]</td>
<td>The specificity score is $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: Quantify how specifically the policy indicates the purpose for data retention.</td>
<td>Consider the set $S = { s_i }$ such that [ \text{category}(s_i) = { \text{data-retention} } ] [ \text{purpose}(s_i) \neq \emptyset ]</td>
<td>Take $S_a \subset S$ such that [ \text{purpose}(s_i) = \text{unspecified} ] [ \text{The specificity score is: } 1 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

specific terms. We quantify this aspect through specificity queries. For example, the statement "We collect your personal information..." covers collection by the first party but is not specific as to which type of personal information is being collected; a specific statement would be "We collect your health data...". In this section, we aim to assess the change in the level of specificity present in the privacy policies.

9.1 Queries

We use the filtering-scoring approach of Sec. 6 to quantify the policy’s specificity of describing a privacy practice. Table 6 describes the eight specificity queries (Q1 → Q8) that quantify how explicit the privacy policy is in describing: how first party is collecting data, how third-party is obtaining data, the information type collected, information type shared, purposes for data collection, purposes for data sharing, and purposes for data retention. For all the queries, a higher score indicates higher specificity.

The reader might notice a discrepancy in Table 6 in the scoring step for queries focusing on the purpose attribute (first party (Q6) and third party (Q7)) vs. the rest of the queries. We treated these cases differently due to the way Polis interpreted privacy policies. Within the Polis system, purpose($s$) = unspecified does not always imply a missing purpose of data collection/sharing. Instead, it might indicate that the purpose is not the subject of that segment. Hence, most of the segments that focus on the data types being collected or shared will carry an unspecified purpose label. Accordingly, we quantify purpose specificity, in the first party and third party contexts, as the ratio of the number of stated purposes in the policy (|$P_s$|) to the total number of possible purposes (|$P$|). On the other hand data retention is typically addressed through a single statement; if there is no such statement, then we expect that to signal specificity in explaining the purpose for data retention.
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9.2 Results

We analyze the evolution of the eight specificity scores between the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies. We also note that manual verification for specificity queries is not suitable here because segments in Polisis are different than the segments in the OPP-115 dataset and the specificity scores depend heavily on the number of segments with a particular label. We consider four cases in Fig. 9:

- **Query Not Covered**: A policy did not cover the requirement in both pre-GDPR and post-GDPR versions, i.e., \( |S| = 0 \) or \( |P| = 0 \) for both versions.
- **Same Specificity**: A policy maintains the same specificity level about a practice between the two versions, but the score is not equal to 1.
- **Fully Specified**: A policy continues to be fully specific about a practice, i.e., the score \( = 1 \) for both versions.
- **Worse Specificity**: The post-GDPR version of the policy has a lower specificity score than its pre-GDPR counterpart.
- **Improved Specificity**: The post-GDPR version of the policy has a higher specificity score than its pre-GDPR counterpart.

**Case 1: Query Not Covered**
Consistent with the results of Sec. 7, we find that the purpose of data retention practice (Q8) is not frequently covered among the studied policies. Also, we find that close to 7% of the policies do not cover the queries Q2, Q4, and Q5, because they do not cover the third party sharing category. This observation is also consistent with the results of Sec. 7 where around 10% of the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies do not cover this category. All policies in both the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR groups covered the privacy practices related to information types and actions for the first party. Also, all policies in both the pre-GDPR and post-GDPR groups covered at least one purpose related to first-party data collection (Q6) and third-party sharing (Q7).

**Case 2: Same Specificity**
A large portion of the policies exhibited the same specificity scores for the analyzed privacy practices. This result is not surprising given that 30-50% of the policies did not change between pre-GDPR and post-GDPR (Fig. 2). For the other policies, they maintain the same specificity levels even when their content changes.

**Case 3: Fully Specified**
For the privacy practices covered in Q2 (and to a lower degree the rest of the practices) the specificity values stay at one. These subsets of policies mention the specific methods of collecting and sharing user data. Nevertheless, this result does not indicate full compliance with the GDPR requirements about informing the users about how data is collected.

