

A Cross-Country Analysis of GDPR Cookie Banners and Flexible Methods for Scraping Them

Midas Nouwens

Digital Design and Information Studies
Aarhus University, Denmark
midasnouwens@cc.au.dk

Kristjan Maalt

Business Development and Technology
Aarhus University, Denmark
krma@btech.au.dk

Janus Bager Kristensen

Center for Advanced Visualisation and Interaction
Aarhus University, Denmark
jbk@cavi.dk

Rolf Bagge

Center for Advanced Visualisation and Interaction
Aarhus University, Denmark
rolf@cavi.dk

Abstract

Online tracking remains problematic, with compliance and ethical issues persisting despite regulatory efforts. Consent interfaces, the visible manifestation of this industry, have seen significant attention over the years. We present robust automated methods to study the presence, design, and third-party suppliers of consent interfaces at scale and the web service consent-observatory.eu to do it with. We examine the top 10,000 websites across 31 countries under the ePrivacy Directive and GDPR (n=254.148). Our findings show that 67% of websites use consent interfaces, but only 15% are minimally compliant, mostly because they lack a reject option. Consent management platforms (CMPs) are powerful intermediaries in this space: 67% of interfaces are provided by CMPs, and three organisations hold 37% of the market. There is little evidence that regulators' guidance and fines have impacted compliance rates, but 18% of compliance variance is explained by CMPs. Researchers should take an infrastructural perspective on online tracking and study the factual control of intermediaries to identify effective leverage points.

CCS Concepts

• **Security and privacy** → **Usability in security and privacy**; • **Human-centered computing** → **Empirical studies in interaction design**; • **Social and professional topics** → **Governmental regulations**.

Keywords

Cookie, Banner, Consent Management Platform, Online Tracking, GDPR, e-Privacy Directive, Web scraping

ACM Reference Format:

Midas Nouwens, Janus Bager Kristensen, Kristjan Maalt, and Rolf Bagge. 2025. A Cross-Country Analysis of GDPR Cookie Banners and Flexible Methods for Scraping Them. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25)*, April 26-May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 28 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713648>

Please use nonacm option or ACM Engage class to enable CC licenses. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

CHI '25, April 26-May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan
© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1394-1/2025/04
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713648>



1 Introduction

European digital regulation continues to struggle with the online tracking industry, despite widespread concerns that much of what is happening violates individuals' fundamental rights to both data protection and privacy, and threatens states' electoral integrity [19] and national security [47]. The way individuals are tracked online, their data flowing to hundreds of actors, remains largely invisible to an average Web user [103]. The visible surface is typically a consent interface — colloquially 'cookie banners' or 'pop-ups'.¹ These interfaces claim to help individuals understand what data is collected, what for, and who it is shared with. In the process, the companies selling these interfaces make the questionable claim to websites that installing the interface will ensure their compliance with laws that, when considered more closely, would appear to prohibit these contemporary tracking practices [100, 101].

The visibility of these interfaces means they are often a topic of public commentary in the news and by politicians.² Wide-ranging laws like the ePrivacy Directive (ePD) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) are so strongly associated with them (and suffer reputational damage because of it) that their much broader scope and ambitions are often forgotten. Even regulatory authorities can be accused of prioritising interface design over considering the legality of the actual tracking that goes on behind them [5].

Academic researchers have mostly participated in this power struggle by collecting empirical evidence about various aspects of these consent interfaces, for example about the user's perception of the pop-ups [49, 61], their impact on consent behaviour [11, 76], legal interpretations of their compliance [48, 71, 89, 100], and the prevalence of different interface designs [14, 56, 60]. These papers have been used by EU data protection authorities (DPAs) to prioritise limited enforcement capacity and justify interpretation [23].

¹Research refers to these variously as consent banners, consent pop-ups, consent notices, consent management platforms, cookie banners, cookie pop-ups, cookie walls, tracking walls, notice & consent or notice & choice. Here we use 'consent interfaces' as a more neutral term that does not say anything about its design (in a way that banner, pop-up, or wall do) or the technology used (which 'cookie' does, given that such interfaces supposedly control other mechanisms). Arguably the word consent is also not entirely representative of these interfaces, however, as sites also claim to use them to inform or establish alternative legal bases such as 'legitimate interest', however legally questionable [100].

²See, for example, the extensive reporting by Natasha Lomas for TechCrunch: <https://techcrunch.com/tag/cookie-consent/>.

Existing studies, although useful, have been methodologically limited in their ability to observe the entire ecosystem. Many countries within relevant jurisdictions have never been studied, meaning comparative knowledge about effective enforcement strategies is lacking. Previous research has also shown that the off-the-shelf interfaces, ‘consent management platforms’ (CMPs), which are the ones primarily hardcoded for study by the literature, are mostly used by medium-popularity websites [41], and so we know less about popular sites (which might implement their own) or less popular sites (with little resource or incentive). Only by taking an expansive view of these interfaces are we able to reckon with its complex, heavily-intermediated nature, and identify the most promising leverage points for intervention.

This paper makes three contributions:

- *Methodological*: open-source methods that can accurately detect the presence of a consent interface, the provider of the interface, the presence of user options, the visual prominence of those options, and the status of granular consent toggles;
- *Empirical*: an analysis of consent interfaces on the top 10,000 most popular websites across 31 countries under the ePrivacy Directive and GDPR;
- *Technological*: consent-observatory.eu, an online scraping service that makes studying consent interfaces easier by removing technical barriers and more accessible to a broader audience, such as journalists and regulators.

2 Background & Related Work

Consent interfaces have been studied by many disciplinary communities. HCI studies have focussed on user perception of such interfaces [61] or their impact on behaviours [40]. Computer Science studies have often undertaken large scale interface measurements [14], including the impact of these interfaces on actual tracking [26]. Legal studies analyse what various laws say about the interfaces [58], and to what extent interfaces could or do comply [34, 100, 101]. Lessons for each of these fields can still be learned from synthesising the above findings. Below we draw out salient aspects from each that inform the study in this paper.

2.1 What is the legal context?

In Europe, there are two key pieces of legislation that shaped the emergence and design of consent interfaces.

