

Alexandra Kapp\*

# Collection, usage and privacy of mobility data in the enterprise and public administrations

**Abstract:** Human mobility data is a crucial resource for urban mobility management, but it does not come without personal reference. The implementation of security measures such as anonymization is thus needed to protect individuals' privacy. Often, a trade-off arises as such techniques potentially decrease the utility of the data and limit its use. While much research on anonymization techniques exists, there is little information on the actual implementations by practitioners, especially outside the big tech context. Within our study, we conducted expert interviews to gain insights into practices in the field. We categorize purposes, data sources, analysis, and modeling tasks to provide a profound understanding of the context such data is used in. We survey privacy-enhancing methods in use, which generally do not comply with state-of-the-art standards of differential privacy. We provide groundwork for further research on practice-oriented research by identifying privacy needs of practitioners and extracting relevant mobility characteristics for future standardized evaluations of privacy-enhancing methods.

**Keywords:** mobility data, privacy, privacy-enhancing methods, expert interviews, practical applications, GDPR

DOI 10.56553/popets-2022-0117

Received 2022-02-28; revised 2022-06-15; accepted 2022-06-16.

## 1 Introduction

Nowadays smartphones are being used daily for a variety of functions - from mobile phoning through navigation to renting an e-scooter via an app. The usage of these applications produces data about the locations and movements of individuals, so-called *human mobility data*, which can be a great resource to optimize services but also for a multitude of diverse tasks such as traffic planning [1] or epidemiological research [2]. As

such data entails highly personal information, it falls under the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) which restricts companies from freely using such collected data for arbitrary purposes. While the analysis of human mobility data offers great potential, it can be assumed that not all desirable use cases are implemented due to uncertainty regarding privacy regulations. A recent study [3] concludes that 46% of German companies refrain from innovations because of ambiguities in the interpretation of the GDPR. For example, 31% claimed to not have implemented new technologies based on Big Data or Artificial Intelligence because of it and 41% stated that they were unable to set up data pools or share data with business partners.

Anonymization<sup>1</sup> of data can be used as a measure to enhance customers' privacy and simplify data usage for companies, as GDPR principles no longer apply once data is considered anonymous (Recital 26 GDPR). Therefore, one option to make use of data more confidently is the implementation of privacy-enhancing methods that sufficiently guarantee privacy. However, anonymization of mobility data is a difficult task since people's movements follow predictable patterns [7] that allow easy re-identification. Individuals have successfully been re-identified from "anonymized" taxi data [5], out of highly aggregated mobile phone data [6], or the aggregated count of customers per station [8]. This already illustrates that procedures that guarantee sufficient anonymization from a legal point of view are partly considered insecure within the privacy community. While big tech companies such as Google, Apple, or Microsoft put effort into adopting state-of-the-art privacy concepts like local differential privacy [9], it is doubtful that these are widely used outside the big tech industry [10].

Making mobility data available in a privacy-sensitive manner is a complex and multi-faceted problem. There is typically a trade-off between utilizing data and protecting privacy and the legal and technical as-

\*Corresponding Author: Alexandra Kapp: Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft Berlin (HTW), University of Applied Sciences, E-mail: kapp@htw-berlin.de


<sup>1</sup> "Anonymization" is a misleading term, as it suggests that data becomes fully anonymous. Numerous examples of successful reidentification of individuals in "anonymized" data suggests otherwise, e.g., [4], [5], [6].

assessment of the anonymity of the data may differ. It is not trivial to gain in-depth insights on data practices in the field as companies rarely share detailed information on data usage. Even companies such as the cellular network operator Telefónica that claims to use sophisticated anonymization techniques [11] do not share details about their methods.

We aim to understand which privacy-enhancing methods for human mobility data are already in use by practitioners and which privacy needs are still present. Thus, a profound understanding of real-life practices in the work with respective data is necessary, as the suitability of privacy methods depends on the context they are applied in. For example, if the goal is to re-release reports with aggregated statistics to third parties, one could add noise to the aggregates as a comparatively simple method that likely provides reliable results. On the other hand, training a next-location prediction algorithm requires fine-granular data input and therefore other appropriate privacy-enhancing methods are needed.

As shown in Figure 1, we presume that mobility data serves as a data source to conduct analysis and modeling tasks which are means to acquire certain purposes. For example, data from a public transport routing app (data source) is used to aggregate the number of routing queries for each hour of the day (data analysis) to optimize the operating hours of the public transport lines (purpose). With expert interviews, we aim to gain insights into these respective categories. In addition, we survey on privacy measures that are already in use.

Academic research evaluates their proposed privacy methods with *similarity measures* which quantify the resemblance of analysis outputs with and without privacy enhancement. The more similar the two outputs remain the higher the utility of the privacy measure is rated. With this work, we further want to provide a link between real-life practices and academic research by extracting the core *mobility characteristics* entailed in practitioners' use-cases so that relevant similarity measures can be identified. For example, analyzing the top 10 most used docking stations of shared bicycles entails at its core the same characteristic of interest as determining traffic volume on street segments: the spatial distribution of records. A standardized set of similarity measures that are matched to such characteristics would not only enable easier comparison between different privacy enhancing approaches but also simplify practitioners' assessment of suitable methods for acquired use cases. As similarity measures currently vary strongly within the literature it is difficult to compare



**Fig. 1.** Schematic illustration of the context that privacy-enhanced methods are used in. Data sources are used (in a privacy enhanced manner) for data analysis or modeling tasks to achieve a certain purpose. The evaluation of privacy enhancements is pursued by similarity measures which quantify the difference between analyses conducted with privacy-enhanced (black solid arrow) and raw (orange dashed arrow) data input. Note, that for simplicity the use of privacy-enhanced methods is placed between the data source and the data analysis, which is only one possible set-up.

different approaches, we hereby want to lay the groundwork for future standardization of such similarity measures.

In summary, our contribution consists of the following: (1) We provide a profound insight into real-life practices stated in expert interviews by employees from companies and public administrations in Germany working with human mobility data. (2) We deduce core mobility characteristics as groundwork for the categorization and standardization of similarity measures. (3) We identify privacy needs of practitioners.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give an overview of related work on human mobility data. Section 3 describes our methodology for the data collection, processing, and evaluation of the expert interviews. In Section 4 the evaluation of the qualitative data is presented. Section 5 provides implications for privacy needs and similarity measures deduced from the interviews. Finally, the results are summarized and discussed in Section 6.

## 2 Background

Different **techniques to collect** human mobility data are well documented in the literature, see e.g., [12–14]. This includes data from surveys, mobile phone data in the format of call detail records, GPS tracking devices,

usually smartphones that produce spatially and temporally fine granular data, and locations users post on social media. Some surveys also name WiFi positioning systems [15]. The overviews of data sources mostly focus on openly available data sets or such that have been used for academic research. One can easily imagine what kind of human mobility data companies could potentially raise with different techniques. Fiore et al. [16] name five examples of sources for micro-trajectory data: Location-based services, like Google maps, record the GPS position while the app is running, cellular network operators collect call detail records, municipalities collect MAC addresses via Wi-Fi probe messages of nearby smartphones, car navigation systems record the GPS data of the navigation device, banks register the shops their customers pay at. While all these are valid examples of potentially used datasets, to the best of our knowledge there are no systematic overviews of mobility data actually used by companies and the ways this data is handled.

