

# From Ad Identifiers to Global Privacy Control: The Status Quo and Future of Opting Out of Ad Tracking on Android

Sebastian Zimmeck  
Wesleyan University

Nishant Aggarwal  
Wesleyan University

Zachary Liu  
Wesleyan University

Konrad Kollnig  
Maastricht University

## Abstract

Apps and their integrated third party libraries often collect a variety of data from people to show them personalized ads. This practice is often privacy-invasive. Since 2013, Google has therefore allowed users to limit ad tracking on Android via system settings. Further, under the 2018 California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), apps must honor opt-outs from ad tracking under the Global Privacy Control (GPC). The efficacy of these two methods to limit ad tracking has not been studied in prior work. Our legal and technical analysis details how the GPC applies to mobile apps and how it could be integrated directly into Android, thereby developing a reference design for GPC on Android. Our empirical analysis of 1,896 top-ranked Android apps shows that both the Android system-level opt-out and the GPC signal rarely restrict ad tracking. In our view, deleting the AdID and opting out under the CCPA has the same meaning. Thus, the current AdID setting and APIs should be evolved towards GPC and integrated into Android’s Privacy Sandbox.

## 1 Introduction

**Note: This is a pre-print of work-in-progress. Our analysis and findings may still change in the future.**

A large part of the mobile app ecosystem relies on advertising revenue. Apps and their integrated third party libraries often collect a variety of data from people to show them relevant ads. However, this data collection and profiling over time threatens people’s privacy [68]. Compared to iOS, the sharing of data with advertising services is more common on Android [43], which is our focus here.

Whether Android apps are allowed to track people for advertising purposes is dependent on people’s advertising ID (AdID) setting in the system settings, see Figure 1. Per Google’s Developer Program Policy [23], “apps uploaded or published to Google Play must use the advertising ID [...] for any advertising purposes.” and “the status of the ‘Opt out of Interest-based Advertising’ or ‘Opt out of Ads Personalization’ setting must be verified on each access of the ID.”




Figure 1: Screenshot of the AdID setting on Android 14. According to Google’s Play Store policies, apps are obliged to honor people’s choices. Whether apps do has not been studied before.

If people are opted out, apps should not have access to the AdID and developers are prohibited from tracking people for ad purposes. However, whether that is always the case is doubtful [62]. Sadly, even though this setting has existed in Android since 2013 and it may give consumers the illusion of control of their data, no previous studies have verified the efficacy of this opt-out mechanism.

Beyond privacy guarantees embedded into the Android system, an increasing number of laws afford people an opt out right from tracking. Per the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), individuals must be able to withdraw their consent to data processing easily at any time (Article 7(3)) and can object, without any reason, to advertising-related data processing (Article 21(2)). Similarly, per the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), §1798.120, consumers can opt out of the sale or sharing of personal information. In the case of the CCPA, there even exists an explicit technical standard to communicate this opt-out to app developers, i.e. the Global Privacy Control (GPC). Like the Android

system-level opt-out, the GPC, too, has not been studied on Android (nor iOS) before.

To get insights into the efficacy and implementation of both opt-out choices on Android, we focus on three research questions:

- RQ1. (Legal) How does the CCPA and GPC apply to opt-out from tracking in mobile apps?
- RQ2. (Technical implementation) How can and should the legal requirements be implemented on Android?
- RQ3. (Evidence) On Android, how does opting-out from the AdId and personalised ads in the system settings, respectively sharing the GPC signal, affect 1) apps' sharing of the Android AdId with third parties, 2) the number of tracking domains that apps contact, and 3) the US Privacy Strings that apps share?

In answering these questions, it is our goal to give critical insights into user control over tracking, and ultimately advance (legally mandated) opt out rights on the Android platform. This is especially true because our empirical findings indicate that current opt-out choices on Android do not give users much choice, and thereby sadly confirms many people's expectations from privacy on mobile [63].

## 2 Background and Related Work

Our work is motivated by the existing lack of control over ad tracking on mobile apps (§2.1). To evaluate this problem we analyze a set of Android apps leveraging static and dynamic privacy analysis techniques (§2.2). People should be able to efficiently and effectively opt out of ad tracking on Android (§2.3). The integration of privacy preference signals, in particular, GPC, into the Android platform would be a big step towards that goal (§2.4).

### 2.1 Ad Tracking on Mobile Apps

Examining 100,000 Android apps, Chen et al. found that 36.3% of the privacy settings identified in these apps are hard to find due to unclear user interface designs, which impact people's privacy because 82.2% of the observed settings are set to disclose data by default [12]. Such data disclosure can be privacy-invasive, in particular, as industry concentration of ad networks has significantly increased the breadth and depth of data accessible to individual companies engaging in such practices [8]. To help people regain control many self-help tools have emerged [32, 42, 46]. This is despite the fact that the Android system already integrates some controls, as discussed before (see Figure 1). This indicates that Android's existing tracking controls might have important gaps.

### 2.2 Mobile App Privacy Analysis

To better understand the status quo of ad tracking on the Android platform, in particular, the effectiveness of opting out from ad tracking, we perform a static and dynamic analysis on a set of 1,896 apps. We closely follow a number of previous studies that investigated the privacy properties of mobile apps. Methodologically, these studies fall into two categories: (1) studies that analyze the privacy properties of apps' program code without running them (*static analysis*) [4, 7, 16, 40, 70, 78] and (2) studies that analyze apps by running them on actual or virtual phones and observing their behavior (*dynamic analysis*) [2, 18, 46, 60, 61, 65].

Regarding static analysis, Viennot et al. were among the first to analyze Android apps at scale [70]. They developed a methodology to download and statically analyze about 1 million apps. The focus of their study was to give a descriptive overview of the app economy on the Android platform as a whole. One of the largest and earliest static analysis studies into Android app *privacy* was subsequently carried out by Binns et al. [7]. They, too, studied about 1 million apps and found that the vast majority could share data with a variety of companies. In another large-scale study Zimmeck et al., analyzed about 1 million Android apps and verified their privacy practices against what the app developers promised in their privacy policies [78]. They found many apps to be non-compliant.

Regarding dynamic analysis, a range of techniques can be employed to study apps' behaviors at runtime. The early approaches focused on modifying mobile operating systems to observe personal data traversing through the systems. Enck et al.'s TaintDroid [18] falls in this category for the Android operating system as does Agarwal's and Hall's ProtectMyPrivacy [2] for the iOS operating system. While this approach can give highly accurate insights into apps' data flows, the growing complexity of mobile operating systems makes it difficult to maintain it over time. Hence, more recent studies tend to focus on the capture and analysis of apps' network traffic [46, 60, 61, 65].

Recently, a number of studies combined static and dynamic analysis approaches to get more detailed insights into the behavior of apps and leverage the advantages of both [43, 57].

### 2.3 Opting Out of Ad Tracking in Mobile Apps

Kollnig et al. found that while most Android apps engage in third party tracking, only few obtained consent before doing so [41]. Nguyen et al. came to the same conclusion [50, 51]. In many cases the lack of obtaining consent is the result of a coordination failure. Most third parties rely on app developers to obtain consent on their behalf but typically fail to put in place robust measures to ensure the developer actually obtains such [41]. Consent management platforms that app developers can integrate, such as OneTrust [54], aim to help

developers obtain people’s consent. On the iOS platform, Apple, with iOS 14.5, introduced mandatory opt ins, however, is facing challenges to enforce this mechanism [44]. In doing so, Apple deviated from its earlier implementation of ad tracking controls as an opt-out that used to be similar to that implemented on Android since 2013 (as shown in Figure 1).

Compared to websites, the choices for people to have their privacy rights respected have traditionally been more limited for mobile apps. This phenomenon is, in part, due to the proprietary nature of mobile operating systems, which makes it more difficult to analyze privacy practices in apps and hold app developers to account. Consumer Reports’ Permission Slip app allows people to easily exercise their privacy rights under various US privacy laws, albeit, at the cost of a human in the loop [15]. OptOutCode is a proposal to implement a platform-agnostic approach to privacy choices by encouraging people to opt out by prefixing the name of their devices with “O\$\$” signalling “do not (O) sell (\$) or share (S)” personal information [59].<sup>1</sup> The Digital Advertising Alliance, an online ad industry association, provides the AppChoices app [17].