The 2002 ePrivacy Directive regulates confidentiality of communications in what was then a rapidly digitising world [31]. A significant change occurred in 2009 [32], where the storage or reading of information on an individual’s “terminal device” (e.g. their phone, or browser) moved from an opt-out provision (which already created some banners) to an opt-in provision, particularly in response to Sony Music/BMG’s covert installation of rootkits on people’s devices when they inserted CDs as an anti-piracy measure [58]. Like a cookie, this counted as storing and reading information from a terminal device, and like a cookie, needs consent. Yet while the law is generic across many different technological areas (including malware, fingerprinting, HTML storage, or even connected device technologies like RFID [29]), it became known as the “Cookie Law”. Some national implementations exempt consent if a website reads or writes data that is “strictly necessary” for providing the service

or assessing its quality and effectiveness, provided it does not affect the user’s private life.

The 2016 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) regulates the processing of personal data [33]. It became enforceable in 2018 – around the same time that the consent interface market began professionalising into ‘consent management platforms’, and websites started to install more interfaces [41]. However, the law did not make a material change to the ePrivacy Directive in the context of online tracking, which already required consent for *any* data access. Although ePrivacy law relies on the GDPR’s (and its predecessor’s) definition of consent by referring to it, and the statutory text of this definition did get stronger in 2018 (such as emphasising that a pre-checked box, or continuing to use a website could not be consent [4]), the European Court of Justice later clarified that the old definition was to be interpreted in just as strong a way, and so little had really changed in what websites were supposed to do [1]. What likely explains the compliance rush is a panic around fines and consequences, which *did* change and firms were concerned that regulatory action would be harsh, when in practice, limited enforcement occurred around online tracking in the years directly following the GDPR going into effect. Furthermore, uncertainty does still exist in relation to diverging national guidance [12]. This includes whether closing a consent banner should constitute a rejection (the French DPA says yes [24], the Swedish DPA no [43]) or how accept and reject options should be presented visually (the Danish DPA states green is an impermissible nudge [21], but few other DPAs express views on colours). The spread of these interfaces, and the question whether they truly empower users, has also reignited discussions about the legal theory of consent in privacy and data protection laws [53, 94].

While the vast majority of work focuses on European law [13], privacy laws exist in over 160 countries, with many copied from the GDPR or very similar in nature [37, 38]. Studies on consent interfaces are now emerging with comparable regulations such as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) in the United States [72, 82, 104].

2.2 What part of the Web is studied?

Academic research on consent interfaces do not all study the same part of the Web. The Web is not a singular entity [81] and users have different experiences due to the device and browser they use, their position in the material infrastructure, geo-restrictions, personalisation, regulatory jurisdiction, etc. There are three variables that impact whose point of view is represented in these studies: *which online services are looked at, how many domains are included, and the vantage point from which the data is collected.*

Many studies use popularity-based ‘top lists’ of websites – created by services such as Tranco, Alexa, Majestic, or Google – rather than a manually curated set of domains.³ Often, these studies simply use the list of globally most popular sites [14, 40, 62, 74, 88, 104], whereas others create subsets from these top lists. For example, by filtering the list using the country code top-level domain (ccTLD, such as .be for Belgium [16]), the language of the site (mostly English [39, 55]), the website categorisation (e.g. shopping, business,

³Exceptions include supplementing lists with handpicked domains [54, 91], a UN database [2], and incorporating lists from magazines/news outlets [93].

entertainment, health [51, 88, 102]), different popularity segments such as combining the top 500 with a samples from the larger top million [56], or some combination of these [71]. These lists all come with their own pros and cons — they are based on global traffic, biased towards international sites and transnational platforms, suppressing nationally popular domains including government, newspaper, or e-commerce [87]. While a country’s web can be studied by filtering lists using the ccTLD, many nationally specific sites also use .com or .org, foreign sites use ccTLD’s for novelty effect (e.g., youtu.be, linktr.ee, remove.bg), while some national subunits make heavy use of gTLDs (e.g. Catalonia’s .cat, Scotland’s .scot). It is empirically unclear what the impact of these flaws is — whether the .fr subset of the global list is a reasonable approximation of the top websites visited by people in France. Only a handful of studies create lists based on national traffic [16, 84], likely because until the Chrome User Experience Report in 2021, no available list included the location of the visitor.

The number of domains included seems to matter too, as previous studies show consent interfaces and their designs are not distributed at random [41]. The top 50 most popular sites appear to implement their own designs, while the middle 100 to 10,000 seem more likely to use off-the-shelf CMPs. This makes the studies hard to compare, as they vary from small lists of just 100 [51] or 500 [60, 92] domains; medium lists between 1,000 [71] and 50,000 [54], and some in the millions [14, 41, 74]. Naturally, if consent interfaces are not equally as prevalent across all popularity segments, studying different segments will result in different distributions.

The vantage point of the study — the IP address from which a website is accessed — also matters, although perhaps less so. Many papers omit it, although some consider differences across countries [84, 85]. The most comprehensive investigation of the impact of vantage points looked across many EU countries as well as some outside it [27]. The broad conclusion from these papers is that little difference is found within the EU, some difference is found when crawling from outside the EU, but websites seem to adjust their compliance tactics more with their national base (as proxied by ccTLD) rather than visitor vantage point.

In summary, our knowledge of consent interfaces is generally based on analyses of the most popular websites according to global traffic, visited from a vantage point within the EU. As lists in particular vary so much across studies, and as consent interface design and presence are both affected strongly by the domains chosen [27, 41], studies are extremely hard to rigorously compare.

2.3 What design elements are analysed?

All studies in our review analyse whether there is a consent interface on the website or app, but differ in the other design elements that they consider, often motivated by legal requirements and how those translate into a user interface. For example, studies have looked at whether the interface is a paywall [84] and if so, the prices asked [75], the legal bases they attempt to establish (e.g., consent or legitimate interest) [62], the position of the interface on the screen [73], whether it uses a banner or barrier style design [76], the presence of different kinds of buttons (e.g., accept, reject, settings) [60], the visual prominence of those buttons [56, 73],

the text labels of those buttons [91], the purposes that are mentioned for which data is collected [16], the legal quality of those purpose descriptions [90], whether any purpose checkboxes are pre-checked [71, 91], whether the website uses implied consent [71, 76], or whether the interface is designed by a consent management platform and if so, which one [85].