Data on human mobility is a highly desired resource for various **purposes**. For example epidemic spreading of diseases is being studied [2], just recently during the COVID-19 pandemic [17]. There is also growing research focusing on deep learning approaches to predict the next location of a person [13], for instance, to predict locations of affected people during disasters like earthquakes [18]. For an overview of various machine learning applications that human mobility data is used for, see [15]. Dedicated research also focuses on visual explorations of mobility data [19] and more and more interactive tools enable users to visualize large-scale fine granular mobility data<sup>2</sup>. These examples are only a few of various use cases that build on human mobility data though this does not necessarily reflect applications in enterprise settings.

There is plenty of research dealing with **privacy-enhancing methods** for mobility data, for a detailed overview on methods for trajectory micro-data see Fiore et al. [16]. To give a few examples: There are simple approaches like the reduction of granularity of coordinates [20] or reducing the sampling interval [21]. More advanced methods aim to provide indistinguishability between individuals within a dataset, like  $k$ -anonymity [22], or provide uninformativeness with the guarantee of differential privacy, e.g., [23–26].

While privacy researchers consider differential privacy as the de-facto standard, there is little information

on the adoption of such methods in the field. Garfinkel et al. [27] point out that the deployment of differential privacy comes with challenges and requires skilled staff. Calacci et al. [28] state that risk and utility are often evaluated without context which is vital for a proper assessment. They analyze the public and market utility as well as the risks associated with different levels of granularity of mobility data, thereby only considering coarsening and aggregating as privacy enhancement, which they say is still most commonly used in practice. De Montjoye et al. [29] also criticize the insufficient implementation of privacy measures for mobile phone data and propose four different approaches for practical implementations in real-life scenarios. While both, Calacci et al. and de Montjoye et al. assume reasonable scenarios, we aim to collect empirical data on the context of mobility data usage.

Privacy-enhancing methods reduce the information content and thus there is a common perception of an associated reduction of utility of the data. This is true for many use cases, for example, when a public transport company wants to analyze the typical distance their customers are willing to walk to a stop, the utility is likely decreased when the exact locations are obfuscated with noise or aggregated to larger grid cells. Other use cases are less impacted by such measures, for example, those that are based on highly aggregated data such as the evaluation of customer numbers over time of a new bike-sharing system. Thus, it is vital to understand the analysis purposes and methods that are applied in practice to evaluate the trade-off between utility and privacy when privacy-enhancing methods are applied. Similarity measures are commonly used in research to quantify the utility, though there do not exist any standard measures for privacy-enhancing methods applied to mobility data [16]. In addition to a (potential) impact on the utility, other effects of privacy-enhancing methods also ought to be considered in practice, e.g., research about medical data shows that users are more willing to share data when they have trust that their privacy is preserved [30].

### 3 Methodology

In July and August 2021 we conducted a total of 13 semi-structured expert interviews that lasted on average about one hour, with a range between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours. The interviews covered questions on mobility data sources, including their origin, struc-

<sup>2</sup> for example kepler.gl and unfolded.ai

ture, and personal reference. Further questions dealt with data analysis and modeling techniques, their purposes as well as the impact they have on the companies' actions. Additionally, we asked about analyses planned for the future, those that have not been conducted due to (legal) restrictions or obstacles, and data protection and anonymization practices. Questions were asked about how long data is stored, in which format, and whether anonymization techniques are applied. Questions on data security, the legal basis, and user communication were included, however, they are not further evaluated within this work. See Appendix A for the full interview guide.

### 3.1 Participant recruitment and moderation

All interviewees were employees in leading positions of German organizations working with human mobility data. One organization was represented with two interviewees from different departments, thus resulting in twelve different organizations of the following types: public administrations, public transport companies, a mobility platform (part of a public transport company), a mobility service provider, an automobile manufacturer, a location-based service app, a sensor company providing sensors for people counts, and market research companies. The location-based service app was still in the state of a startup and did not work with any real customer data yet, but the participant could report on planned data usage. Also, one public administration only recently started with a dedicated team to work with human mobility data and one person from a public transport company reported mostly from their current build-up process. The rest of the interviewees had multiple years of experience with mobility data within their field and company. All participants were in the positions of founders, CEOs, team or project leads of relevant divisions. See Table 1 for an overview of all participants which also introduces the participants' IDs which will be used in Section 4.

We recruited participants through contacts of our research group network and by sending email invitations to relevant company representatives (see Appendix B for the email invitation text). We used purposeful sampling [31], a method where a variety of relevant cases is sought to be included by specifically targeting a selection of such differing subjects, i.e., a variety of different types of organizations working with mobility data.

**Table 1.** Overview of interview participants.

ID	Organization type	Job title
P1	public administration	mobility manager
P2	public administration	manager in traffic mgmt.
P3	public administration	head of the data science
P4	public transport company	team lead AI systems
P5	public transport company	product owner analytics
P6	public transport company	team lead offer planning
P7	mobility platform	project lead
P8	mobility service provider	managing director
P9	automobile manufacturer	head of analytics
P10	location-based service app	CEO
P11	sensor company	head of technical division
P12	market research company	CEO
P13	market research company	managing director

All interviews were held in German and conducted remotely using a video conferencing tool. The interviews were recorded and transcribed with the aid of transcription software. The automatically created transcripts were proofread and corrected by the interviewer.

### 3.2 Analysis and coding

The qualitative content analysis with an inductive approach [32] was conducted to analyze the interview transcripts. All questions within the interview guide were constructed to fit into one of the following groups (see Appendix A) which match the scheme in Figure 1: (1) purposes, (2) data sources, (3) data analysis and modeling (initially: methods), and (4) privacy (the code on user communication an legal was not used for the evaluation). All relevant parts of the transcripts were extracted into a table format and categorized into one of the four codes. Each group was then evaluated separately. During the iterative coding phase each transcript chunk was coded on a fine-granular level first, then the codes were grouped into broader categories. The coding process was conducted by the interviewer herself and the coding iterations were discussed with and reviewed by one further person; the revisions served as the base for further refinements. For the analysis of purposes, we aimed to find common motivations and themes which are printed in bold type in Section 4.1. Data sources were categorized based on technical similarities and are

listed in Table 2. The major distinction between applications was the computation of statistical aggregations (see all final codes in Table 3) and the application of mathematical models (see all final codes in Table 4). Themes for the motivation of anonymization were derived (see final themes printed in bold type in Section 4.4); applied and planned privacy-enhancing methods were collected (see final codes in Table 5).