The opt out rights that people in most, if not all, US states are more limited compared to the privacy choices under European Union (EU) law. In the EU, personal data processing needs opt in consent or one of five alternative, consent-free legal grounds (legitimate interest, contract, public interest, legal obligation, vital interest). However, despite these protections, EU authorities have been struggling with their enforcement, e.g., of the GDPR and ePrivacy Directive, which has led to a surge of non-compliant consent banners and tracking practices [41, 43, 52, 69]. In the US, determining the applicability of opt out rights is difficult as well. To determine the threshold of 100,000 or more consumers or households for the applicability of the CCPA’s right to opt out,<sup>2</sup> Samarin et al. used the number of app installs [62]. Whether an operator sells people’s data can be generally determined via an opt-out of sale link, a statement to that effect in a privacy policy, or the presence of an opt-out of sales mechanism [53].

Ad tracking is often not disclosed in privacy policies or notices. People remain in the dark about which data is collected from them and by whom [76]. Samarin et al. investigated the extent to which Android app developers comply with the CCPA in providing accurate privacy notices [62]. For the apps of 69 developers, they found that a significant percentage collected personal information that was not disclosed [62]. For the iOS platform, apps commonly violate their privacy label and transmit data without disclosing this [38, 44]. Evaluating the completeness of GDPR requirements of 163,068 Android apps privacy policies that contained data collection

statements, Xiang et al. found that nearly all of them (99.3%) had at least one unsatisfied requirement [73].

## 2.4 Privacy Preference Signals

Privacy preference signals are digital representations of how people want their personal data to be processed [33]. As such, they make it easier and more effective for people to exercise their opt out rights on the web and in mobile apps and, thereby, limit collection and sharing of their data. Though, various legal, technical, usability, and accountability challenges persist [34].

On mobile, privacy preference signals have long been available to users, although with mixed success. On iOS, Apple rolled out an Advertising Identifier, alongside an opt-out from ad tracking, in 2012. Google quickly followed suit by rolling out similar features in 2013. These initiatives aimed to move away from permanent device identifiers, such as the UDID on iOS and the Android\_ID on Android, that could not be reset by users but could be used by apps to track user activities — and thus brought notable privacy risks.

Beyond mobile apps, one of the most well-known privacy signals is Do Not Track (DNT) [71]. DNT was developed from 2009 as a binary signal for people to express their opt out of tracking towards *websites* (instead of *apps*). However, DNT adoption remained low as there was no clear legal obligation to actually comply with received DNT signals. Somewhat surprisingly, after many years of being dormant, a recent decision of the Landgericht Berlin [45] — requiring LinkedIn to respect DNT signals — revitalized DNT.

As a successor to DNT, GPC [21] is currently emerging as the technical standard for expressing opt out choices on the web. In recent work, Zimmeck et al. evaluated the usability and enforceability of GPC [77, 79] finding that people find GPC useful and usable despite slow adoption. This is despite the fact that compliance with GPC is now a legal requirement in California (since January 2021) [5] and Colorado (since July 2024) [14] with other US states likely to follow in the future. Despite the legal obligations for apps to follow the signal if they receive it, neither Android nor iOS currently offer a GPC signal as part of their operating systems. This underlines that more work needs to be done in order to advance GPC, which is attempted by this paper.

The use of privacy signals is not without limitations. At their core, they rely on the concept of privacy self-management. This approach has been criticized because individuals can get overwhelmed by the number of choices and cannot actually understand the underlying data practices [6, 52, 64]. While we are aware of these critiques, GPC is a unique privacy preference signal because it is the first such signal that has broad legislative support. Moreover, unlike existing approaches, GPC aims to move beyond choices for individual websites or apps towards a unified system that applies across different technologies and platforms. As such,

<sup>1</sup>This idea is similar to Google’s opt out solution for Google Location services access points [31]: “To opt out, change the SSID (name) of your Wi-Fi access point (your wireless network name) so that it ends with ‘\_nomap.’ For example, if your SSID is ‘12345,’ you would change it to ‘12345\_nomap.’”

<sup>2</sup>California Civil Code, Title 1.81.5. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 (CCPA), §1798.120(a) and §1798.140(d).




Figure 2: Overview of our dynamic analysis setup for collecting app network data for the apps in our app dataset. To decrypt the data we channeled it through Mitmproxy. We also channeled it through a Los Angeles-based Mullvad VPN server so that apps’ requests come from a California IP address resulting in applicability of the CCPA.

GPC has the potential to become a vital tool in the toolbox of meaningful protections of people’s data. It is therefore that we study the efficacy and implementation of opt-out signals on Android in our work.

### 3 The Status Quo

We seek to understand the effectiveness of opting out from ad tracking on the Android platform.

#### 3.1 Analysis Methodology and Limitations

Towards that goal we performed a static and dynamic analysis of 1,896 Android apps, the *app dataset*.

**App Dataset.** We collected the apps for our app dataset per the top lists of free apps for Google’s US Play Store for each of the 49 app categories, which include 17 game categories [27]. The 45 apps listed in each of the 49 top charts are heavily influenced by popularity [26]. Thus, our app dataset is representative of the most popular free apps on the US Play Store. We selected the most popular free apps as those impact a broad user base and are most likely a “business” per the CCPA. To get the lists of the top free 45 apps for each category we scraped them from the Google Play Store. We then successfully downloaded 1,896/2,205 (86%) of the listed apps from the US Play Store with Raccoon [55]. 309 apps were incompatible with our test device, removed from the Play Store before we could download them, or not successfully downloaded.<sup>3</sup> The average app size was 105 MB and the median app size 63 MB. Apps in the Productivity category had the most installs while those in the Events category had the least (Appendix, Figure 12). We ran our dynamic analysis for each app in the app dataset proceeding in batches of apps for a total of two weeks with the analysis of one app taking about 5 minutes.

<sup>3</sup>We downloaded the apps in August 2023. We made two download attempts per app.

**Dynamic Analysis Setup.** Figure 2 shows an overview of our dynamic analysis setup. We ran each app’s analysis on our *test device*, a Google Pixel 6A (Android 13 Build TQ2A.23.05.05.002). The test device was instrumented via a network data collection script, the *controller*, connected to the Android Debug Bridge (adb) [30]. To decrypt network traffic via Mitmproxy [48], we rooted the test device with Magisk [47] and installed the Mitmproxy certificate in the test device’s certificate store using the `MagiskTrustUserCert` module. To bypass Chrome Certificate Transparency we integrated the `MagiskBypassCertificateTransparencyError` module. To circumvent apps’ SSL pinning, if any, we deployed a Frida server (v.16.1.4) [20] on the test device running an SSL-unpinning script. The app’s connections to its servers were set up via a Mullvad VPN server [49] located in Los Angeles to ensure applicability of the CCPA.<sup>4</sup> We used a custom data collection script to save the outputs from Mitmproxy in the commonly used HAR format while making sure that we log all contacted domains even if onward communication was prevented by certificate pinning.<sup>5</sup>

**Dynamic Analysis Procedure.** Our dynamic analysis has the purpose of ascertaining the effect that sending GPC signals has on apps’ data selling and sharing practices. It is further aimed at shedding light on the extent to which AdID access — Android’s current mechanism for controlling opt outs — aligns with GPC. Therefore, we tested each app under four different conditions capturing network traffic for 30 seconds for each condition in the following order:

1. **AdID:** The app has access to the AdID.
2. **AdID + GPC:** The app has access to the AdID but all HTTP requests are sent with a GPC header prohibiting data selling and sharing.
3. **No AdID:** The app does not have AdID access.
4. **No AdID + GPC:** The app does not have AdID access, and all HTTP requests are sent with a GPC header prohibiting data selling and sharing.

In all four conditions our controller granted all permissions requested by an app at install time.<sup>6</sup> When switching conditions, our controller cleared the persistent storage and shared preferences of the test device.<sup>7</sup> In addition, we added a dummy

<sup>4</sup>During the analysis Mullvad rotated the IP address to keep the network performant, which, however, did not impact our analysis.

<sup>5</sup>For more details on this limitation see §3.1.

<sup>6</sup>We tested whether granting or denying permissions made a substantial difference in tracking behavior, which was not the case. Appendix, Figure 14 shows the top 50 permissions the 1,896 apps in our app dataset declared in their manifest file. Our testing also showed that tracking does not substantially depend on the order in which the conditions are being run.

<sup>7</sup>The shell command our controller used to clear persistent storage and shared preferences was `adb shell su -c pm clear $TARGET_PACKAGE_NAME` with `su -c pm clear` to tell the test device to delete all data associated with a package [30].