In response to regulatory efforts to bring online tracking into compliance, different parts of these interfaces become more or less salient. For example, as guidance was released and legal cases were fought about the requirements for valid consent (e.g., clarifying the illegality of implied consent and pre-checked purposes), legitimate interest appeared as a new legal basis and the pay-or-OK approach became more prevalent (although primarily only in Germany [74]). Academic studies follow these developments and have helped to either provide evidence of new practices for regulators to react to or evaluated the compliance levels after regulatory activity.

2.4 What detection methods are used?

A variety of methods have been explored to improve the accuracy and coverage of the analysis of consent interfaces. Many studies rely on a manual analysis of the interfaces (see Table 1). This makes them both accurate and flexible with regards to new and interesting interface elements, but labour intensive and thus limited in the number of sites evaluated. Automated detection methods are easier to deploy at scale, but have struggled to deal with the diverse and often devious ways consent interfaces are programmed. We summarise the different detection methods for various interface elements below and the accuracy of these methods (as reported by the authors) where possible.

To automatically detect a *consent interface*, a few methods can be used. Various studies [16, 27, 54, 56] use CSS selectors from browser extensions such as “I don’t care about cookies” [35] and “EasyList Cookie List” [97], sometimes supplemented by the authors [16, 54]. Some studies use the visibility of the element, including the z-index of an element (the higher the index, the higher in the ‘stack’ it is, like a pop-up) [16, 55, 85], its coordinates [39] or its ‘screenshot-ability’ [56]. Many studies analyse the text on the page, ranging from string matches for ‘cookie(s)’ [39, 54] or a broader corpus [56, 85], to fine-tuned language models [16, 55]. Gundelach and Herrmann [39] compare four different methods: CSS selector lists, searching for the word ‘cookie’ combined with heuristics, a language model combined with heuristics, and searching for the word ‘cookie’ combined with computer vision. They conclude that word-matching, checking whether the element’s coordinates are inside the viewport, and then picking the element with the most amount of text has the best results, and report an accuracy of 96.5% (F1=0.96) (based on a manual inspection of 1,000 sites). Rasaii et al. [85] select possible candidates by analysing the z-index and position of an element and then searching inside the element for a match against a multi-language word corpus. They report an accuracy of 99% (F1=0.99) — the highest in the literature — based on a manual inspection of 1,000 sites.

To detect *consent management platforms* (CMPs), some researchers similarly use CSS selectors [76], while others monitor network traffic during page load to check for domains that are known to be

Table 1: The prevalence of consent interfaces and their design elements as found by previous research, in chronological order. Button prevalence is only reported if they were present on the initial screen of the interface. Note that there are many methodological differences that impact these numbers and that some of these percentages are our reconstructions based on limited information from the paper and not directly reported. These percentages should be understood as approximations rather than precise measurements.

Source	Year	Analysis method	Sample size	Interface prevalence	CMP	Accept option	Reject option	Visually unequal	Pre-checked purposes
Leenes and Kosta [65]	2015	Manual	100	50%					
Degeling et al. [25]	2019	Manual	6.357	62%	15%				
Eijk et al. [27]	2019	Automated	1.500	40%					
Sanchez-Rola et al. [88]	2019	Manual	2.000		3%				
Utz et al. [99]	2019	Manual	1.000			71%	3%		
Hils et al. [41]	2020	Automated	4.222.704		9%				
Matte et al. [71]	2020	Automated/Manual	22.949/560		6%				47%
Nouwens et al. [76]	2020	Automated	10.000		7%		13%		56%
Mehrnezhad [73]	2020	Manual	116	91%		80%	6%	39%	
Bornschein et al. [15]	2020	Manual	360	64%		45%	4%		
Soe et al. [93]	2020	Manual	300						5%
Kampanos and Shahandashti [54]	2021	Automated	17.737	45%		89%	9%		
Krisam et al. [60]	2021	Manual	389			89%	7%		
Wesselkamp et al. [102]	2021	Manual	385	60%					
Habib et al. [40]	2022	Automated/Manual	10.000/191					78%	26%
Jha et al. [51]	2022	Automated	12.277	63%					
Sheil and Malone [91]	2022	Automated/Manual	3.735	55%		76%	16%		8%
Rasaii et al. [85]	2023b	Automated	10.000	47%	13%	87%		26%	
Kirkman et al. [56]	2023	Automated	10.992	24%			34%		
Alharbi et al. [2]	2023	Manual	243	41%		95%	61%	20%	
Khandelwal et al. [55]	2023	Automated	85.470	53%			22%		
Gundelach and Herrmann [39]	2023	Manual	1.000	47%			52%	46%	
Bouhoula et al. [16]	2024	Automated	85.443	45%			43%		
Zhang et al. [104]	2024b	Automated/Manual	82.624/239		8%				71%
Average				53%	9%	79%	21%	42%	42%

hosted by specific CMP providers [40, 41, 56]. Some studies take advantage of the fact that many CMPs are part of the Transparency & Consent Framework (TCF) — a data-sharing network created by the Interactive Advertising Bureau [45] — which requires all members to expose specific APIs that return a CMP identifier [71, 85, 104].

To detect *user options*, such as links or buttons, most studies search the page for words matching a multi-language corpus of common terms (often machine translated from English rather than specifically created for a particular language). Rasaii et al. [85] use this approach with a corpus of 172 words and accurately find accept buttons 97% of the time, and reject buttons 87.4% of the time. Some studies include heuristics to first detect interactive elements [16, 39, 55, 57]. Bouhoula et al. [16] query for all elements with the property `role="button"` (checking that it has a non-negative `tabindex` value, and a non-null `onClick` attribute). They classify those elements into accept, reject, close, save or settings options using a language model, and report an overall (rather than per-item) accuracy of 95.1% for all options ($F1=0.91$). Khandelwal et al. [55] find all user-focusable elements by simulating tab key-presses, filter out all elements that redirect the user to a different page, and then classify these elements into accept, reject, save, or settings options through a combination of clicking on them

and observing the effect it has on the page, and a machine learning model. Their overall accuracy score (including more than just user option detection) is 93.7%.