### 3.3 Research ethics and anonymization

During the recruitment, participants received information about the purpose of the study, and an informed consent document (see Appendix C) was signed before the interview. The interviewer also informed participants verbally about the purpose of the research and the audio recording. Additionally, they were guaranteed precautionous handling of the shared information which does not allow to identify the person or company. To further stress that no sensitive information about the person or company would be revealed, this information was again repeated within the verbal introduction at the beginning of the interview (see Appendix A). After the transcription, all audio files were deleted and the names of participants and their employers were removed from the transcripts. The transcripts were then stored in an encrypted manner. See Appendix D for the full study procedure with respect to ethical considerations.

### 3.4 Limitations

Participants were only recruited from companies based in Germany. Thus, results can only be applied to a limited amount of companies in other countries. As GDPR was of special interest, the results can most easily be transferred to other EU countries. We have made our best effort to recruit diverse organizations, though we cannot claim to have included all types of organizations working with human mobility data. Our main research focus is directed at companies working on urban mobility topics, therefore we recruited our participants accordingly. Still, we are aware that companies from other contexts also work with such data, for example, location-based service apps like fitness apps, restaurant recommendations, or dating apps, to only name a few.

## 4 Findings

Participants are referred to by their ID P1-P13 as assigned in Table 1.

### 4.1 Purposes for data collection and analyses

The primary purpose for collecting personal data is usually the operation of a service. As P8 stated, they cannot provide route suggestions if they don't know where the customer wants to go to. However, this evaluation focuses on determining themes for data analysis and modeling purposes beyond the operation of applications.

Several experts mentioned that data is used for **demand-driven offers** to customers. For example, the P8 (mobility service provider) said they position their vehicles close to the predicted demand and plan their fleet size accordingly. They also optimize routing algorithms for ride-hailing applications based on customer data. P6 (public transport company) stated that they not only do mid- to long-term offer planning but also adapt their schedules within a few weeks to better suit the changing needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. They added that ticket options and pricing are also part of the long-term offer planning that relies on customer mobility data. **Quality management** was mentioned by P8, for example by comparing the actual and predicted waiting time of taxi customers. P9 (automotive manufacturer) named the need for data for **autonomous driving**.

Data is not only used internally but it is also used to **provide information to customers**: P6 said they use historic data to predict future passenger loads and display such information in their routing application. P9 stated that the display of real-time traffic can help car drivers to avoid traffic jams.

Insights from aggregated data have been stated to be used for **marketing**. Personalized advertising has only been named by one expert as a potential option that is not intended to be pursued.

Various experts named **reports of aggregated statistics for monitoring of KPIs, internal knowledge, and strategic planning**. Not only to obtain new insights but also to verify gut feelings, as one expert said: "Every [manager] knows [...] the customer behavior very well. [...] [They] have a feeling, an experience, but it's better to really see it in black and white" [translated from German].

P6 and P3 (both public administration) stated to use data for **city and traffic planning**, e.g., to plan bicycle infrastructure. They also envisioned other fields of application for the future, e.g., to compute emissions produced within a city by the transport sector or to create plans for emergency or catastrophe situations.

The **provision of data to third parties** was mentioned in various forms: P3 mentioned their efforts of providing as much data as possible as open data for transparent policymaking. Some interviewees said they are obliged to provide data to other parties, for example, public transport companies need to report aggregated statistics to the public administration. One expert also claimed they are considering to potentially sell anonymized data in the future. All data the public administration has access to can potentially be subject to parliamentary inquiries. Two experts also reported on the use of data for evidence in court.

## 4.2 Data sources and responsibilities

There are two types of data that practitioners work with: data collected by themselves and external data, such as open data, bought data, or data provided by contractual partners. The question of origin plays a major role in terms of who needs to have technical and legal competencies on the protection of privacy: if data is gathered through external sources the responsibility is seen with the providing entity. The provider needs to have the competencies of applying adequate privacy measures while the party receiving data is (at most) interested in the high-level information on whether the data is GDPR compliant.

As P11 (sensor company) stated: “[...] We have such a certificate for our solution. Well, what we attach to the tender and show: Okay, look at our solution, it works. But it is also compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation. [...] Otherwise, we wouldn’t be able to offer the solution in the market in Germany or anywhere else or in Europe [...]” [translated from German]. While P13 (market research company) said: “There I notice the tendency that the industry clients, so to speak, they like to play down the data protection requirements a bit in order to get this data more quickly, so as not to make things so difficult for themselves” [translated from German].

Table 2 summarizes the categorized data sources named by the interviewees which are already being used or desired to be used in the future.

Large-scale household **surveys** are a traditional mobility data source that all interviewed public administrations and public transport companies stated to rely on. The experts mentioned additional custom studies on smaller scales that are commissioned by public administrations or companies. They all agreed that surveys are commonly conducted by third-party research facilities who are responsible for the data privacy concept while only aggregated and anonymized data is made available to third parties.

Unlike other forms of mobility data where the person carries the tracking device, **stationary sensors** are positioned statically and people passing the sensor are registered. As the sensor provider (P11) explained, there are specialized companies that install and run sensors, provide software, make the sensor signals human-readable, and take care of anonymization measures if the data contains personally identifiable attributes. Technical variations that interviewees stated include pressure sensors within the road surface (e.g., to measure traffic volume), infrared sensors (e.g., to count entering and exiting public transport passengers), camera-based sensors (e.g., to count people within a room) or sensors based on WiFi technology that allows the tracking of MAC addresses of mobile devices across multiple sensors. Only camera and WiFi-based sensors were seen as potentially critical in terms of privacy.

Routing applications provide information on the optimal route and potential alternatives, based on a provided start and end location and time. **Routing queries** made within such apps precede many actual trips and can be considered a proxy to mobility data. P5 and P6 from public transport companies reported that they collect such data with their own routing applications and use it for analytical purposes, e.g., for passenger load forecast. As app operators, they both stated to have raw data access which is restricted by technical and organizational measures. Usually, query data is not stored with any user identification which limits the personal references. Though, as people tend to query routes to sensitive and personal locations, like home or work, privacy concerns could be raised, as P6 also mentioned.

Apps that allow the booking of mobility services produce mobility-related **transaction data**. Transaction data includes the exact start and destination location as well as time, price, and user information. This data is primarily needed to handle the booking transaction with the payment, as P8 said, but is also used for aggregated statistics. P2 from a public administration reported obtaining aggregated statistics of such transac-

**Table 2.** Data sources by type, providing entity, user, and available format as stated by the experts.

Type	Provision	User (among interviewees)	Available format
surveys	third party research institutes	public administrations (P1-P3), public transport companies (P4-P6)	aggregated and anonymized data
stationary sensor data	sensor companies maintain sensors and preprocess data	public administration (P3), public transport company (P6)	preprocessed and anonymized data
routing queries	app operator	mobility service provider (P8), public transport companies (P5, P6), mobility platform (P7)	data users are also app controllers, thus, access to data in any (legally permitted) way
transaction data	app operator	mobility service provider (P8), mobility platform (P7)	data users are also app controllers, thus, access to data in any (legally permitted) way
GPS tracking	controller of tracking device applications (e.g., smartphone apps, vehicles equipped with GPS trackers)	mobility service provider (P8), mobility platform (P7), public transport company (P6), public administration (P3), market research company (P12), automobile manufacturer (P9), location-based service app (P10)	heterogeneous: If data users are also app controllers they have access to data in any (legally permitted) way. Third parties can only access aggregated and anonymized data.
mobile phone data	cellular network providers	public administration (P3), public transport company (P6)	aggregated and anonymized origin-destination matrices

tion data from a partnering bike-sharing provider. Unlike routing queries, transaction data includes information on actually performed trips with precise time and place information and a linked user record. It is therefore highly personal information.