Figure 3: Overview of our dynamic analysis procedure for collecting app network data for the apps in our app dataset. To increase the reliability of our network data captures and minimize background traffic interference via data not originating from the app under scrutiny we turned on “data saver” and turned off “private DNS” settings on the test device.

header to all HTTP requests in the conditions that did not involve sending the GPC header to minimize any differences that might occur due to GPC header injection. Figure 3 shows the complete details of our dynamic analysis procedure.<sup>8</sup>

**Third Party Analysis.** To understand which third parties collect which types of data and how opt out choices are propagated through the Android ad ecosystem and beyond, we identified the 33 most prevalent third party tracking domains across all apps in our app dataset based on the X-Ray Tracker List [8, 39]. All tracker domains in our app dataset except for two had multiple subdomains. We combined the trackers with different subdomains but the same domain to match the trackers in the X-Ray Tracker List. For example, we combined [app.adjust.com](http://app.adjust.com), [view.adjust.com](http://view.adjust.com), [app.us.adjust.com](http://app.us.adjust.com), and [s2s.adjust.com](http://s2s.adjust.com) into [adjust.com](http://adjust.com). We then identified the organizations behind each of those 33 domains and read their privacy policies. In our privacy policy analysis we looked for explicit references to privacy laws that the organizations deemed applicable and analyzed the extent to which their described practices, for example, the “sharing” or “selling” of personal information, would be subject to the CCPA. We performed this analysis conservatively. If a policy stated that an organization does not share or sell personal information, we did not second-guess this statement and took it at face-value.<sup>9</sup> Based on our network data captures, we then analyzed which personal information the organizations received and how their

apps reacted to the different test conditions.

**Limitations.** Our dynamic analysis procedure is subject to various limitations that could impact our results and conclusions. First, automated dynamic analysis is inherently limited in that it only runs part of the app. In our case, we only collected data before any user interaction to simulate a data collection and sharing scenario without user consent. Some of the web traffic we captured likely used a custom encoding. Some of it was also encrypted using certificate pinning. While we followed state-of-the-art methods for SSL-unpinning [43, 51, 74], we were unable to decrypt all encrypted traffic. An estimated 0.9% to 8% of Android apps use SSL pinning [58]. Further, our identification of ad trackers is based on the X-Ray Tracker List [8, 39], which may be incomplete, outdated, or inaccurate. For example, [googleapis.com](http://googleapis.com) may have been used for Android housekeeping purposes only and not for ad tracking. We also used a VPN to simulate a California location; some apps may use GPS or other mechanisms to detect our real location and behave differently. However, we tested apps with and without GPS access and did not notice substantial differences. We also did not observe server to server interaction, though, typically tracking SDKs interact client to server as identifiers, privacy preference signals, and privacy flags need to be communicated to a server at least once.

Furthermore out of the 1896 apps we ran through the dynamic analysis, we had a total of 85 failures. This gives us a failure rate of approximately 4.48%. The process to identify failures was a two step process. First we logged all the output from the analysis to a file and checked through for any kind of flags for failure including but not limited to failures in Frida

<sup>8</sup>Detailed setup instructions and analysis scripts are publicly available. The URL is omitted here to preserve anonymity during the review process.

<sup>9</sup>Any legal analysis in this paper was performed by a co-author who is admitted to the California bar and an expert in privacy law, especially, California privacy law, with more than a decade of relevant experience.

and Mitm. Then we manually checked each of these apps to confirm the result.

### 3.2 CCPA Opt Out Applicability

Per the CCPA, a consumer has a right to opt out from ad tracking. If the CCPA’s opt out right is applicable, a consumer can “direct a business [...] not to sell or share the consumer’s personal information.”<sup>10</sup> For websites their display of a “Do Not Sell or Share My Personal Information” link or other interactive element provides an indicator for selling and sharing practices. However, this type of identification is becoming less useful as the CCPA after its CPRA amendments no longer requires it if a business respects opt-out preference signals.<sup>11</sup> However, for mobile apps, similar to websites, the integration of an ad network serves as an indicator to identify whether an app “sell[s] or share[s]” personal information (§3.2.1). Further, the inclusion of an app in Google’s Play Store top lists for free apps serves as an indicator that its operator is running a “business” (§3.2.2). Both requirements must be satisfied for the CCPA opt out right to be applicable.<sup>12</sup> Our work rests on the interpretation of the CCPA’s opt out requirements by the Office of the California Attorney General and the California Privacy Protection Agency. Notably, the former enforced the CCPA’s opt out right against a mobile app game developer who made available personal information of its players to an integrated third-party mobile advertising platform [66], which qualifies as selling or sharing of personal information per the CCPA.

#### 3.2.1 “Selling” or “Sharing”

While the “selling” or “sharing” of personal information can be determined by evaluating the behavior of an app, such determination is also possible by evaluating the behavior of an integrated third party ad network, i.e., whether it is “buying” or “collecting” personal information.<sup>13</sup> The evaluation of an ad network’s behavior is more efficient because the finding that it buys or collects personal information would extend to all apps that integrate it. The ad network could also sell the personal information to other ad networks, data brokers, or




Figure 4: The percentage of apps in our app dataset that connect to the top 33 tracking domains in our app dataset. The online ad ecosystem is characterized by the dominance of just a few ad networks that are included in many apps and a long tail of ad networks with a small market share included in just a few. We can leverage this property of the ad ecosystem to identify many apps that are selling or sharing personal information with relatively little effort for relatively high information gain.

other organizations, or share it with those. Such further selling or sharing by an ad network can also indicate an app’s sale or sharing of personal information. Overall, it is possible to evaluate a relatively small number of ad networks to understand the selling and sharing activity of a larger set of apps integrating those ad networks.

Pursuing this idea, we began our evaluation with the 33 most prevalent third party tracking domains across all apps in our app dataset based on the X-Ray Tracker List [8, 39]. We read their privacy policies and identified whether they mentioned the (1) buying or collecting or (2) selling or sharing of personal information per the CCPA. We found that 28/33 (85%) do either or both. For example, InMobi is a typical ad network selling personal information.<sup>14</sup> Conversely, although Meta’s policy does not mention selling or sharing personal information, it does state that Meta is buying or collecting such.<sup>15</sup> Thus, not only will an app that integrates InMobi be considered to sell or share personal information, the same will be true for an app integrating Meta. It is enough to evaluate just a few ad networks to determine whether the apps integrating those are selling or sharing personal information (Figure 4). 88% of apps’ selling or sharing can be identified by just one integrated ad network.

<sup>10</sup>CCPA, §1798.120(a).

<sup>11</sup>CCPA, §1798.135(b)(1).

<sup>12</sup>While we provide our evaluation here for the CCPA, it would work similarly for other US state privacy laws e.g., those of Colorado and Connecticut. It is also not limited to mobile apps but, for example, can be used for the web platform as well.

<sup>13</sup>Per CCPA, §1798.140(ad)(1) “‘selling’ [...] means [...] communicating [...] by electronic or other means, a consumer’s personal information [...] for monetary or other valuable consideration.” Per CCPA, §1798.140(ah)(1) “‘sharing’ [...] means [...] communicating [...] by electronic or other means, a consumer’s personal information [...] for cross-context behavioral advertising, whether or not for monetary or other valuable consideration, [...]” The concept of “sharing” was introduced as an addition to the CCPA by the CPRA to remove any doubt that the CCPA covers cross-context behavioral advertising [67]. Similar definitions of “selling” and “sharing” are included in other US state privacy laws, e.g., those of Colorado and Connecticut.

<sup>14</sup>InMobi’s privacy policy [37] states:“Under the CCPA, ‘sale’ is defined broadly and includes the transfer of personal information by a business to a third party for valuable consideration (even if there is no exchange of money). InMobi may be deemed to be ‘selling’ personal information.”

<sup>15</sup>“The following terms will apply to the extent that, (i) for purposes of the California [Consumer Privacy] Act you are a Business, (ii) you share with Meta Personal Information about California residents which would otherwise constitute a Sale or Sharing, and (iii) [...] you use a Meta Product [...]”




Figure 5: The policies of 81 apps randomly selected from our app dataset stating whether the app operator is selling or sharing data or whether the policy mentions the CCPA. Each app included in the graph connected to at least one of our 33 analyzed tracking domains that is selling or sharing personal information or buying or collecting such. The two most downloaded apps on the left side of the graph are Google Docs and Sheets.




Figure 6: The 81 apps sampled from the app dataset categorized by download counts and whether the CCPA opt out right applies.