Only two studies try to automatically analyse the *visual prominence* of user options. Gundelach and Herrmann [39] extract the colour of each pixel of a detected element and compute the dominant colour (76% accurate), while Kirkman et al. [56] convert a screenshot to black and white and look at the contrast between the detected element and the background (no accuracy reported).

The *status of checkboxes* or toggles to control processing purposes is to our knowledge only analysed through automated means by Nouwens et al. [76], using known CSS selectors of specific CMPs.

In summary, many different methods have been tried, only some of which report their accuracy in a granular way. It seems that generally speaking, a combination of a word corpus with heuristics outperforms both simple hard-coded CSS selectors and more complex machine learning approaches.

2.5 What are the results?

The results of consent interface studies vary wildly for all the reasons above, on top of the changes we might expect over time (see

Table 1). If we take the average of these results – with all the serious caveats of doing so based on the methodological differences discussed above – we can estimate that 53% of sites have a consent interface, and a marginal 9% of sites use CMPs. Of these interfaces, 79% have an accept options, while only 21% have a reject option. If these interfaces do have both options, 42% of the time they are not visually equal but instead have one option that is more prominent than the other. Granular controls, such as processing purposes or individual vendors, are pre-checked in 42% of the interfaces.

3 Method

3.1 Data collection

3.1.1 Country selection. The scope of the study is each country that transposed the ePD and adopted the GDPR, the two laws from the European Union that triggered the online tracking industry to develop consent interfaces. This includes all countries in the European Economic Area (EEA) plus the United Kingdom.⁴ For each of these countries, we crawled the top 10,000 locally most popular websites.

3.1.2 Website selection. We aim to study differences in consent interfaces between countries, as this is a crucial level for any intervention that wants to change the status quo: regulatory guidance, enforcement responsibilities and priorities are all predominantly national in scope. Previous analyses of consent interfaces which incorporate a national element typically use the country code top-level domain (ccTLD) as a proxy for the average browsing experience of a person within that country (e.g., .nl for the Netherlands, or .pl for Poland) [27, 54, 71, 91], even though this misses out on popular non-national sites (such as .com or .org domains). In part, this is because there is no free service which generates ranked lists of the most popular websites per location, which would enable an estimation of a user’s real experience across both the national and transnational elements of their browsing.⁵ Other studies use a list of globally popular websites and visit them from the vantage point of a specific location [41, 85, 104], but this approach misses out on important local sites and erases the experiences of users in small jurisdictions [87], and in any case it appears websites rarely adjust their consent interfaces based on user location [27].

We also adopt a ccTLD approach in this study, but want to clarify the consequences of this clearly for our analysis: the results do not represent the average consent experience of a user in the country, but instead captures how national web cultures and enforcement actions correlate with the design of consent interfaces. By omitting or limiting the transnational element, we heighten the statistical focus on national differences where there is competence to make change.

3.1.3 List generation. The top lists for each country were generated using Tranco [64] by aggregating all domains mentioned in

⁴The included countries are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (which has not substantively altered the laws since leaving the EU).

⁵Only the Chrome User Experience list (CrUX) has lists based on location-level traffic, but their popularity ranking uses very coarse bins (1k, 5k, 10k) and previous work has indicated that popularity ranking is an important factor that affects consent interface design [41], so this level of granularity might obscure important dynamics.

the CrUX, Majestic, Cloudflare Radar, and Cisco Umbrella lists, averaging the domain’s popularity in each list from 13-07-2024 to 11-08-2024, and using harmonic progression to generate a single popularity score per domain. We used the CrUX list, the only list that has location-specific traffic information, to filter out any national domains that were not actually visited by people in that country (e.g., some globally popular sites use a ccTLD for novelty effect, such as youtu.be or twitch.tv). The final domain lists per country are linked to in Appendix A.

3.1.4 Scraping process. We collected the data between 12-08-2024 and 04-09-2024. The websites were scraped from a vantage point in Denmark. We limited our concurrency to four sites, to reduce the chances of being detected as a bot. Each site was scraped in its own virtual container. We successfully collected data from 94% of the target domains; 4.66% of sites were unreachable, and 1.34% of domains blocked the scraper (see Table 2).

3.2 Scraper setup

3.2.1 Domain preparation. We collected the data using a scraper built with *puppeteer-extra* (v. 3.1.15), an open source framework that extends Google’s Puppeteer library (v. 5.5.0) and makes it possible to add plugin functionality. We used the *puppeteer-extra-plugin-stealth* (v. 2.6.5), which uses a number of different mechanisms to avoid being detected as a bot. We complemented this with our own scripts to detect whether a website was showing a CAPTCHA challenge, a Cloudflare ‘Are You Human’ challenge, or an HTTP 403 Forbidden error. Once the scraper navigated to the target domain, we redefined any closed ShadowDOM as open (since some websites place their interface code inside this DOM, making it unreadable to code) and then waited for the DOMContentLoaded event to be fired to make sure the page was done loading. After this signal, the scraper waited for an additional 10 seconds and simulated some mouse movement (since we observed some websites do not load their consent interface until after a delay or until user behaviour is detected). If the domain was not successfully navigated to, loaded, or scraped after 2 minutes, it was skipped.

3.2.2 Data extraction. Once the preparatory steps were completed, we extracted the actual information relevant for this study. This included the presence of a consent interface, the identification of the third-party CMP, which options were available on the initial screen of the interface for the user to click on (e.g., accept, reject), how these options were visually styled, and whether there were any purpose-level control options and what their status was. The methods to detect these components are described below, and the open-source code is available at: github.com/cavi-au/consent-observatory.eu. We only considered the first page of the consent interface because 1) the law requires accepting and rejecting to be equally as easy, which regulators have made clear means they should be on the same page [100]; and because 2) previous research has shown that people rarely interact with the second page (users went to the second page only 6.9% of the time [76]).