**GPS tracking** data is diverse due to different types of devices and applications. Some experts stated to collect GPS data themselves, either via their smartphone applications or GPS-equipped vehicles. For example, the market research company (P12) offers an app that constantly tracks participants during the collection phase of a study. GPS data is also acquired from third parties: P3 (public administration) reported that they considered using aggregated data about street-level speed and traffic volume that had been collected with an app for cyclists and P6 (public transport) reported about planning a market research study which includes GPS tracking.

**Mobile phone data** is collected by cellular network providers. P6 explained that they buy such data from a service provider who gets anonymized data from cellular network providers. The service provider then processes them into usable formats such as origin-destination matrices and redistributes them.

### 4.3 Data analysis and modeling techniques

Methods stated by the experts can mainly be assigned to one of two groups: statistical aggregations and mathematical models. While statistical aggregations provide descriptive analytics of the data, mathematical models, i.e., machine learning models and traffic models, allow tasks such as classification, prediction, or simulation.

All stated **statistical aggregations** are presented in Table 3. They are grouped according to shared underlying characteristics which are generic attributes of mobility data independent from the specific context.

On the highest level, mostly all experts aggregate data to record counts like the total number of trips or customers. On a more fine-granular level, different experts are interested in spatial (and temporal) distributions that quantify people at certain locations (and times), e.g., public transport companies (P6) are interested in the number of customers entering and exiting stations (at different times of day) and the number of tickets sold per station, while the mobility service provider (P8) wants to know where (and when) their services are mostly used.

Origin-destination matrices are used by public transport companies (P6, P13) to gain insights into mo-

**Table 3.** Statistical aggregations used by the interviewed experts and their underlying mobility characteristics.

Statistical aggregations	mobility characteristic
trip counts, customer counts, returning customers	record counts
total passengers over time, bike rentals over time	temporal distribution of records
people count per location / sensor, top 20 shared mobility stations, sold tickets at a station, passengers entering and exiting a station, number of transits per station, traffic volume, occupancy rate in a place / public transport line, real-time traffic information	spatial distribution of records
<i>all aggregations for spatial distributions disaggregated by certain time windows</i>	spatial and temporal distribution of records
mobility demand by OD relations, round trips of shared bikes (i.e., same start and end station)	distribution of OD counts
relation of public transport share compared to other modes by OD relation	modal split per OD pair
average trip lengths (evaluated in research studies)	trip length
dedicated analysis of trip chains (evaluated in research studies)	travel patterns
daily driven distances (car), temporal changes in daily distances (e.g., to see trends during COVID-19 pandemic or holidays)	daily range
modal split (evaluated in research studies)	modal split
trips conducted with multiple traffic modes (e.g., bike & ride) (evaluated in research studies)	inter-modality of trips
proportion of people who use more than one traffic mode (evaluated in research studies)	multi-modality of people
average speed per street segment (bicycle and car)	speed
waiting times at traffic lights, customer time spent in stores	time allocation
customer groups (e.g., x% of customers visiting store A also visit store B)	correlation between visits of different locations

bility demand, further disaggregated by modes of transport they reveal shortcomings in public transport infrastructure. According to P13, surveys and market research studies evaluate average trip lengths, trip chains, the modal split, as well as the share of inter-modal trips (i.e., multiple modes of transport are mixed within a trip) and multi-modal people (i.e., a person uses multiple traffic modes for different trips). P3 (public administration) stated to be interested in data on speed and traffic volumes of bicycles per road segment. Additionally, they were interested in waiting times at traffic lights. P11 (sensor company) stated that clients are interested in identifying customer groups based on their visited locations. Additional performance indicators such as the number of unique customers per location, the number of returning customers per location, and time spent at different stores are determined.

Next to statistical aggregations, experts (plan to) use data for different **mathematical models**, listed

in Table 4. Due to the nature of such models, underlying characteristics cannot be determined in the same manner as before. P8 (mobility service provider) uses demand prediction models and optimizes routings of ride-hailing services to optimally group users. P11 (sensor provider) explores the prediction of people counts, though they do not see any demand for such features among their customers. P12 (market research company) reported to use classifiers that detect the mode based on continuous smartphone GPS tracking and further sensor data. They also experimented with activity recognition algorithms which are supposed to recognize the purpose of a visit, such as “at home” or “waiting”. Public administrations (P2, P3) and public transport companies (P6) reported using traffic models, commonly 4-step-



**Table 4.** Mathematical models in use and in planning by interviewed experts.

in use	in planning
4-step traffic models	next-location-prediction
occupancy prediction	activity recognition
mode detection	clustering of mobility patterns
routing optimization	agent-based models
demand prediction	

traffic-models<sup>3</sup>, which take a variety of data sources as input such as population density, modal split and origin-destination matrices to simulate different scenarios and forecast traffic. According to P2 and P3, agent-based models are also in the planning which require user trajectories of an entire day to properly take trip chains into account. Predicting the next probable location of a user (next-location prediction) was in a proof of concept stage at the location-based service app (P10). They also planned on implementing an algorithm to cluster customers' mobility behavior.

#### 4.4 Privacy

We found major differences regarding the **engagement of the interviewees with privacy measures**. We hypothesize that there is a difference between participants' organizations that **collect data themselves and those that obtain them from third parties**. For example, experts from public administrations (almost) exclusively work with third-party human mobility data, therefore they did not report any need of implementing anonymization methods themselves. Still, privacy is an important topic for them, as data protection authorities strictly check any personal data that is used by public administrations.

All interviewees applying anonymization methods to their data named one of the two **reasons**: (1) For purposes **outside of the scope the user consented to**. (2) To make the data **available to third parties**. Different experts reported that they **struggle to pursue all their use cases due to GDPR**. They said, that personal data cannot be used for any arbi-

trary purpose, even if it might serve the customers' interests. Therefore, anonymization techniques can help to remove the personal reference and enable the use for additional analyses. As one interviewee explained: "There is a source layer [...] [with] GPS in full resolution and whatnot. This is normally not usable at all for analysts like me and after processing [and anonymizing] it is moved to the secondary assets. The primary assets for the primary use case are then deleted" [translated from German].

Interviewees with a business model based on **providing data to third parties**, such as market research companies or the sensor provider, have a **high interest in applying privacy measures as compliance with GDPR is a major criterion to acquire clients**. Accordingly, they seemed to have the highest expertise in privacy-enhancing methods. Table 5 shows an overview of privacy-enhancing methods that were stated by the experts.