### 3.2.2 “Business”

For the CCPA’s opt out right to apply, in addition to selling or sharing personal information, the app in question must be part of a “business.”<sup>16</sup> The first two thresholds for making that determination — annual gross revenues in excess of twenty-five million dollars and the annual buying, selling, or sharing of

<sup>16</sup>Per CCPA, §1798.140(d)(1) “‘Business’ means: [a] [...] legal entity that is organized or operated for the profit or financial benefit of its shareholders or other owners, that collects consumers’ personal information [...] and that [...] determines the purposes and means of the processing of consumers’ personal information, that does business in the State of California, and that satisfies one or more of the following thresholds: (A) [...] annual gross revenues in excess of twenty-five million dollars [...]. (B) [...] annually buys, sells, or shares the personal information of 100,000 or more consumers or households. (C) Derives 50 percent or more of its annual revenues from selling or sharing consumers’ personal information.” Similar thresholds are included in other US state privacy laws, e.g., those of Colorado and Connecticut.

personal information of 100,000 or more consumers or households in California — depend on the number of people using the app. Generally, apps with more users are more likely to be subject to the CCPA opt out right. Thus, apps appearing in the top free apps lists of the Play Store or similar popularity lists are a good starting point for identifying covered apps. For the third threshold — deriving 50 percent or more of annual revenues from selling or sharing consumers’ personal information — the inclusion of a higher number of ad networks is an indicator for reliance on such revenue.

In order to test the extent to which inclusion of an app in one of Google’s Play Store top free app lists is indicative for passing one or both of the size-related thresholds of annual gross revenue and number of consumer or households affected, we randomly sampled 100 apps from our app dataset. 83/100 (83%) apps had Google Play Data Safety pages with a link to their privacy policies and were still available at the time of the sampling. 81/83 (98%) apps had at least one of the most prevalent 33 tracking domains included that sells or shares, respectively, buys or collects personal information. We further checked whether the privacy policy of each of these 81 apps stated the applicability of the CCPA. Such statement could be related to the selling or sharing of data but it would also be sufficient if the app operator deemed the CCPA applicable in general. The reason is that the qualification as a “business” does not necessarily need to relate to the opt out right but could also relate to other provisions of the CCPA.<sup>17</sup> 49/81 (60%) policies stated that the covered apps were selling or sharing personal information. An additional 9/81 (11%) mentioned the CCPA, that is, implied that the app operators believed to run a business per the definition of the CCPA. In some cases they expressed so in state-specific privacy policies linked to from their main privacy policies. Thus, 58/81 (72%) of the apps we examined are part of a business as self-identified by their operators (Figure 5). Those 58 apps are subject to the CCPA opt out right (Figure 6).<sup>18</sup>

The 9/81 (11%) apps, each of which connects to at least one of the 33 top tracking domains and whose policies imply that the CCPA is applicable but do not explicitly state selling or sharing, are not compliant with the CCPA. It is implied by their policy statements that the CCPA is applicable, that is, that they are a business. That they are selling or sharing data is evidenced by their inclusion of a third party tracking domain (§3.2.1). Thus, the CCPA’s opt out right applies to them. Further, for the 23/81 (28%) apps whose policies do not explicitly state that they are selling or sharing data or imply applicability of the CCPA otherwise, the CCPA’s opt out right may still be applicable as each of the apps connects to at least one of the 33 tracking domains. From the policies

<sup>17</sup>As we already can determine the “selling” or “sharing” by an app per our analysis of the integrated ad networks (§3.2.1), it is sufficient at this point to determine whether an app is generally subject to the CCPA.

<sup>18</sup>We will make our detailed privacy policy results publicly available upon publication.




Figure 7: The two options for sending GPC signals on the web platform via GPC headers (A) and the GPC DOM property (B). They are identical for desktop and mobile browsers.

of 8/23 (35%) of those apps, it appears that the app operators are not from the US as they provide a street address outside the US or email address with an international country domain, and, therefore, may be unfamiliar with the requirements of the CCPA.

Our finding of 58 apps being subject to the CCPA represents a lower bound as we rely on the app operators' self-declared CCPA applicability in their privacy policies. Almost certainly more apps than those we identified are subject to the CCPA and its opt out right. Based on the 58 out of 81 apps from our random sample, we can create a confidence interval where we are 95% confident that the proportion of apps in our entire app set is subject to the CCPA is between 62% – 81%. Determining whether an app operator passes at least one of the thresholds for running a business per the CCPA is difficult from the outside and presents an obstacle. To enable people to understand their rights and hold app operators accountable, we recommend that Google explain the thresholds and conditions of relevant laws to app operators and list the applicable laws on apps' Play Store pages.

### 3.3 Opting Out per the CCPA by Sending GPC Signals or Deleting the AdID

Most of the 1,896 apps in our app dataset are subject to the CCPA opt out right. Since GPC is sanctioned by California regulators — not only for the web but also for mobile platforms — mobile apps are required to respect opt out requests they receive via GPC.




Figure 8: Opt out implementations on Android via GPC (A and B) and the Android AdID setting (C). For (C), note that the ad request and the AdID may be sent in a request together or in two separate requests. However, the difference is purely implementational and has no impact for the opt out.

#### 3.3.1 GPC on Browser and Non-browser Apps

Opting out via GPC on mobile platforms works differently for browser and non-browser apps. For browser apps, there is no difference between opting out via GPC on mobile platforms and opting out on desktop platforms. Opting out from a website via a mobile browser on Android works the same way as opting out from a website via a desktop browser. In both cases, the browser app transmits the GPC signal via the GPC header to a website's servers or a website's client script queries the value of the navigator.globalPrivacyControl JavaScript DOM property on the client. Figure 7 shows the two options for opting out via GPC on the web. However, for non-browser apps the situation is markedly different. In this regard, the way GPC works on the web does not neatly align with what mobile platforms require.

For one, non-browser mobile apps do not need to connect to a first party server first before connecting to a third party



server. Such a sequence of connections would be necessary on the web for a redirect from a first to a third party server. However, on non-browser mobile apps connections to first and third party servers can be generally out of order and independent of each other. This difference makes it difficult to replicate the propagation of a GPC signal from a first to a third party server via a GPC header as it is done on the web. Some non-browser mobile apps may not even connect to any first party server at all but instead only to third party servers. In such cases the propagation of GPC headers from a first to a third party would break down completely.<sup>19</sup> However, third parties can detect GPC headers directly on their end without relying on first party redirects. The GPC specification does not differentiate between a third party server receiving a GPC header indirectly via a redirect and a third party server receiving a GPC header directly [21]. That a third party integrated on a website usually receives GPC signals via a redirect does not mean that such redirection is required. Third parties are required to listen for GPC signals either way. Thus, in our dynamic analysis we sent GPC headers to all first and third party URLs the app connected to.

In lieu of (or in addition to) a GPC header implementation, a non-browser mobile app could also implement a client script to query the value of the `navigator.globalPrivacyControl` JavaScript DOM property. Figure 8 shows both options. While querying the value of the `navigator.globalPrivacyControl` is not subject to the redirect considerations of the GPC header option, it has other challenges. Notably, it would only work to the extent non-browser mobile apps use web technologies, e.g., WebViews. To the extent that apps use non-web technologies for serving ads, it would not be possible to query any JavaScript property. In our app dataset, we only found 8 apps whose network data contained a response script for querying the value of `navigator.globalPrivacyControl`. Overall, we believe that it is necessary that GPC be implemented at the operating system level to provide a meaningful opt out mechanism on Android (§4.2).

### 3.3.2 Sending GPC Signals and Deleting the AdID Have the Same Meaning under the CCPA

There is precedent for such mechanism. Android already has a system-wide opt out mechanism from ad tracking in form of the setting and APIs for enabling access to and deleting the AdID (Figure 8). The AdID is a unique, user-resettable, and user-deletable ID for advertising, provided by Google Play services [29]. It is the only identifier that ad networks are allowed to use for personalized advertising when distributing their apps via the Google Play Store [23]. With the `getId` method of the `AdvertisingIdClient`

<sup>19</sup>Manually checking 20 randomly selected apps from our app dataset we found that apps connecting to only first or third parties are uncommon as each connected to both.

class Android apps can retrieve a device’s AdID, and with the `isLimitAdTrackingEnabled` method they can check whether a user has deleted the AdID [22]. As shown in Figure 1, the AdID setting allows people to “[i]nstruct apps not to [...] build profiles or show [...] personalized ads” and to “[o]pt out of interest-based ads.” Any attempts to access the AdID will receive a string of zeros instead of the identifier [29]. The setting will be applied device-wide to all installed apps and their integrated third parties. Further, `isLimitAdTrackingEnabled` will be enabled once the AdID is deleted, as we confirmed on our test device.