3.3 Interface detection

The process to detect the presence of a consent interface extends the approach developed by Rasaii et al. [85]. First, the scraper checks

Table 2: Scraper success rates for collecting data about a website. ‘Target’ is the number of attempted URLs. ‘Successful’ means data was retrieved. ‘Unreachable’ means a failed server connection. ‘Blocked’ means access was denied.

	Scraper success rates						
	Target	Successful		Unreachable		Blocked	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Austria	10000	9467	95	430	4	103	1
Belgium	10000	9502	95	360	4	138	1
Bulgaria	10000	9526	95	474	5	0	0
Croatia	10000	9471	95	529	5	0	0
Cyprus	1889	1724	91	130	7	35	2
Czech Republic	10000	9583	96	241	2	176	2
Denmark	10000	9533	95	372	4	95	1
Estonia	10000	9665	97	192	2	143	1
Finland	10000	9510	95	358	4	132	1
France	10000	9057	91	671	7	272	3
Germany	10000	9386	94	434	4	180	2
Greece	10000	9413	94	349	3	238	2
Hungary	10000	9484	95	516	5	0	0
Iceland	4692	4535	97	95	2	62	1
Ireland	10000	9463	95	377	4	160	2
Italy	10000	8666	87	1082	11	252	3
Latvia	10000	9487	95	513	5	0	0
Liechtenstein	124	122	98	2	2	0	0
Lithuania	10000	9425	94	245	2	330	3
Luxembourg	2374	2243	94	87	4	44	2
Malta	1290	1222	95	37	3	31	2
Netherlands	10000	9529	95	303	3	168	2
Norway	10000	9653	97	266	3	81	1
Poland	10000	9587	96	256	3	157	2
Portugal	10000	9029	90	770	8	201	2
Romania	10000	9392	94	608	6	0	0
Slovakia	10000	9559	96	441	4	0	0
Slovenia	10000	9299	93	701	7	0	0
Spain	10000	8901	89	876	9	223	2
Sweden	10000	9552	96	360	4	88	1
United Kingdom	10000	9163	92	533	5	304	3
Total	270369	254148	94	12608	5	3613	1

Table 3: Accuracy scores of each automated detection method, based on 100 sites per country. ‘FP’ and ‘FN’ refer to False Negative and False Positive results; values are rounded percentages. Missing values means that the randomised evaluation sample lacked data points for this element, which means no accuracy score could be calculated.

	Detection method accuracy score																							
	Interface			Accept			Reject			Settings			Save			Pay			Checkbox			Pre-checked		
	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN	F1	FP	FN
Austria	0.99	0	1	0.99	0	1	0.99	1	0	0.99	1	0	0.98	0	1	-	-	-	0.71	1	9	0.00	0	2
Belgium	1.00	0	0	0.97	0	4	0.97	0	2	0.95	0	4	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0
Bulgaria	0.95	4	2	0.96	2	2	0.90	2	0	0.83	4	4	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Croatia	0.97	4	0	0.96	0	4	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.80	0	2	1.00	0	0
Cyprus	0.94	2	4	0.93	0	6	0.96	0	2	0.97	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Czech Republic	0.97	0	4	0.97	0	4	0.98	0	2	0.98	0	2	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.78	4	0	-	-	-
Denmark	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.89	0	9	1.00	0	0
Estonia	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.00	0	2	0.00	0	2
Finland	0.98	0	2	0.98	0	2	0.96	0	2	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.55	2	3	-	-	-
France	0.99	0	2	0.96	0	6	0.96	0	4	0.96	0	4	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Germany	0.99	0	2	0.96	0	6	0.98	0	2	0.98	0	2	0.94	0	2	0.67	0	2	0.91	2	2	0.50	2	2
Greece	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.89	2	0	-	-	-
Hungary	0.92	6	6	0.96	0	6	0.90	0	6	0.96	0	4	0.00	0	2	-	-	-	0.75	2	2	-	-	-
Iceland	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland	0.97	4	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.90	2	0	-	-	-
Italy	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Latvia	0.98	2	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	0.97	2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.67	2	0	-	-	-
Liechtenstein	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Lithuania	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	0.99	0	2	0.99	0	2	0.98	0	2	0.98	0	2	0.88	2	0	-	-	-	0.88	2	0	0.00	2	0
Malta	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Netherlands	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.70	4	2	0.67	0	2
Norway	1.00	0	0	0.98	2	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Poland	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	0.98	2	0	0.86	2	0	-	-	-	0.94	0	2	1.00	0	0
Portugal	0.98	2	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.50	2	2	0.67	0	2
Romania	0.95	2	5	0.96	0	5	0.95	0	3	0.94	0	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.67	3	2	0.00	2	2
Slovakia	0.94	8	0	0.98	2	0	0.98	2	0	0.98	2	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Slovenia	0.94	4	5	0.98	0	2	0.96	2	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50	2	2	0.67	0	2
Spain	0.98	2	2	0.99	0	2	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.88	2	0	0.83	2	0
Sweden	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	0.94	4	0	0.97	2	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.92	0	4	1.00	0	0
United Kingdom	0.98	2	2	0.98	2	2	0.97	2	0	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	0	0	-	-	-
Total	0.99	1	1	0.98	0	2	0.99	0	1	0.99	0	1	1.00	0	0	-	-	-	0.82	1	2	0.67	0	1

whether there is any element on the page that has a `z-index` larger than 10 and a `position` equal to `fixed`. It looks for these elements in the DOM, the ShadowDOM, and iframes, which returns a list of potential consent interfaces. The scraper then checks whether the items in this list contain a word from a corpus of commonly found words in consent interfaces, either in the element’s text content or attribute values. The corpus includes 363 phrases from all the official languages of the countries in the scope of this study (see Appendix B).⁶ This corpus was developed iteratively by manually looking at consent interfaces on the Tranco top 500 most popular ccTLD sites for each country and other hand-picked sites if certain national languages were not represented in that top list (e.g. Sami, Irish). The scraper also includes a negative corpus of word patterns (e.g., `\d+ years or older`) and an analysis of the visibility of the

detected elements (see Section 3.6), which can be used for filtering in post-processing.