P4, P9 and P11 stated to **remove personal information** that is not needed for analyses, such as name, phone number, or MAC address. Some experts claimed to remove the user identification entirely while others still retained the link between different user records but used **pseudonymization** methods on the user ID. Data **aggregation** is not only a method for analytical purposes but also a measure of anonymization, as stated by P2, P11 and P12. P2, P6, P12 and P9 reported that data is restricted such that locations counts of spatially aggregated data need to surpass a certain threshold to be accessible, thereby providing **indistinguishability**. Two of them received such restricted data from third parties while two implemented such measures themselves. P9 reported working with a **reduction of granularity of coordinates and timestamps (coarsening)** for start and end locations. P12 explained that map views would only show heatmaps instead of exact points as a visual implementation of reduced granularity. **Cropping of the beginning and end of a trajectory** for fine granular GPS trajectory data was reported by P9 and P12 also stated to **add noise to the data**.

Advanced methods like **synthesizing data**<sup>4</sup>, methods that implement **differential privacy** and **decentralized data processing** have only been named

<sup>3</sup> The 4-step-traffic-model is a travel demand model to forecast traffic following four steps: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, (3) mode choice, (4) route choice [33].

<sup>4</sup> On the basis of raw data a new synthetic data set is created that, depending on the used algorithm, maintains certain statistical distributions from the original dataset.

**Table 5.** Privacy-enhancing methods and their contexts within the experts' organizations.

Privacy measure / guarantee	Context
removal of personal attributes	storage of recorded GPS locations without any customer information
pseudonymization	sensor company pseudonymizes MAC-address recorded with WiFi sensors
aggregation	(1) aggregate data from surveys/studies as reports (2) dashboard with aggregated bike sharing data provided to public administration (3) internal knowledge sharing of insights based on statistics
indistinguishability	(1) market research company (P12) provides origin-destination information only for connections above a certain threshold (2) mobile phone data is provided only for connections above a certain threshold (3) State Office of Statistics provides spatially aggregated data only for cell counts > 5 (4) automobile manufacturer (P9) only includes POIs in analyses that exceed a certain user count threshold
coarsening	(1) heatmaps instead of maps with single points are used to visualize study results (2) P9 rounds coordinates to three decimal places for the analysis of POIs
cropping of trajectories	(1) P9 crops trajectories for the analysis of frequently used road segments (2) P3 names cropping as a known best practice and role model for potential future release of anonymized open data
noise	P12 uses different anonymization techniques based on the analyses: adding of noise is mentioned as one option
synthetization	P12 investigated synthetization options but evaluated the utility as not sufficient for their sample sizes
differential privacy	P12 tests differential privacy methods to exempt data from being strictly bound to study purposes
de-centralized data processing	P12 envisions to run certain algorithms (e.g., mode detection) directly on user devices in the future; for privacy reasons but also for faster processing capabilities

by one expert (P12) as methods that are being tested within the organization for potential future usage.

## 5 Practical implications

### 5.1 Privacy needs of practitioners

Based on the interviews, we can identify different privacy needs of practitioners.

A common scenario is the compilation of pre-defined aggregated statistics. While the experts did not see privacy needs in addition to aggregations, privacy research

suggests otherwise [6, 8]. Since many analyses in different contexts are based on similar characteristics (see Table 3) a set of proven privacy-enhancing methods and tools for standard analyses could be helpful.

However, not all useful analyses are known in advance. Data is used in exploratory scenarios and new use cases arise. As one expert said: “We repeatedly have questions [that could be answered with the survey data]. But for data protection reasons it was promised that the data will be deleted at the end of last year” [translated from German]. Data release is another relevant scenario: Data used for decision processes of public administrations is desired to be published as open data. Also, agent-based traffic models are desired to be used

but they need single user trajectories as input which are usually not shared by data providers. Data synthetization techniques could be a viable privacy enhancement where data remains in the original format and can be used for arbitrary purposes and without time restrictions. Though it should be noted that synthetization techniques maintain only certain statistical properties depending on the specific algorithm. There is an increasing amount of research on synthetization of mobility data, but these methods are far from established and practically proven. They need to be evaluated carefully and if applied, limitations of the utility need to be well communicated.

The operation of applications based on machine learning models like mode detection, next-location-prediction, or activity recognition need fine-granular input data which cannot be obfuscated or aggregated in advance. Differentially private adaptations of machine learning algorithms can be used to limit the impact of single users onto the model and thereby the potential privacy breaches. Also, de-centralized approaches, like federated learning, could be considered to prevent centralized storage of personal data.

The lack of expertise to assess which anonymization techniques are sufficient causes insecurity and lengthy processes. As one participant said: “[...] it is not so easy to find expertise that covers both technical know-how on data level and can serve the legal perspective as well. [...] If someone says I want to do this, but the data must be anonymized for that, we have to involve a lot of other people who tell us how to do it and who can also somehow give the okay for it to be really legally secure” [translated from German]. Concrete recommendations for action would provide guidance for faster processes and implementations.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a need for easy-to-use tools that can also be implemented by organizations that do not have the resources or expertise for employees with dedicated skills on privacy methods. The more accessible such methods are, the likelier the gap between research and practice will shrink.

## 5.2 Similarity measures

Utility losses due to privacy-enhancing methods are quantified with similarity measures, as shown in Fig-

ure 1.<sup>5</sup> They determine how much a characteristic, e.g., the spatial distribution, of privacy-enhanced data resembles the output generated with the raw data. As researchers evaluate their proposed privacy methods on varying similarity measures results are hard to compare amongst them. Similarity measures might address different characteristics or even different nuances of a characteristic, for example, the spatial distribution can be captured by quantifying how many of the top 50 locations are identified correctly or by comparing the distribution of location visits with the Jensen-Shannon divergence. Depending on the use case, different characteristics need to be maintained by privacy-enhancing methods, thus different similarity measures are relevant.

With Section 4.3 we want to provide guidance on relevant characteristics for a future categorization and standardization of such similarity measures. While the definition of characteristics is fairly straightforward for statistical aggregations, suitable measures for mathematical models are more difficult to evaluate. Either a more profound understanding of such models is needed to derive respective characteristics or privacy methods need to be evaluated directly on accuracy measures of downstream tasks, e.g., correctly detected traffic modes by a mode detection algorithm with and without privacy enhancement.

## 5.3 Recommendations

In summary, we can derive the following recommendations:

- To provide practitioners with guidance and clarity on the use of state-of-the-art privacy-enhancing methods for mobility data, an easily accessible framework could be useful which compiles practical real-world use cases and suggests adequate privacy methods. The handout for companies published by Germany’s digital association Bitkom on “Anonymization and pseudonymization of data for machine learning projects” is an illustrative example of such a publication about a related topic [34].
- A provision of easy-to-use tools for privacy enhancing methods will enable organizations without the expertise and resources to implement state-of-the-

<sup>5</sup> There is no standard name for such measures, different publications also use the following terms: measure (or metric) of utility, evaluation, resemblance, dissimilarity, quality, accuracy, information loss, or utility loss.

art methods. Such tools could provide a compiled report of typical mobility analyses or the generation of synthetic data. A project like the *Synthetic Data Vault (SDV)* [35] which is an overall system for synthetic data models, benchmarks, and metrics could be extended for mobility data or serve as an example for a similar approach.