**Case 4: Worse Specificity**
Interestingly, we observe a considerable portion of policies exhibiting lower specificity in describing their privacy practices. We attribute this reason to the policies trying to be more comprehensive and general in describing the data practices at the expense of the specificity of the data practices clauses. This is a representative example from the post-GDPR privacy policy of hrc.org:

> “We also may be required to release information if required to do so by law or if, in our sole discretion, such disclosure is reasonably necessary to comply with legal process or to protect the rights, property, or personal safety of our web site, HRC, our officers, directors, employees, members, other users, and/or the public. We may also share personal information in the event of an organizational restructuring”.

While the pre-GDPR version contained segments related to sharing data with third-party entities, this newly added segment does not specify the type of personal information released.

**Case 5: Improved Specificity**
Finally, we observe that a large portion of the privacy policies have improved their specificity by using more precise phrases to describe the data collected and shared along with the purposes. Except for Q3 and Q6, we notice that there are more policies with improved specificity than those with worse specificity (17% vs. 11.5% on average). Here is an example from the post-GDPR privacy policy of hrc.org:

> “We also may be required to release information if required to do so by law or if, in our sole discretion, such disclosure is reasonably necessary to comply with legal process or to protect the rights, property, or personal safety of our web site, HRC, our officers, directors, employees, members, other users, and/or the public. We may also share personal information in the event of an organizational restructuring”.

While the pre-GDPR version contained segments related to sharing data with third-party entities, this newly added segment does not specify the type of personal information released.

---

13 https://www.hrc.org/hrc-story/privacy-policy
a representative example for such a case for legacy.com.

pre-GDPR: “Examples of Personally Identifiable Information we may collect include name, postal address, email address, credit card number and related information, and phone number....”

post-GDPR: “…the personal data you provide when you register to use our Services, including your name, email address, and password; the personal data that may be contained in any video, photo, image....”

We note here that pre-GDPR version did not mention how the personal data was being collected, while the post-GDPR version specifically mentions it as when the user registers to use the service.

Conclusion
In conclusion, privacy policies appear to be moving in the right direction. While many of them have maintained the same specificity levels (due to unchanged policies or low coverage of data practices), a considerable number of policies have been changed. Of those policies, a minority have changed negatively; to comply with the GDPR, they have tried to be more comprehensive in describing their practices at the expense of being less specific. The majority of the policies that changed, however, have been more specific in informing the users about their privacy practices. It appears that the introduction of the GDPR, with its specific requirements about informing the users, might have contributed to this positive trend.

10 Limitations
Despite our efforts to cover a diverse set of websites and to understand privacy policies’ evolution from multiple angles, we acknowledge that this work has several limitations.

First, our approach in assessing the content of privacy policies does not fully capture all the efforts introduced due to the GDPR. For instance, the concept of layered privacy notices has been adopted by several companies to give users two levels of understanding: an overview of high-level practices and an in-depth description of these practices. Unfortunately, this is difficult to automatically analyze as it can come in a variety of formats, such as expandable hidden text and multi-page policies. This could have affected our readability and specificity metrics in particular. Still, our user study partially captures such visual changes, and our compliance metrics are mostly unaffected. Moreover, in our presentation analysis, we study HTML tags only while CSS tags might have had an impact on the look and feel of a policy. However, in this study, we do not analyze CSS tags as they are not standardized.

Second, our study is limited to the English language policies as we wanted to leverage the existing techniques of advanced semantic understanding of natural language. We made this trade-off for depth vs. language-coverage and decided not to use a keyword-based analysis, which is easier to expand across languages with a dictionary-based approach.

Third, the use of automated approaches for selecting privacy policies and analyzing them is inherently error-prone. Hence, our specificity and compliance analysis might have been affected by the errors made with the machine learning models. This is accentuated by the fact that privacy policies are complex and even human annotators disagree on the interpretations sometimes, as we found in our manual verification. Nevertheless, with the recent success and increasing accuracy levels across different tasks [8, 27], we believe that such techniques, coupled with manual post-analysis, are a highly effective venue for in-depth analysis at scale.

11 Related Work
In the last couple of decades, researchers have investigated the effectiveness of privacy policies. We survey the evolution of the privacy policies’ landscape, particularly in relation to regulatory intervention. We also describe the recent research that studies the GDPR’s impact on privacy policies.

Evolution of the Privacy Policies Landscape
In 2002, the Progress and Freedom Foundation (PFF) studied a random sample of the most visited websites and found that, compared to two years earlier, websites were collecting less personally identifiable information and offering more opt-in choices and less opt-out choices [1]. Another longitudinal analysis has been performed by Milne and Culman in the 1998-2001 period, confirming the positive change in the number of websites including notices about information collection, third-party disclosures, and user choices [19]. In the same period, Liu and Arnett found that slightly more than 30% of Global 500 Web sites provide privacy policies on their home page [15].