3.4 CMP detection

We detect whether a consent interface is a consent management platform (CMP): a third-party software service that provides the interface for a website owner. To do this, we used the TCF API approach [71, 85, 103] and called the `__tcfapi` and `__cmp` APIs, which return an object with (among other things) the `cmpId`. We cross referenced this id with IAB’s public list [46] to get the CMP provider name. We supplemented this approach with a custom list of CSS selectors to detect CMPs that do not implement the TCF standard. We first extracted all `id` and `class` values from the HTML of the detected interface. We then manually matched these selectors with their corresponding CMP provider, and used regular expression pattern matching to find these same selectors in the HTML of other detected interfaces (see Appendix C for the full list).

⁶The full list is: Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Icelandic, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Luxembourgish, Maltese, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Sami (northern), Slovak, Slovene, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish

3.5 User options detection

Developing the detection method for user options in the consent interface followed a two step process.

3.5.1 Word corpus generation. We developed a heuristic to detect any elements within an interface that a user can interact with. This heuristic looks for any elements with the tag `button` or `a`, elements which have a class, input type, or role that indicate it might be a button (e.g., `.btn` or `input[role="submit"]`), or elements which have an `EventListener` attached to them. We scraped the top 500 most popular ccTLD websites of each country for elements that met this heuristic, extracted their labels, and then manually categorised all those labels as an ‘accept’, ‘reject’, ‘settings’, ‘save’, or ‘pay’ option. As much as possible, this classification was done by, or with the help of, people who spoke the language,⁷ or otherwise by visiting a website that contained that word and using context clues and automated translation services to determine which category it belonged to. We then normalised the list of labels using compatibility decomposition (NFKD) (which, for example, decomposes `é` into `e` and `´`) and regular expressions to remove various characters (e.g., control characters, spacing marks, punctuation, modifier symbols, separators). This resulted in a corpus of 4081 labels across all languages (1288 for accept, 1009 for reject, 1531 for settings, 188 for save, and 65 for pay).

The classification of ambiguous words is an inherently interpretive exercise. Some words are used for elements of interest in one interface, but are irrelevant in another. For example, “learn more” is used by some interfaces to go to settings, but in others it takes the user to a privacy policy. Some words are used for two different categories of user options at the same time (e.g., “accept necessary cookies”). In addition to more obvious labels, we counted variations of “close” and “dismiss” as accept options, “accept necessary” as reject, “learn more” and “see details” as settings, and “login” as pay. In cases of doubt, we chose to be more inclusive and risk false positives to ensure our analysis represents the best case scenario for the presence of user options.

3.5.2 Data extraction. To detect user options in a consent interface, we check the attribute values and text content of all child elements inside a detected consent interface (under 256 characters). We normalise the text and compare it to the corpus, looking for the best match within a Levenshtein distance of 1. We also check for event listeners (on the element or an ancestor) and perform a visual analysis (see Section 3.6), which can be used for post-processing to filter out non-visible or non-interactable (e.g., a header with the word “Consent”) elements. When multiple user options were detected that fell into the same category (for example when there is a settings button but there is also a settings link in the text), we chose to use the most visible element for our analysis.

3.6 Visual prominence analysis

We developed a method to calculate how visually prominent and clickable an element is on the page. The analysis of visibility is based on the element’s size, colour, background colour, border width, border colour, border radius, and text decoration. It uses

⁷This was the case in English, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, French, Greek, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Estonian, German, Serbian, Croatian, and Bulgarian.

these properties to calculate the colour saturation, contrast between the element and its background, the element’s border and its background, the element’s text and its background, and the text’s decoration. These values can be either negative or positive (or 0 if no value could be extracted) and are weighted based on the extent to which we believe the specific design element contributes to an element’s visual prominence. The saturation has the biggest impact (factor 1.5), followed by the contrast between the element and its background (1), border contrast and text contrast (0.5), and border saturation contrast and text decoration (0.2) The final score is the sum of these individual scores (see Figure 1 for examples).

While the scores themselves may not be meaningful alone (e.g., a score of 0.35 has no inherent meaning), they allow for consistent comparisons between elements. Elements are considered equally as visually prominent if the difference between their score is less than 0.5. We decided on this threshold by finding the bimodal separation point in the distribution of differences and manually inspecting sets of elements that fell on either side of this cut-off point to see if it was a fair and meaningful distinction.

It is important to recognise that the visibility of an element on a screen is subjective and is co-constituted between the user and the environment. For instance, green and red are visually different to computers and some people, but not to those with red-green colour blindness. Factors like screen brightness and size also affect visibility depending on the user. Despite this subjectivity, quantification is necessary for large-scale, automated comparisons, and the resulting scores were deemed reasonable upon manual inspection.


3.7 Purpose controls detection

We detect whether there are any purpose-level controls on the first page of the interface. These are toggles, checkboxes, or buttons that allow a user to give more granular consent than just accepting or rejecting all data processing. For example, “Create profiles for personalised advertising” or “Measure advertising performance” [44]. This heuristic looks for all items inside the detected consent interface that satisfy the CSS selector `input[type="checkbox"]` or `[role="checkbox"]`. It returns its current status (checked or not) and whether it is disabled (often the “mandatory purposes” have a checkbox that cannot be interacted with).

3.8 Detection accuracy

We manually evaluated 3,100 random website screenshots (100 for each country) to establish a ground truth to compare our detection methods against (see Table 3).

On average, the detection method for the consent interface achieves an F1 score of 0.99, similar to Rasaii et al. [85], with Hungary scoring the lowest at 0.92. We obtain an F1 score of 0.98 for accept options, 0.99 for reject options, and 0.99 for settings options, surpassing previous work. The F1 score for save options is 1.00, but because it is based on a much smaller sample, it should be interpreted cautiously. We were unable to calculate a score for pay options, as these were mostly absent from the sample of screenshots. The detection of purpose controls, such as checkboxes, results in a relatively lower F1 score of 0.82 (with the lowest for Finland at 0.55), while the detection of checkbox status yields an F1 score of 0.67, primarily due to false negatives.