- A set of standardized similarity measures and downstream tasks would facilitate the comparison of different privacy enhancing methods and enable practitioners to choose the most suitable method for their use case. The SDV package includes model agnostic metrics which could again serve as an example or be extended with mobility data specific metrics.
- GDPR certificates for privacy-enhancing technologies could accelerate the processes within organizations and provide security for decision makers.

## 6 Discussion

Movement data undoubtedly holds great potential for commercial as well as scientific analyses. However, the highly individual patterns in the data, which make them so interesting, mean that anonymization is hardly possible without utility losses. The high legal attention to the processing of such data leads to frequently encountered challenges in practice which motivated us to take a detailed look at the data used in organizations and the analysis and anonymization methods that are being applied. We conducted 13 interviews with employees of German companies and public administrations working with human mobility data. Even though many assumptions are made concerning the practical use of such data, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic study to evaluate such sources, usage, and privacy measures in enterprises. We grouped and listed our results to provide an overview of real-world practices with such data and identified different scenarios of privacy needs of practitioners. Thereby, these insights can be used as a basis for future research on practice-oriented privacy-enhancing techniques and tools that help to close the gap between research and practice.

The interview evaluation shows a detailed breakdown of data sources in use, including their origin and available formats. This information can guide future privacy research regarding target groups and use cases for proposed methods.

Compliance with GDPR is a major concern stated by many experts. Thereby, legal requirements are almost exclusively the origin of instating privacy measures. This is in accordance with Beringer et al.'s [36] findings who see a need for a regulatory framework for usable privacy and security and conclude that business interests are mainly directed at collecting as much data as possible. Though, much uncertainty remains about possible techniques, their implications on utility, and tools to implement those in practice. Expertise of anonymization techniques strongly varies among organizations and largely depends on whether data is gathered and used by themselves, provided to third parties, or if it is only received by data providers. While academic research has accepted differential privacy as the de-facto standard, it is not yet implemented in practice, if known at all. One expert also stated that they neither have the time nor the expertise to implement advanced methods. Providing easy-to-use tools to simplify the implementation of privacy-enhancing methods is thus a necessary step to increase the usage of such methods. Especially companies that have no dedicated business case of providing anonymized data usually lack such resources.

To increase the accessibility of methods that state-of-the-art research suggests, the utility for the actual data analysis purposes of practitioners needs to be ensured. Therefore, we see the need for a diverse palette of standardized similarity measures that cover different kinds of use cases. Proposed privacy-enhancing methods use varying similarity measures concerning different mobility characteristics. This makes the comparison and interpretation of the utility across different methods burdensome. We hope that our research provides a more comprehensive overview of the practical context of mobility data use cases and relevant mobility characteristics that help to develop a set of diverse similarity measures reflecting actual practitioners' needs.

## Acknowledgements

This work is part of the FreeMove project. I acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the framework of the FreeMove project.

I hereby thank Helena Mihaljević for the constructive feedback and the other project members for their valuable input.

## References

- [1] D. Naboulsi, M. Fiore, S. Ribot, and R. Stanica, "Large-Scale Mobile Traffic Analysis: A Survey," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 124–161, 2016.
- [2] S. Lai, A. Farnham, N. W. Ruktanonchai, and A. J. Tatem, "Measuring mobility, disease connectivity and individual risk: A review of using mobile phone data and mHealth for travel medicine," *J. Travel Med.*, vol. 26, no. 3, p. taz019, Mar. 2019.
- [3] B. Research, "DS-GVO und Corona –Datenschutzherausforderungen für die Wirtschaft," <https://www.bitkom.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/bitkom-charts-pk-privacy-29-09-2020.pdf>, Sep. 2020.
- [4] P. Ohm, "Broken Promises of Privacy: Responding to the Surprising Failure of Anonymization," *UCLA Law Rev.*, vol. 57, p. 1701, Aug. 2009.
- [5] M. Douriez, H. Doraiswamy, J. Freire, and C. T. Silva, "Anonymizing NYC Taxi Data: Does It Matter?" in *2016 IEEE Int. Conf. Data Science and Adv. Analytics (DSAA)*. Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, 17, pp. 140–148.
- [6] F. Xu, Z. Tu, Y. Li, P. Zhang, X. Fu, and D. Jin, "Trajectory Recovery From Ash: User Privacy Is NOT Preserved in Aggregated Mobility Data," *Proc. 26th Int. Conf. on World Wide Web*, pp. 1241–1250, Apr. 2017.
- [7] M. C. Gonzalez, C. Hidalgo, and A.-L. Barabasi, "Understanding Individual Human Mobility Patterns," *Nature*, vol. 453, pp. 779–82, Jul. 2008.
- [8] A. Pyrgelis, C. Troncoso, and E. D. Cristofaro, "What Does The Crowd Say About You? Evaluating Aggregation-based Location Privacy," *Proc. Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2017, no. 4, pp. 156–176, Oct. 2017.
- [9] G. Cormode, S. Jha, T. Kulkarni, N. Li, D. Srivastava, and T. Wang, "Privacy at Scale: Local Differential Privacy in Practice," in *Proc. 2018 Int. Conf. Manage. Data*. Houston TX USA: ACM, May 2018, pp. 1655–1658.
- [10] A. Hopkins and S. Booth, "Machine Learning Practices Outside Big Tech: How Resource Constraints Challenge Responsible Development," in *Proc. 2021 AAAI/ACM Conf. AI, Ethics, and Society*, ser. AIES '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Jul. 2021, pp. 134–145.
- [11] Telefónica, "Unser Anonymisierungsverfahren in drei Schritten," <https://www.telefonica.de/analytics/anonymisierungsverfahren-in-drei-schritten.html>.
- [12] H. Barbosa, M. Barthelemy, G. Ghoshal, C. R. James, M. Lenormand, T. Louail, R. Menezes, J. J. Ramasco, F. Simini, and M. Tomasini, "Human mobility: Models and applications," *Phys. Rep.*, vol. 734, pp. 1–74, Mar. 2018.
- [13] M. Luca, G. Barlacchi, B. Lepri, and L. Pappalardo, "A survey on deep learning for human mobility," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 55, no. 1, Nov. 2021.
- [14] J. Wang, X. Kong, F. Xia, and L. Sun, "Urban Human Mobility: Data-Driven Modeling and Prediction," *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–19, May 2019.
- [15] E. Toch, B. Lerner, E. Ben Zion, and I. Ben-Gal, "Analyzing large-scale human mobility data: A survey of machine learning methods and applications," *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 58, pp. 501–523, Mar. 2019.
- [16] M. Fiore, P. Katsikouli, E. Zavou, M. Cunche, F. Fessant, D. L. Hello, U. Aivodji, B. Olivier, T. Quartier, and R. Stanica, "Privacy in trajectory micro-data publishing: A survey," *Trans. Data Privacy*, vol. 13, p. 91, 2020.
- [17] F. Schlosser, B. F. Maier, O. Jack, D. Hinrichs, A. Zachariae, and D. Brockmann, "COVID-19 lockdown induces disease-mitigating structural changes in mobility networks," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 117, no. 52, pp. 32883–32890, Dec. 2020.
- [18] X. Lu, L. Bengtsson, and P. Holme, "Predictability of population displacement after the 2010 Haiti earthquake," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 109, no. 29, pp. 11576–11581, Jul. 2012.
- [19] G. Andrienko, N. Andrienko, P. Bak, D. Keim, and S. Wrobel, *Visual Analytics of Movement*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2013.
- [20] M. Gruteser and D. Grunwald, "Anonymous Usage of Location-Based Services Through Spatial and Temporal Cloaking," in *Proc. 1st Int. Conf. Mobile Systems, Applications and Services*, ser. MobiSys '03. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2003, pp. 31–42.
- [21] B. Hoh, M. Gruteser, H. Xiong, and A. Alrabady, "Enhancing Security and Privacy in Traffic-Monitoring Systems," *IEEE Pervasive Comput.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 38–46, Nov. 2006.
- [22] S. Bennati and A. Kovacevic, "Privacy metrics for trajectory data based on k-anonymity, l-diversity and t-closeness," *arXiv:2011.09218 [cs]*, Nov. 2020.
- [23] M. E. Gursoy, L. Liu, S. Truex, and L. Yu, "Differentially Private and Utility Preserving Publication of Trajectory Data," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 18, no. 10, pp. 2315–2329, Oct. 2019.
- [24] G. Acs and C. Castelluccia, "A case study: Privacy preserving release of spatio-temporal density in paris," in *Proc. 20th ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ser. KDD '14. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Aug. 2014, pp. 1679–1688.
- [25] H. To, K. Nguyen, and C. Shahabi, "Differentially private publication of location entropy," in *Proc. 24th ACM SIGSPATIAL Int. Conf. Advances in Geographic Inf. Systems*, ser. SIGSPACIAL '16. Burlingame, California: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2016, pp. 1–10.
- [26] H. Roy, M. Kantarcioglu, and L. Sweeney, "Practical Differentially Private Modeling of Human Movement Data," in *Data and Applications Security and Privacy XXX*, S. Ranise and V. Swarup, Eds., vol. 9766. Cham: Springer Int. Publishing, 2016, pp. 170–178.
- [27] S. L. Garfinkel, J. M. Abowd, and S. Powazek, "Issues Encountered Deploying Differential Privacy," *Proc. 2018 Workshop Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pp. 133–137, Jan. 2018.
- [28] D. Calacci, A. Berke, K. Larson, Alex, and Pentland, "The tradeoff between the utility and risk of location data and implications for public good," *arXiv:1905.09350 [cs, math]*, Dec. 2019.
- [29] Y.-A. de Montjoye et al., "On the privacy-conscientious use of mobile phone data," *Scientific Data*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 180286, Dec. 2018.