Just as a GPC header must be sent with each request or the value of the `navigator.globalPrivacyControl` JavaScript DOM property must be checked every time an ad is intended to be served [21], Google’s Developer Program Policy [23] requires that “the status of the ‘Opt out of Interest-based Advertising’ or ‘Opt out of Ads Personalization’ setting must be verified on each access of the ID.” If it is not set, a third party is not allowed to track the user for ad purposes. Google requires developers [28] to “abide by a user’s ‘Opt out of Interest-based Advertising’ or ‘Opt out of Ads Personalization’ setting. If a user has enabled this setting, [developers] may not use the advertising identifier for creating user profiles for advertising purposes or for targeting users with personalized advertising.” However, it remains permissible to serve contextual ads or engage in frequency capping, conversion tracking, reporting and security and fraud detection activities [28]. Thus, in our view, opting out from ad tracking via the AdID setting has the same intended meaning under the CCPA as opting out via GPC. For all practical purposes, sending GPC Signals and deleting the AdID are equivalent.<sup>20</sup>

### 3.4 Sending GPC Signals or Deleting the AdID Does Not Result in a CCPA Opt Out

Whether an opt out mechanism is effective in preventing the selling or sharing of personal information per the CCPA can be evaluated based on various circumstantial evidence. First, an app’s disclosure of a device identifier to an ad network that is subject to the CCPA indicates that a user is not opted out (§3.4.1). Second, the number of connections to such ad networks should be lower when opted out (§3.4.2). Third, privacy flags, such as the IAB’s US Privacy String or Google’s Restricted Data Processing (RDP), should be set to opt out (§3.4.3).<sup>21</sup> We find that opting out via GPC or deleting the AdID does not have substantial impact on these factors and, thus, prove to be ineffective for exercising the CCPA opt out right on the Android platform.

<sup>20</sup>We are making this point here for Android but it equally applies to iOS via Apple’s Identifier for Advertisers (IDFA).

<sup>21</sup>When we refer to the US Privacy String, we mean both its cookie and JavaScript API implementation.




Figure 9: Third party tracking domains with at least one AdID occurrence in our app dataset in the No AdID or No AdID + GPC conditions. An overview of all AdID occurrences for the 33 most prevalent third party tracking domains is shown in Appendix, Figure 13.

### 3.4.1 Disclosing Device Identifiers

We did not find substantial differences of device identifier sharing or selling under the different conditions of our app network data. The Android ID, serial number, and MAC address of our test device was not shared or sold under any condition. While in earlier Android versions, these identifiers were commonly used for advertising purposes, recent Android versions completely block access to these identifiers for user-level apps. In a handful of requests, we found the test device’s IMEI in requests going to [googleapis.com](https://googleapis.com), which, however, was not correlated to any particular condition and might have happened for system-level housekeeping purposes. However, third parties integrated in many apps received the IP address of our test device. While they obviously needed the IP address of our test device to connect to it, in many cases the IP address was contained in the body of a request or response, i.e., not used for connection purposes. Still, this finding remains inconclusive. While an IP address can be misused as an identifier for ad tracking purposes, there are also legitimate use cases, e.g., for frequency capping to avoid sending the same ad repeatedly to the same device. Just as for the other identifiers, we did not find the IP address disclosure correlated to any particular condition.

Surprisingly, we found that in the No AdID and No AdID + GPC conditions a small number of third parties were still able to access the AdID (Figure 9). While for Google-owned domains — [app-measurement.com](https://app-measurement.com), [googleapis.com](https://googleapis.com), and [google-analytics.com](https://google-analytics.com) — there could be legitimate housekeeping reason for the Android platform to access these identifiers, there were also individual instances of non-Google domains — [omtrdc.net](https://omtrdc.net), [gadsme.com](https://gadsme.com), and [wizz.chat](https://wizz.chat) — that also had access to the AdID. After double-checking our results and re-running our analysis confirming the results, a

plausible explanation we can think of for how the non-Google third parties could have access to the AdID is that they stored it at their backend and associated it with another identifier or device fingerprint that they synced once the app was run in the new condition.<sup>22</sup> Since we quit the app and cleared the app cache and data in between conditions, we do not think that the AdID from a previous condition run was still stored on the test device for the subsequent run under the next condition.<sup>23</sup>

While the disclosure of device identifiers (or of any personal information, for that matter) can provide an indicator for ad tracking, such finding could not be interpreted as conclusive proof. In many cases, the sending of personal information to a third party domain does not necessarily mean that it is actually being stored at its destination. Many ad networks make normal ad requests, append privacy flags, such as the US Privacy String, and leave it to the downstream providers to respect the opt outs by not recording personal information of opted out users [75]. While this operating procedure is becoming less prevalent, it still happens. Thus, the presence of privacy flags or the absence of connections to ad network domains are better indicators for the absence of ad tracking.

### 3.4.2 Connecting to Ad Tracking Domains

Our findings do not show substantial differences in the number of connections to the 33 ad tracking domains we analyzed across the four conditions (Figure 10). However, we observed smaller differences, for example, when we compared the connections between the AdID and No AdID + GPC conditions of [app-measurement](https://app-measurement.com). The AdID condition had over 1,000 connections compared to just a few over 750 for the No AdID + GPC condition. This effect could be a result of the compound of effect of each, deleting the AdID and enabling GPC, as evident by their graphs which show a slight decrease in the number of trackers for each compared to the number of tracking domain connections for AdID. As previously mentioned (§3.2.1), the online ad ecosystem is characterized by the dominance of a small set of ad networks that are included in many apps and a long tail of ad networks with a small market share included in just a few. This presence of top domains persistently throughout the different conditions is equally represented in all conditions. Overall, the number of connections does not indicate that sending GPC signals or opting out via deleting the AdID are effective means for exercising the CCPA’s opt out right.

<sup>22</sup>We are in discussion with the Android Privacy team at Google regarding the disclosure of the AdID to third parties we observed.

<sup>23</sup>The AdID cannot be deleted or reset programmatically through adb. Therefore, as part of our dynamic analysis procedure (Figure 3), we implemented an automation process that navigated to the AdID setting view and sent manual taps to enable access to or delete the AdID. This automation process could have led to false positive results for apps with pop-up screens or other interruptions that may have conflicted with the process. To exclude this error source we re-ran our experiment for the affected apps manually. While we identified some false positives, the number of AdID accesses shown in Figure 9 remained.

Tracker Occurrences in Top Domains




Figure 10: The number of apps in our app dataset that connect to the 33 most prevalent third party tracking domains. There are no substantial differences between test conditions.

### 3.4.3 Setting of CCPA Privacy Flags

Many ad networks provide app developers the option to enable CCPA, GDPR, or other privacy law settings when they integrate the ad networks’ SDKs into their apps. When enabled, such a setting would attach a privacy flag, e.g., the IAB’s US Privacy String, to all outgoing requests. If an ad network server receives a request with a privacy flag attached, personal information should be discarded per applicable privacy laws. The IAB provides an industry-wide CCPA privacy flag in the form of the US Privacy String.<sup>24</sup> In addition, there are also company-specific privacy flags, such as Google’s RDP [25].

199 apps in our app dataset contained a script with the `us_privacy` key and corresponding value. However, the value of the US Privacy String was rarely set to opt out, that is, `1YY-` (Figure 11). Deleting the AdID did not impact the values substantially as the comparison between the AdID and No AdID conditions shows. In the AdID condition 9 values were `1YY-` while the No AdID condition had 11. Sending GPC signals did not lead to more opt outs either as indicated by AdID + GPC with 10 `1YY-` US Privacy String values compared to

<sup>24</sup>On January 31, 2024 the US Privacy String became part of the IAB’s GPP framework that covers privacy flags for multiple US states and international jurisdictions. Specifically, the US Privacy String became the GPP’s `usca` California privacy section [36]. Since we performed our analysis before that date we are focusing here on the US Privacy String. However, we ran our manual analysis for error checking in February 2024, that is, after the deprecation of the US Privacy String. To make sure the results are consistent, we checked the data for GPP. We did not find any significant outcome. GPP can be implemented on Android as recommended by the IAB with the GPP data and GPP string stored in the default Shared Preferences for the app context [35].

	rdp 0, 1	do_not_sell false, true	ccpa status opted_in, opted_out
<b>AdID</b>	12, 29	152, 2	339, 23
<b>AdID + GPC</b>	12, 30	154, 2	341, 23
<b>No AdID</b>	12, 31	156, 2	337, 24
<b>No AdID + GPC</b>	12, 31	155, 4	338, 26

Table 1: The number of apps in our app dataset that use company-specific privacy flags with left row values indicating opt in states and right row values opt out states. Note that, compared to the other two privacy flags, Google’s RDP flag was more often set to being opted out than being opted in, albeit, at relatively low absolute rates.

the AdID condition with 9. We believe that differences in opt values between test conditions are likely due to fluctuation as apps do not always deterministically connect to the same domains. These results indicate that neither deleting the AdID nor turning on GPC had substantial impact on increasing CCPA opt outs.