(a) Nearly invisible. The top image says “Neka alla” (“Reject all”) and the bottom says “Ok”. Both images have very low contrast between the text and the background, and no other features that make it stand out.

(b) Subtle. The top element has no contrast between the button background and parent background and low contrast between the background and the text and border. The bottom element is merely an underlined link.

(c) Visible. The top element has high contrast between the text and the background, but no other colour or border. The bottom element is a button with a background, but with medium contrast.

(d) Prominent. The top element has a high contrast between the parent background, button background, and the text, and it is underlined. The bottom element has lower contrast, but a vibrant colour.

Figure 1: Examples of elements with different visibility scores.

4 Results

4.1 How prevalent are consent interfaces?

On average, 67% of websites use a consent interface (see Table 4).

4.1.1 Consent interfaces across countries. There are substantial differences in the prevalence of consent interfaces across countries (see column *Interfaces* in Table 4). For instance, Germany has the highest proportion of consent interfaces across their top 10,000 with 78%, while Estonian websites have the lowest share with only 41%.⁸ There is no clear way to separate countries into ‘consent-heavy’ or ‘consent-light’ groups: the prevalence of consent interfaces gradually decreases between the two extremes, without a clear dividing line.

4.1.2 Consent interfaces across popularity ranks. Consent interfaces are quite evenly spread across popularity ranks (see column *Popularity Rank* in Table 4) – the difference between the top 1,000 and the bottom 1,000 is just 12 percentage points – although consent interfaces are somewhat more prevalent in the top 3,000 most popular websites.

There are national differences in the way consent interfaces are spread across popularity ranks. In some countries, the proportion stays quite even no matter how popular the sites are, such as in Poland or Slovakia, where the difference between the highest and lowest proportion is minimal (6 and 7 points respectively). Other countries, such as Ireland, Estonia, or Latvia, exhibit a ‘top-heavy’ pattern where the most popular sites have higher shares of consent interfaces, which then quickly drops off. A third category of countries have distributions with peaks and valleys, where popularity rises or dips across the ranks. In Germany, for example, the middle popularity segment has the highest share of interfaces, whereas in the United Kingdom this segment actually has the lowest share, and the Netherlands and Portugal instead show a ripple pattern.

⁸Iceland and Liechtenstein have lower shares, but are left out of consideration because of the small sample size.

4.2 How prevalent are consent management platforms?

CMPs are third-party software that website owners can download or buy and then install on their page. At least 67% of all consent interfaces are consent management platforms (CMPs), or 44.5% of all websites analysed (see column *CMP* in Table 4). 11.7% of CMPs were detected using the TCF API, which means they are part of the IAB Transparency & Consent Framework. The top three most used CMPs are Usercentrics (headquartered in Germany), CookieYes (in the U.K.), and OneTrust (in the U.S.). Together, these three services make up 37.57% of all CMPs. Despite this concentration, there is still a long tail of other providers: the total number of unique CMPs that we found was 115 (see Appendix D).

4.2.1 CMPs across countries. CMPs are quite evenly spread across countries: Denmark has the largest share of banners that are CMPs with 84%, and Slovenia the smallest with 54%. The national CMP markets all exhibit concentration, with just a handful of services being used by most of the websites. The lowest market share by the top three CMP providers is 36% in Romania, but the highest is 64% in Denmark. In a number of countries, the top three include CMPs that are locally developed. For example, ibuenda in Italy, tarteaucitron and Didomi in France, Shoper in Poland, Shoptet in the Czech Republic, Usercentrics in Germany, CookieHub in Iceland, Mozello CookieBar in Latvia, and CookieInformation and Usercentrics (which bought the Danish Cookiebot in 2021) in Denmark. Interestingly, apart from Usercentrics, CookieInformation, and Shoptet, none of these national CMPs make it in the top three of another country, which means some countries have a national web culture to use locally developed CMPs (and this means those CMPs are within the jurisdiction of national supervisory authorities).

Table 4: Prevalence of consent interfaces and CMPs. The countries are ranked based on how many websites have consent interfaces. The colour of the Popularity Rank cells reflects the proportion of interfaces in that popularity bin: darker means more. The CMP percentages are relative to the number of interfaces, not the number of websites. All CMPs without a coloured background are only present once in the top three across all countries. The * indicates that the country had fewer than 10,000 domains available for scraping.