Despite the increased proliferation of privacy policies, their lack of clarity was one of the primary motivations of the regulatory measures before the GDPR. In 2004, Antón et al. showed that 40 online privacy statements from 9 financial institutions have questionable compliance with the requirements of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA). They assessed the requirements of having “clear and conspicuous” policies via keyword-based investigation and readability metrics [2]. In 2007, Antón et al. studied
the effect of the Health Information and Portability Accountability Act (HIPAA) via a longitudinal study of 24 healthcare privacy policy documents from 9 healthcare Web sites. A similar conclusion held: although HIPAA has resulted in more descriptive policies, the overall trend was reduced readability and less clarity. Resorting to a user study, in 2008, Vail et al. showed that users perceive traditional privacy policies (in paragraph-form) to be more secure than shorter, simplified alternatives. However, they also demonstrated that these policies are significantly more difficult to comprehend than other formats [25].

In a recent study, Turow et al. studied the surveys around the “privacy policy” as a label in the period of 2003 to 2015 in the US. They found that the users’ misplaced confidence in this label, not only carries implication on their personal lives but also may affect their actions as citizens in response to government regulations or corporate activities [24].

Privacy Policies After the GDPR

Since the GDPR had been enforced on May 25, 2018, a few studies have investigated its impact on privacy practices of companies. Despite the initial trials with automated approaches in these studies, they have been limited in terms of scale, which is the main goal behind automation. Contissa et al. conducted a preliminary survey of 14 privacy policies of the top companies as an attempt to measure the compliance of these companies with the GDPR automatically. They found a frequent presence of unclear language, problematic processing, and insufficient information. They used Claudette, a recent system designed for the detection of such types of issues in privacy policies [14]. Tesfay et al. introduced a tool, inspired by the GDPR to classify privacy policy content into eleven privacy aspects [23]. They validated their approach with ten privacy policies.

The first large-scale study concurrent to ours is that by Degeling et al., who performed a longitudinal analysis of the privacy policies and cookie consent notices of 6,759 websites representing the 500 most popular websites in each of the 28 member states of the EU, [7]. They found that the number of websites with privacy policies has increased by 4.9% and that 50% of websites updated their privacy policies just before the GDPR came into action in May 2018. Unlike our work, however, their work has been focused on cookie consent notices and terminology-based analysis of privacy policies, without an in-depth tackling of the semantic change of privacy policies.

12 Conclusion

In this paper, we seek to answer a question about the impact of the recently introduced General Data Protection Regulation on website privacy policies. To answer this question, we analyze a sample of 3,686 pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies along five dimensions: presentation, readability, coverage, compliance, specificity. We study the presentation of the privacy policy through a user study of 460 participants. We find that the user-perceived appeal of privacy policies has not changed significantly with the introduction of the GDPR. We compare the readability of pre-GDPR and post-GDPR policies using several widely-used metrics and conclude that policies appear to be, on average, longer which accordingly demands more user time and effort. For the last three dimensions, we employ a novel, goal-based methodology to automatically extract the privacy-category coverage, compliance, and specificity from policies. We observe that policies have improved their coverage of key privacy practices and GDPR requirements. This improvement, however, comes at a specificity cost in some cases.

13 Availability

We will make the corpus of the privacy policies along with the performed analyses public.

References


A Policy Classifier Architecture

Fig. 10 shows the detailed architecture of the single-label classifier used in Sec. 3 for checking whether the crawled pages are valid privacy policies. The input text, obtained from the web page, is tokenized into words, using the Penn Treebank Tokenizer in nltk\(^1\). Then the words are mapped into vectors at the word embeddings layer. The word vectors are input to a convolutional layer, followed by a Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) and a Max-pooling layer. The next layer is a fully connected (dense) layer followed by another ReLU. Finally, we apply a softmax on the output dense layer to obtain a probability distribution over the two labels “valid” and “invalid”. For more details about this kind of classifiers we refer the reader to the work of Kim [9] on sentence classification.

B User Survey

In Fig. 11 we show a screenshot of an example step from the user survey that we presented to the users in Sec. 4.