Looking at three company-specific privacy flags — RDP (Google), `do_not_sell` (SuperSonic Studios/Unity), and `ccpa status` (Vungle) — the picture does not change. There are some apps that opt out; however, the opt outs that occurred were condition-independent. Just as for the US Privacy String, company-specific flags rarely changed when (1) deleting the AdID or (2) sending GPC signals (Table 1). Generally, some apps opted people out regardless of either signal. It could be that opt outs happen by default or are triggered when detecting a California IP address. However, it is evident that neither deleting the AdID nor sending GPC signals make a difference. Thus, the privacy flag values also do not provide any indication that anything changes in terms of data sharing when deleting the AdID or sending GPC signals. These results overall suggest that apps generally do not respect privacy choices via sending GPC signals or deleting the AdID.

## 3.5 Lack of Alignment between Deleting the AdID and CCPA Opt Outs

Deleting the AdID and opting out per the CCPA are not aligned. It is true that once people delete their AdIDs, ad networks no longer have access to those making ad tracking slightly more challenging. They would now need to use alternative identifiers, which could be either existing ones (e.g., IP addresses) or newly created ones (e.g., hash values from device fingerprints). While the use of such alternative identifiers would be against Google’s Developer Program Policy [23], it would not be against the CCPA if deleting the AdID would not also be interpreted as CCPA opt out. Google’s Developer Program Policy does not specify that deleting the AdID has the meaning of exercising a CCPA opt out right. Regulators have not offered such interpretation either. The reverse is also true. Exercising the CCPA opt out right does not prevent ad networks from tracking people as long as the AdID is not




Figure 11: The number of apps in our app dataset that connect to a domain with a US Privacy String value. The apps are mutually exclusive within a given row but not across rows as one app can connect to multiple domains. Only domains that had at least one US Privacy String value in its app network traffic are included.

deleted.

Neither Google nor any regulator has asserted an alignment between opting out and deleting the AdID. While some ad networks may decide to make such alignment, we are not aware of such practice. In our view, opting out per the CCPA and deleting the AdID should be aligned. Both are intended to stop ad tracking. The first is based on a statute and the second on a contract, but their goals are the same. When deleting the AdID Android users declare that they are “[o]pt[ing] out of interest-based ads” (Figure 1). Thus, they should also be opted out. Conversely, if a user opts out, the AdID should be deleted. Given the similarity of both opting out and deleting the AdID, there is no reason why there are two settings. There should be one unified privacy setting that allows people to exercise their opt out right to stops ad tracking, and that setting should be GPC as it is recognized by the CCPA.

## 4 The Future

Android should provide a GPC opt out mechanism to comply with the CCPA and other privacy laws that afford people an

opt out right.<sup>25</sup> To integrate GPC into the Android platform we have three recommendations. First, regulators should interpret deleting the AdID as GPC opt out (§4.1). Second, Google should evolve the AdID setting and APIs towards GPC (§4.2). Third, Google should integrate GPC in the Privacy Sandbox and prevent its circumvention (§4.3).

### 4.1 Regulators Should Interpret Deleting the AdID as GPC Opt Out

The limited GPC adoption on Android is not surprising. Many app developers may not be aware of their obligation to comply with GPC. Some may also not know how to do so. GPC started on the web and has yet to be adopted by mobile platform operators. Regulators are playing a crucial role in this process. Re-interpreting of what it means to delete the AdID would be a big step forward. As we laid out (§3.3.2), deleting the

<sup>25</sup>We focus here on the CCPA but our recommendations generally also apply to other states’ and international privacy laws. We are in discussion with the Android Privacy team at Google regarding our proposed revision of the Privacy Sandbox.



AdID has the same meaning under the CCPA as sending GPC signals. Thus, it should be interpreted accordingly.<sup>26</sup> In particular, deleting the AdID is the closest equivalent to universally opting out across apps.<sup>27</sup>

## 4.2 Google Should Evolve the AdID Setting and APIs Towards GPC

As Google is developing its Privacy Sandbox, a privacy framework for the web and Android platform, it plans to phase out the AdID [11]. While, indeed, the AdID does not have a future for its current purpose, its underlying infrastructure should be re-purposed for a universal opt out mechanism at the operating system level. The emerging legal landscape requiring online ads to be served in a privacy-preserving manner presents an opportunity for Google to evolve the AdID setting and APIs towards GPC and align them with the mandatory GPC requirement in California and other jurisdictions. In particular, the proposed change of the CCPA per Assembly Bill 3048 [9] requires that “[a] business shall not develop or maintain a device through which a consumer interacts with a business that does not include a setting that enables the consumer to send an opt-out preference signal to that business [...]” Evolving the AdID setting and APIs towards GPC requires technology and policy changes in tandem.

When app and SDK developers submit their code on the Play Store for review, Google should ensure via its policies and submission interfaces that they declare whether they are selling or sharing personal information or collect and buy such. Then, to make people aware of their rights Google should surface a GPC prompt for universally opting out as part of the setup of a new or reset Android device. In a less desirable implementation Google could also surface such prompt upon the first start of an app that is selling or sharing personal information.<sup>28</sup> Before any selling or sharing of personal information could occur, an app would transmit a user’s GPC status to integrated third party SDKs. While transmitting the status via a header would work exactly as defined in the GPC standard [21], querying the GPC DOM property would not be available for apps and SDKs that do not use web technologies. However, they could query a user’s GPC status via a call to a new GPC API, as re-purposed from the current AdID API. This new GPC API would be the Android-equivalent of the GPC DOM property on the web. If not already known, at the point of making such call, a user should be prompted for their GPC choice. In general, if GPC is turned on, people should

<sup>26</sup>Even if there would be no alignment between Google’s policies and the requirements of the law, regulators are free to interpret deleting the AdID as they see fit.

<sup>27</sup>Per the CCPA Regulations [10] and the Colorado Privacy Act Rules [13], consumers can opt out with all businesses and controllers they interact with “without having to make individualized requests with each.”

<sup>28</sup>Any app-specific prompts should also contain an option for applying a user’s choice across all apps as a number of laws require universal opt outs [77].

be opted out to the maximum extent per any applicable law.

## 4.3 Google Should Integrate GPC in the Privacy Sandbox and Prevent its Circumvention

The Privacy Sandbox for Android (Appendix, Figure 15) is intended to provide privacy-preserving tracking alternatives for ad personalization and related use cases so that there is no need to rely on a cross-app ad tracking [11]. The Privacy Sandbox does not contain an option for people to exercise their opt out rights and prevent the selling or sharing of their personal information. Thus, Google should integrate GPC into the Privacy Sandbox to ensure compliance with people’s opt out rights. As the design and development of the individual mechanisms of the Privacy Sandbox — e.g., Topics API, Protected Audience, and Attribution Reporting [11] — are evolving it will become clear which, if any, are subject to an opt out right.<sup>29</sup> GPC would function as a switch turning off those mechanisms that are while leaving those turned on that are not.

There is a significant risk that some developers will try to keep tracking people rather than using the new mechanisms of the Privacy Sandbox. In particular, apps can easily create a custom identifier and propagate it to other apps through Android inter-process communication (IPC) capabilities. Such identifier syncing would be akin to cookie syncing on the web [1, 19, 56], which is pervasive in circumventing the ongoing phase-out of third party cookies. For example, intents, which are core to Android, can currently be used to share any type of data between apps. We asked Google about this issue but were told that no IPC framework changes are planned. On iOS, IPC is much more limited. To avoid rolling out privacy features that are hard to enforce, we suggest that Google re-design Android’s IPC system as part of the Privacy Sandbox development. Not doing so would create a significant risk of the Privacy Sandbox being undermined to the detriment of people’s privacy.

## 5 Conclusions

We find that people’s opt out rights per the CCPA are not respected on Android. Sending GPC signals has very little impact on preventing the selling or sharing of personal information. Similarly, while deleting the AdID nearly always prevents apps from accessing it, the setting is not aligned with people’s opt out choices. In our view, deleting the AdID and opting out has the same meaning. Thus, the current AdID setting and APIs on Android should be evolved towards GPC, which should be integrated into the Privacy Sandbox and

<sup>29</sup>For example, Google’s EU user consent policy requires developers to obtain valid user consent for processing Topics or Protected Audience data to comply with EU law [24].

enforced by regulators. To enable people to understand their rights and hold app operators accountable we also recommend that Google explain the thresholds and conditions of relevant laws to app operators and list the applicable laws on apps' Play Store pages. Since we focused here on Android, the opt out compliance on iOS remains an open question. While iOS has the App Tracking Transparency framework [3], it may not help people to exercise their opt out rights and result in similar compliance rates as we saw on Android.

## Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers and our shepherd for their valuable suggestions. Don Marti, Aram Zucker-Scharff, and Justin Brookman provided excellent feedback and industry expertise on our draft. We are grateful to the National Science Foundation (Award #2055196) and to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Program in Universal Access to Knowledge) for their support of this research. We thank Wesleyan University, its Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, and the Anil Fernando Endowment for their additional support. We also thank Wesley Tan for support of the research in its earlier stages. Conclusions reached or positions taken are our own and not necessarily those of our financial supporters, its trustees, officers, or staff.

## Availability

In line with good scholarly practice, we will share our code and data.

## References

- [1] Gunes Acar, Christian Eubank, Steven Englehardt, Marc Juarez, Arvind Narayanan, and Claudia Diaz. The web never forgets: Persistent tracking mechanisms in the wild. In *CCS*, page 674–689, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [2] Yuvraj Agarwal and Malcolm Hall. ProtectMyPrivacy: Detecting and mitigating privacy leaks on iOS devices using crowdsourcing. In *Proceeding of the 11th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services - MobiSys '13*, page 97, Taipei, Taiwan, 2013. ACM Press.
- [3] Apple Developer. App tracking transparency. <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/apptrackingtransparency>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [4] Steven Arzt, Siegfried Rasthofer, Christian Fritz, Eric Bodden, Alexandre Bartel, Jacques Klein, Yves Le Traon, Damien Outeau, and Patrick McDaniel. FlowDroid: Precise context, flow, field, object-sensitive and lifecycle-aware taint analysis for android apps. In *PLDI*, pages 259–269, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [5] Xavier Becerra. <https://twitter.com/AGBecerra/status/1354850758236102656>, January 2021. accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [6] Elettra Bietti. Consent as a Free Pass: Platform Power and the Limits of the Informational Turn. *Pace Law Review*, 40(1):92, 2020.

- [7] Reuben Binns, Ulrik Lyngs, Max Van Kleek, Jun Zhao, Timothy Libert, and Nigel Shadbolt. Third party tracking in the mobile ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Web Science, WebSci '18*, page 23–31, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] Reuben Binns, Jun Zhao, Max Van Kleek, and Nigel Shadbolt. Measuring third-party tracker power across web and mobile. *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, 18(4), aug 2018.
- [9] California Legislature. AB-3048 California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018: opt-out preference signal. [https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202320240AB3048](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB3048), 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [10] California Privacy Protection Agency. California Consumer Privacy Act Regulations. [https://cpa.ca.gov/regulations/pdf/cpa\\_regs.pdf](https://cpa.ca.gov/regulations/pdf/cpa_regs.pdf), 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [11] Anthony Chavez. Introducing the privacy sandbox on android. <https://blog.google/products/android/introducing-privacy-sandbox-android/>, feb 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [12] Yi Chen, Mingming Zha, Nan Zhang, Dandan Xu, Qianqian Zhao, Xuan Feng, Kan Yuan, Fnu Suya, Yuan Tian, Kai Chen, XiaoFeng Wang, and Wei Zou. Demystifying hidden privacy settings in mobile apps. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2019, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 19-23, 2019*, pages 570–586, San Francisco, 2019. IEEE.
- [13] Colorado Department of Law. Colorado Privacy Act Rules. <https://coag.gov/app/uploads/2023/03/FINAL-CLEAN-2023.03.15-Official-CPA-Rules.pdf>, 2023. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [14] Colorado Department of Law. Universal opt-out shortlist. <https://coag.gov/uoom/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [15] Consumer Reports. Permission Slip. <https://permissionslipcr.com/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [16] Anthony Desnos. Androguard. <https://github.com/androguard/androguard>, 2016. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [17] Digital Advertising Alliance. Download the AppChoices tool - now with 'do not sell' enhancements. <https://youradchoices.com/appchoices>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [18] William Enck, Peter Gilbert, Byung-Gon Chun, Landon P. Cox, Jaeyeon Jung, Patrick McDaniel, and Anmol N. Sheth. TaintDroid: An Information-flow Tracking System for Realtime Privacy Monitoring on Smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI'10*, pages 393–407, Vancouver, BC, 2010. USENIX Association.
- [19] Steven Englehardt and Arvind Narayanan. Online Tracking: A 1-million-site Measurement and Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '16*, pages 1388–1401, New York, NY, USA, October 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [20] Frida. Frida. <https://frida.re/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [21] Global Privacy Control Group. Global Privacy Control (GPC). <https://privacypcg.github.io/gpc-spec/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [22] Google. Play services advertisingidclient.info. <https://developers.google.com/android/reference/com/google/android/gms/ads/identifier/AdvertisingIdClient.Info>, 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [23] Google. Developer program policy. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/14144369>, Dec 2023. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [24] Google. Comply with eu user consent policy. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/6048248>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [25] Google. Helping advertisers comply with the u.s. states privacy laws in google ads. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/6048248>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [26] Google. Play Console Help — app discovery and ranking. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/9958766?hl=en>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [27] Google. Play Console Help — choose a category and tags for your app or game. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/9859673?hl=en#zippy=%2Cgames%2Capps>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [28] Google. Play console help ads. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/9857753>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.

- [29] Google. Play console help advertising id. <https://support.google.com/googleplay/android-developer/answer/6048248>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [30] Google for Developers. Android debug bridge (adb). <https://developer.android.com/tools/adb>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [31] Google Maps Help. Control access point inclusion in Google’s Location services. <https://support.google.com/maps/answer/1725632#zippy=%2Chow-do-i-opt-my-access-point-out-of-google-location-services>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [32] Daniel Greene and Katie Shilton. Platform privacies: Governance, collaboration, and the different meanings of “privacy” in iOS and Android development. *New Media & Society*, 20(4):1640–1657, 2018.
- [33] Maximilian Hils, Daniel W. Woods, and Rainer Böhme. Privacy preference signals: Past, present and future. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2021(4):249–269, 07 2021.
- [34] Soheil Human, Harshvardhan J. Pandit, Victor Morel, Cristiana Santos, Martin Degeling, Arianna Rossi, Wilhelmina Botes, Vitor Jesus, and Irene Kamara. Data protection and consenting communication mechanisms: Current open proposals and challenges. In *Proceedings - 7th IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, 2022 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops, pages 231–239, United States, jun 2022. IEEE.
- [35] IAB Tech Lab. Global Privacy Platform. [https://iabtechlab.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/global\\_privacy\\_platform\\_rfc\\_june\\_2022.pdf](https://iabtechlab.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/global_privacy_platform_rfc_june_2022.pdf), 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [36] IAB Tech Lab. GPP extension: IAB privacy’s california privacy technical specification. <https://github.com/InteractiveAdvertisingBureau/Global-Privacy-Platform/blob/main/Sections/US-States/CA/GPP%20Extension%3A%20IAB%20Privacy%E2%80%99s%20California%20Privacy%20Technical%20Specification.md>, 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [37] InMobi. Privacy policy. <https://www.inmobi.com/privacy-policy>, Feb 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [38] Simon Koch, Malte Wessels, Benjamin Altpeter, Madita Olvermann, and Martin Johns. Keeping privacy labels honest. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PoPETS 2022)*, pages 486–506, Sydney, Australia and Online, 2022. PoPETS 2022.
- [39] Konrad Kollnig. xray-blacklist.json. <https://github.com/TrackerControl/tracker-control-android/blob/master/app/src/main/assets/xray-blacklist.json>, 2023. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [40] Konrad Kollnig, Reuben Binns, Max Van Kleek, Ulrik Lyngs, Jund Zhao, Claudine Tinsman, and Shadbolt Nigel. Before and after gdpr: tracking in mobile apps. internet policy. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(4), 2021.
- [41] Konrad Kollnig, Pierre Dewitte, Max Van Kleek, Ge Wang, Daniel Omeiza, Helena Webb, and Nigel Shadbolt. A fait accompli? an empirical study into the absence of consent to third-party tracking in android apps. In *Seventeenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2021)*, pages 181–196, Berkeley, CA, 2021. USENIX Association.
- [42] Konrad Kollnig and Nigel Shadbolt. Trackercontrol: Transparency and choice around app tracking. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7(75):4270, 2022.
- [43] Konrad Kollnig, Anastasia Shuba, Reuben Binns, Max Van Kleek, and Nigel Shadbolt. Are iphones really better for privacy? a comparative study of ios and android apps. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, volume 2022, pages 6–24, Sydney, Australia, March 2022. Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium Advisory Board.
- [44] Konrad Kollnig, Anastasia Shuba, Max Van Kleek, Reuben Binns, and Nigel Shadbolt. Goodbye tracking? impact of ios app tracking transparency and privacy labels. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT ’22, page 508–520, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [45] Landgericht Berlin. Landgericht Berlin, Az.: 16 O 420/19, Teil- und Schlussurteil, Verbraucherzentrale Bundesverband e.V. gegen LinkedIn Ireland Unlimited Company. [https://www.vzbv.de/sites/default/files/2023-10/Teil-%20und%20Schlussurteil\\_LG%20Berlin\\_24.08.2023.pdf](https://www.vzbv.de/sites/default/files/2023-10/Teil-%20und%20Schlussurteil_LG%20Berlin_24.08.2023.pdf), Aug 2023. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [46] Anh Le, Janus Varmarken, Simon Langhoff, Anastasia Shuba, Minas Gjoka, and Athina Markopoulou. AntMonitor: A System for Monitoring from Mobile Devices. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Crowdsourcing and Crowdfunding of Big (Internet) Data - C2B(1)D ’15*, pages 15–20, London, United Kingdom, 2015. ACM Press.
- [47] Magisk. Magisk. <https://magiskmanager.com/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.