- [30] S. Kalkman, J. van Delden, A. Banerjee, B. Tyl, M. Mostert, and G. van Thiel, "Patients' and public views and attitudes towards the sharing of health data for research: A narrative review of the empirical evidence," *J. Med. Ethics*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 3–13, Jan. 2022.
- [31] L. A. Palinkas, S. M. Horwitz, C. A. Green, J. P. Wisdom, N. Duan, and K. Hoagwood, "Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research," *Adm. Policy Ment. Health*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 533–544, Sep. 2015.
- [32] U. Kuckartz, "Qualitative text analysis: A systematic approach," in *Compendium for Early Career Researchers in Mathematics Education*, G. Kaiser and N. Presmeg, Eds. Cham: Springer Int. Publishing, 2019, pp. 181–197.
- [33] M. G. McNally, "The Four Step Model," in *Handbook of Transport Modelling*, 2nd ed. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Sep. 2007, pp. 35–53.
- [34] P. Aichroth et al., "Anonymisierung und Pseudonymisierung von Daten für Projekte des maschinellen Lernens," Bitkom, Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [35] N. Patki, R. Wedge, and K. Veeramachaneni, "The synthetic data vault," in *2016 IEEE Int. Conf. Data Science and Adv. Analytics (DSAA)*, Oct. 2016, pp. 399–410.
- [36] B. Beringer, P. O. Uphaus, and H. Rau, "Usable Privacy in Location-Based Services: The Need for a Regulatory Framework," in *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2021*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, O. Gervasi et al., Ed. Cham: Springer Int. Publishing, 2021, pp. 571–579.

## Appendix

### A Interview guide [translated from German]

#### Code assignment of questions

purposes

data sources

methods (renamed to: data analysis and modeling)

privacy

initial codes that were not used for further evaluation:

User communication and legal

#### Welcome

- Give a introduction of the research project.
- State objective of the interview: "The interviews are a first step within our research project to capture the status quo of privacy of mobility data in prac-

tice: what data is available in the first place, how is it stored and analyzed. Therefore, in this interview, I would like to learn more from you about the three topics: Data collection, data use, and data storage. I will guide you through the interview based on various questions about these blocks, but this does not have to follow strict protocol - I welcome input that you find relevant beyond the questions. In our project, data protection plays an important role - an often difficult and definitely sensitive topic. I would therefore like to emphasize again in advance that we do not want to imply any lack of measures with the questions or put you under any pressure to justify them. All questions that go into detail about data protection measures are solely intended to gain a better understanding of current practices so that we can bring our research closer to reality. No results will be published that could be construed negatively towards your company in any way. The results will of course be anonymized, i.e. no names of companies will be mentioned. The same applies to the use of the data: we want to understand on a general level for which purposes data is needed. No information will be published about your specific use cases that could reveal potential business secrets."

- *Ensure consent form has been signed.*
- *Confirm verbally that the consent to audio record the interview has been given.*

----- Start audio recording -----

#### Interview questions

*Examples in italic type writing can be used by the interviewer to clarify the question.*

#### General

- What is the product / service of your company?
- How many employees are there in your company?
- What is your position in the company?

#### Data collection: What personal mobility data do you collect?

- Which personal mobility data do you collect yourself as a company?
- Which data do you purchase or get from third parties?
- *If there are multiple data sets:*

- Which of these data sets is the most relevant (the most challenging from a privacy perspective) to your work / is used the most?  
(Focus on this data set for the rest of the questions)
- **What does the data look like in detail?**
  - What geolocation technology is used to collect the data? (e.g., GPS, CDR, WiFi sensors)
  - How temporally and spatially granular is the data?
  - Is there additional information about the collected locations? (e.g., semantic information about the locations, such as home, workplace, or restaurant)
  - How long is the average duration of a trajectory?
- **Personal reference of the data**
  - About which persons is data collected? (e.g., all customers, app users, people passing a sensor, ...).
  - Over what period of time is mobility data available about a person? (e.g., anonymization after  $x$  days? New user ID every  $x$  days?)
  - What other data is known about the user? (e.g., demographic data, place of residence, purchase information, subscriptions / contracts)

**Data use: How will the data be used to gain insights for your purposes?**

- **For what purposes is the data used?**  
(Question to get started on data use: reporting, optimizing pricing models, advertising, etc.? First ask in general terms, then ask in more detail for specific analyses that are used.)
  - **What types of analyses or modeling are performed? With what goal?**  
(Depending on the answer, ask further in detail.)
    - Aggregate statistics
    - Detailed analysis of individual areas or users
    - Models, for prediction or classification
  - **At what frequency are the analyses conducted?**  
(e.g., regular reports, real-time, one-time analyses)
  - **How have the analyses evolved over time?** (e.g., have more been added steadily / become more complex, have different ones been tried and discarded)
  - **What role does exploration of data, without specific prior targeting, play in your work?**
  - **Which explorations are carried out here?**  
Ask for a specific example: what did the last exploration look like? What data, what analyses?