- [48] Mitmproxy Project. Mitmproxy. <https://mitmproxy.org/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [49] Mullvad. Mullvad. <https://mullvad.net/en>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [50] Trung Tin Nguyen, Michael Backes, Ninja Marnau, and Ben Stock. Share first, ask later (or never?) studying violations of GDPR’s explicit consent in android apps. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 3667–3684, Berkeley, CA, August 2021. USENIX Association.
- [51] Trung Tin Nguyen, Michael Backes, and Ben Stock. Freely Given Consent? Studying Consent Notice of Third-Party Tracking and Its Violations of GDPR in Android Apps. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’22*, pages 2369–2383, New York, NY, USA, November 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [52] Midas Nouwens, Iaria Liccardi, Michael Veale, David Karger, and Lalana Kagal. Dark Patterns after the GDPR: Scraping Consent Pop-ups and Demonstrating their Influence. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI ’20*, pages 1–13, New York, NY, USA, 2020. ACM.
- [53] Sean O’Connor, Ryan Nurwono, and Eleanor Birrell. (un)clear and (in)conspicuous: The right to opt-out of sale under CCPA. *CoRR*, abs/2009.07884:59–72, 2020.
- [54] OneTrust. Protect mobile app consumer privacy and enable data control. <https://www.onetrust.com/products/mobile-app-consent/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [55] Onyxbits. Raccoon - apk downloader. <https://www.onyxbits.de/raccoon>, 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [56] Panagiotis Papadopoulos, Nicolas Kourtellis, and Evangelos Markatos. Cookie synchronization: Everything you always wanted to know but were afraid to ask. In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW ’19*, page 1432–1442, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [57] Amogh Pradeep, Alvaro Feal, Julien Gamba, Ashwin Rao, Martina Lindorfer, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, and David Choffnes. Not your average app: A large-scale privacy analysis of android browsers. In *23rd Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS 2023)*, volume 2023, pages 29–46, Lausanne, Switzerland, July 2023. PETS.
- [58] Amogh Pradeep, Muhammad Talha Paracha, Protick Bhowmick, Ali Davanian, Abbas Razaghpanah, Taejoong Chung, Martina Lindorfer, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, Dave Levin, and David Choffnes. A comparative analysis of certificate pinning in android & ios. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC ’22*, page 605–618, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [59] Privacy4Cars. OptOutCode. <https://optoutcode.com/>, 2024. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [60] Joel Reardon, Álvaro Feal, Primal Wijesekera, Amit Elazari Bar On, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, and Serge Egelman. 50 ways to leak your data: An exploration of apps’ circumvention of the android permissions system. In *28th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 19)*, pages 603–620, Santa Clara, CA, August 2019. USENIX Association.
- [61] Jingjing Ren, Ashwin Rao, Martina Lindorfer, Arnaud Legout, and David Choffnes. Recon: Revealing and controlling pii leaks in mobile network traffic. In *MobiSys ’16*, pages 361–374, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM.
- [62] Nikita Samarin, Shayna Kothari, Zaina Siyed, Oscar Bjorkman, Reena Yuan, Primal Wijesekera, Noura Aomar, Jordan Fischer, Chris Hoofnagle, and Serge Egelman. Lessons in vcr repair: Compliance of android app developers with the california consumer privacy act (ccpa), July 2023.
- [63] Irina Shklovski, Scott D. Mainwaring, Halla Hrund Skúladóttir, and Höskuldur Borgthorsson. Leakiness and creepiness in app space: Perceptions of privacy and mobile app use. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI ’14*, pages 2347–2356, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2014. ACM Press.
- [64] Daniel J. Solove. The myth of the privacy paradox. *GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works*, 2020(10), 2020.
- [65] Yihang Song and Urs Hengartner. PrivacyGuard: A VPN-based Platform to Detect Information Leakage on Android Devices. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM CCS Workshop on Security and Privacy in Smartphones and Mobile Devices - SPSM ’15*, pages 15–26, Denver, Colorado, USA, 2015. ACM Press.
- [66] State of California Department of Justice. CCPA enforcement case examples. <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa/enforcement>, 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.

- [67] TrueVault. Is “sharing” the same as selling under the ccpa? <https://www.truevault.com/learn/ccpa/is-sharing-the-same-as-selling-under-the-ccpa/>, 2022. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [68] Imdad Ullah, Rokhsana Boreli, and Salil S. Kanhere. Privacy in targeted advertising on mobile devices: a survey. *International Journal of Information Security*, 22:647–678, 2023.
- [69] Michael Veale, Midas Nouwens, and Cristiana Santos. Impossible Asks: Can the Transparency and Consent Framework Ever Authorise Real-Time Bidding After the Belgian DPA Decision? Preprint, SocArXiv, February 2022.
- [70] Nicolas Viennot, Edward Garcia, and Jason Nieh. A measurement study of google play. In *The 2014 ACM International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems - SIGMETRICS '14*, pages 221–233, Austin, Texas, USA, 2014. ACM Press.
- [71] W3C. Tracking Preference Expression (DNT). <https://www.w3.org/TR/tracking-dnt/>, 2019. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [72] Jess Weatherbed. Google launches first android beta for ad-tracking overhaul. <https://www.theverge.com/2023/2/14/23599027/google-android-privacy-sandbox-beta-advertising-tracking>, 2023. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [73] Anhao Xiang, Weiping Pei, and Chuan Yue. Policy-checker: Analyzing the gdpr completeness of mobile apps’ privacy policies. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '23*, page 3373–3387, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [74] Yue Xiao, Zhengyi Li, Yue Qin, Xiaolong Bai, Jiale Guan, Xiaojing Liao, and Luyi Xing. Lalaine: Measuring and Characterizing Non-Compliance of Apple Privacy Labels at Scale. In *Proceedings of USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 1091–1108, Anaheim, CA, 2023. USENIX Association.
- [75] Sebastian Zimmeck. Opting out may not prevent websites from collecting your data. <https://sebastianzimmeck.medium.com/opting-out-may-not-prevent-websites-from-collecting-your-data-cfc3ff5b5ff7>, Jul 2021. Accessed: July 23, 2024.
- [76] Sebastian Zimmeck, Daniel Goldelman, Owen Kaplan, Logan Brown, Justin Casler, Judeley Jean-Charles, Joe Champeau, and Hamza Harkous. Website data transparency in the browser. In *24th Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS 2024)*, pages 211–234, Bristol, UK, July 2024. PETS.
- [77] Sebastian Zimmeck, Eliza Kuller, Chunyue Ma, Bella Tassone, and Joe Champeau. Generalizable active privacy choice: Designing a graphical user interface for global privacy control. In *24th Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS 2024)*, pages 258–279, Bristol, UK, July 2024. PETS.
- [78] Sebastian Zimmeck, Peter Story, Abhilasha Ravichander, Daniel Smullen, Ziqi Wang, Joel Reidenberg, N. Cameron Russell, and Norman Sadeh. MAPS: Scaling privacy compliance analysis to a million apps. In *PETS*, pages 66–86, Stockholm, Sweden, July 2019. Sciendo.
- [79] Sebastian Zimmeck, Oliver Wang, Kuba Alicki, Jocelyn Wang, and Sophie Eng. Usability and enforceability of global privacy control. In *23rd Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium (PETS 2023)*, pages 265–281, Lausanne, Switzerland, July 2023. PETS.

## A Supplementary Figures




Figure 12: The number of installs of apps in our app dataset ( $n = 1,811$ ) by genre.




Figure 14: The top 50 permissions declared by apps in our app dataset ( $n = 1,811$ ) in their manifest files.




Figure 13: The Results of the AdID Analysis for the 33 most prevalent third party tracking domains across all apps in our app dataset ( $n = 1,811$ ).




Figure 15: Screenshots of the Android Privacy Sandbox beta version showing the Topics API [72].