- **Is there additional data that you combine with yours?**

(e.g., purchased data, open data)

- If so, which ones and how?

- **What impact do the insights from the data have on your actions?**

(e.g., positioning of mobility hubs, fare design, personalized advertising)

- **What further analysis or modeling is planned for the future?**

- **What insights do you expect to gain from these analyses?**

- **What would be the potential impact of the findings?**

- **What further analyses or modeling would you do, assuming there were no hurdles?**

(e.g., amount of data, legal restrictions, computing capacity, or similar)

- **What insights would you hope to gain from these analyses?**

- **What would be the implications?**

- What hurdles exist to these analyses not being conducted?

- **Are there privacy measures being applied to the analysis?**

(e.g., limit on queries, only certain queries, synthetic data generation,  $k$ -anonymity)

- If so, by whom were these initiated?

- **What technical or legal constraints do you have on data use?**

- **Are there any analyses or modeling that you have not done before due to privacy concerns? Which ones?**

**Data storage: How is the data stored?**

- **How long is the data stored?**

- **In which format is the data stored?**

(e.g., database, single files)

- **Is the data being stored anonymously?**

- If yes, how?

- **Who has access to the data?**

(e.g., individuals, specific departments, the whole company)

- **How is this access documented and controlled?**

- **Is the data passed on to third party data service providers?**

- If so, in what form?

- **Are there restrictions on access?**

(e.g., are only certain queries possible? Is access to raw data possible?)

Are there data security measures that are taken in data storage?

What other technical or legal restrictions do you enforce regarding data storage?

### User communication

Are individuals informed about data collection or processing?

– If yes, how?

On what legal basis is the data collected or processed?

(e.g., consent, contract, legitimate interests, legal basis)

## B Recruitment email [translated from German]

Dear NAME,

Within the framework of the BMBF-funded research project freeMove, we are working on a data protection-compliant use of personal mobility data. As an employee of COMPANY NAME, we cordially invite you to actively participate in our research project in the form of an expert interview.

With the help of these interviews, we would like to gain a better understanding of the use of personal mobility data in practice. Accordingly, we would like to learn more from you about your daily work at COMPANY NAME. This knowledge will feed into the transdisciplinary research on privacy-compliant processing of mobility data. The aim of the research project is to develop practical and legally compliant recommendations for action that simplify work with personal mobility data and make it faster and more transparent. The content of the interviews will be used for research purposes and will only be published after strict anonymization.

CONTACT PERSON NAME is your contact person for scheduling an interview.

### DETAILS TO SCHEDULE A MEETING

More information about the research project can be found on our website [www.freemove.space](http://www.freemove.space) and in the attached PDF document. If you have general questions about the project process, goals, and initial project results, you can contact CONTACT PERSON EMAIL. If you are unable to participate in the interview yourself, we would also be pleased if you could forward your questions to your colleagues.

With kind regards The freeMove Team

## C Text informed consent form [translated from German]

Research project: FreeMove

Performing institution: HTW Berlin

Interviewer: Alexandra Kapp

Interviewee: xxx

Interview date: xx.xx.2021

The BMBF-funded transdisciplinary project FreeMove explores privacy-friendly collection and analysis of mobility data. The aim of the project is to develop recommendations for action for the handling of personal mobility data.

As part of the scientific research project, the Department of Computer Science at the Hochschule für Technik Berlin (HTW Berlin) will conduct expert interviews with employees from administration and business. The purpose of the interview is to gain a sound understanding of the real-world handling and use of personal mobility data.

Personal data is processed, such as the name and employer of the interviewee, and other concrete information that could result from the interview because it is revealed by the interviewees. To facilitate the use of the study results and to verify or post-correct the notes written down by the interviewer, the interviews are recorded. In this process, the voice of the interviewee will be stored for the duration of the transcription process, but will be deleted no later than December 31, 2021.

The transcription will be supported by transcription software called 'Trint'. In this process, data may be transferred to the UK as 'Trint' is based in the United Kingdom (UK). Should data be transferred to the UK, this will be done on the basis of the European Commission's adequacy decision of 28 June 2021, which recognizes the UK as a third country with an adequate level of protection. Further information can be found in the privacy policy of 'Trint'. This is available at <https://trint.com/privacy-policy>. The scientific analysis of the interview is carried out exclusively by the staff of the FreeMove research project. All employees who have access to the interview texts are obliged to maintain data secrecy.

All results will be published exclusively anonymously and without any possible conclusions about individual companies, organizations or persons.

Under the above-mentioned conditions, I agree to participate in the interview as part of the FreeMove scientific research project and consent to the recording, transcription, anonymization and analysis for the



above-mentioned purpose. I also agree that my data may be processed using the software 'Trint' to facilitate the transcription process and that data may be transferred to the UK. My participation in the interview and my hereby given consent to the processing of my personal data are voluntary.

I am entitled at any time to request HTW Berlin to provide me with comprehensive information about the data stored about me. I may at any time request HTW Berlin to correct, delete, block and transfer individual personal data, as well as to restrict processing. In addition, I can exercise my right to object at any time without giving reasons and modify or completely revoke the granted declaration of consent with effect for the future. For this purpose, an e-mail to Alexandra Kapp alexandra.kapp@htw-berlin.de is sufficient. I will not suffer any disadvantages as a result of refusal or revocation.

I hereby confirm that I have been informed in detail about the aim and the course of the research project and about my rights.

DATE, SIGNATURE INTERVIEWER

DATE, SIGNATURE INTERVIEWEE

## D Study procedure with respect to ethical considerations

1. Recruitment: email with detailed information about research objective
2. Interview
  - Get signed informed consent form which informs about research objective, audio recording, transcription software, anonymization, and analysis of the interview
  - Provide verbal information about research objective and preservation of anonymity at the beginning of the interview
  - Get additional verbal consent on audio recording
  - Start audio recording and interview
3. Transcription
  - Transcribe interviews with transcription software (explicitly stated in consent form)
  - Proof-reading by interviewer
4. Deletion of audio recordings
5. Anonymization: Removal of participants names and company names from transcripts
6. Data storage
  - Storage of printed consent forms in a secured location of the research institution separated from transcripts
  - Encrypted storage of transcripts
7. Data evaluation