	Sites		Interfaces		Interfaces % in Popularity Rank										CMP		Top 3 CMPs							
	n	%	0-1K	1-2K	2-3K	3-4K	4-5K	5-6K	6-7K	7-8K	8-9K	9-10K	n	%	name	n	%	name	n	%	name	n	%	
Germany	9386	7362	78	80	76	82	83	84	80	71	69	79	81	4979	68	Usercentrics	1591	32	consentmanager.net	650	13	OneTrust	431	9
Spain	8901	6869	77	81	83	79	77	79	76	75	71	74	4803	70	OneTrust	666	14	CookieYes	616	13	Usercentrics	586	12	
Slovakia	9559	7388	77	79	82	77	76	78	77	76	75	76	4531	61	Shoptet	791	17	TermsFeed	686	15	Usercentrics	579	13	
Austria	9467	7180	76	79	81	78	78	71	74	74	75	76	4721	66	Usercentrics	879	19	Borlabs	681	14	Osano	576	12	
Italy	8666	6562	76	87	80	80	77	69	69	77	74	73	5278	80	ibubenda	1551	29	Usercentrics	800	15	OneTrust	507	10	
Denmark	9533	7149	75	85	81	81	79	73	71	70	72	70	6000	84	Usercentrics	1831	31	Cookie Information	1579	26	CookieYes	411	7	
United Kingdom	9163	6782	74	80	85	81	76	63	73	77	72	72	4814	71	OneTrust	1147	24	Usercentrics	610	13	Osano	455	9	
France	9057	6626	73	80	77	78	72	67	76	76	73	68	4651	70	tarteaucitron	868	19	Didomi	564	12	OneTrust	543	12	
Romania	9392	6811	73	78	76	76	76	76	67	70	68	71	4698	69	CookieYes	657	14	Usercentrics	575	12	Osano	477	10	
Slovenia	9299	6676	72	78	75	78	74	74	75	66	65	69	3586	54	CookieYes	958	27	Cookie Notice	477	13	Moove	409	11	
Netherlands	9529	6802	71	77	81	74	62	77	74	66	66	70	4425	65	Usercentrics	2032	46	OneTrust	371	8	CookieYes	241	5	
Poland	9587	6790	71	70	74	71	72	68	70	72	73	69	4192	62	Usercentrics	962	23	Shoper	471	11	CookieYes	363	9	
Belgium	9502	6414	68	83	76	69	70	68	61	60	62	61	3870	60	Usercentrics	662	17	OneTrust	513	13	CookieYes	370	10	
Croatia	9471	6336	67	76	72	69	71	66	67	70	62	57	3932	62	CookieYes	908	23	Complianz	447	11	Moove	426	11	
Sweden	9552	6342	66	79	72	71	70	67	61	62	61	60	4413	70	Usercentrics	1185	27	CookieYes	532	12	Osano	445	10	
Hungary	9484	6216	66	77	68	67	66	62	68	62	60	63	3555	57	CookieYes	585	16	Usercentrics	523	15	Osano	383	11	
Greece	9413	6105	65	76	70	71	66	65	58	58	61	59	4415	72	CookieYes	773	18	InMobi	629	14	Osano	428	10	
Finland	9510	6116	64	80	76	76	62	59	59	59	57	57	4666	76	Usercentrics	1474	32	CookieYes	524	11	Complianz	358	8	
Ireland	9463	6075	64	82	78	65	59	62	60	60	63	59	4360	72	CookieYes	917	21	OneTrust	719	16	Usercentrics	575	13	
Portugal	9029	5759	64	75	74	65	46	62	63	58	65	66	3474	60	CookieYes	622	18	OneTrust	388	11	Usercentrics	323	9	
Luxembourg*	2243	1436	64	69	62	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	992	69	Usercentrics	152	15	CookieYes	129	13	Complianz	110	11	
Czech Republic	9583	6054	63	72	69	63	69	63	61	61	60	58	3480	57	TermsFeed	902	26	Shoptet	482	14	Usercentrics	384	11	
Norway	9653	5884	61	75	68	64	58	58	59	57	59	56	4399	75	Usercentrics	1072	24	Cookie Information	860	20	CookieYes	426	10	
Bulgaria	9526	5812	61	65	67	64	62	63	63	64	57	53	3215	55	Osano	562	17	CookieYes	481	15	Cookie Notice	292	9	
Lithuania	9425	5750	61	71	63	61	63	61	60	62	61	53	3829	67	CookieYes	690	18	Osano	501	13	Usercentrics	471	12	
Latvia	9487	5297	56	73	63	65	60	55	52	49	48	47	2899	55	CookieYes	579	20	Usercentrics	369	13	Mozello CookieBar	351	12	
Cyprus*	1724	946	55	62	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	656	69	CookieYes	200	30	Osano	63	10	Usercentrics	50	8	
Malta*	1222	600	49	52	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	409	68	CookieYes	162	40	Cookie Notice	47	11	Usercentrics	28	7	
Estonia	9665	3946	41	58	53	47	45	41	37	31	34	34	2869	73	CookieYes	916	32	Usercentrics	332	12	Cookie Notice	286	10	
Iceland*	4535	1775	39	54	40	37	34	27	-	-	-	-	1140	64	CookieHub	389	34	CookieYes	185	16	Osano	107	9	
Liechtenstein*	122	41	34	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	56	Usercentrics	12	52	consentmanager.net	3	13	Cookie-Script	1	4	
Total	254148	169901	67	74	71	70	67	65	66	65	64	63	62	113274	67	Usercentrics	19549	17	CookieYes	14102	12	OneTrust	9101	8




Figure 2: Distribution of top 10 CMP providers by website popularity rank. The main plot groups websites into popularity rank bins of 200 (e.g., 1–200, 201–400). The inset shows the top 1,000 sites, using bins of 50. Dashed lines indicate CMPs that appear in the top 10 only within this smaller subset. The dotted line represents the combined count of all other CMPs outside the top 10. Grid lines mark bin boundaries.

4.2.2 CMPs across popularity ranks. CMPs are used by websites across all popularity ranks (see Figure 2), but predominately by the most popular sites. Usercentrics and CookieYes are, with some distance, clearly the two most used CMPs. However, Usercentrics is used more by the most popular websites, which might be because Usercentrics' cheapest option starts at €50 per month, while CookieYes offers a free option. OneTrust is another CMP that is considerably more popular in the top 3,000, but is less prevalent in the segments after that compared to other CMPs. Didomi, InMobi, and Sourcepoint are CMPs that are only popular with the top 200 ranked websites. Above all, however, we can see that there is a long tail of other CMP providers and their cumulative count is consistently higher than each individual provider in the top ten. This is particularly evident in the top 1,000, where the share of the long tail is double and even triple that of Usercentrics.

4.3 What do consent interfaces look like?

Most consent interfaces have an accept option (88%), while less than half have a reject option (45%) (see Table 5). In fact, more interfaces provide some way to access settings (54%) – a button or link that often takes the user to another view with more information and granular controls – than a way to refuse consent. Likely, the reject options are hidden on this second screen, a common design practice that is generally considered non-compliant and well-documented to significantly decrease users' opt-out rates [11, 76]. Reject options also consistently score lower on visual prominence compared to accept options. Pay buttons that ask users to subscribe if they do not want to consent are still vanishingly rare (0.24%). The European Data Protection Board recently opined that this “should not be the way forward” [30] in response to attempts from Meta to implement this across their platforms, but websites are increasingly developing first-party data collection methods such as login walls as alternatives to third-party tracking. Purpose controls – checkboxes or toggles – are not very common on the initial screen (only 16% of interfaces have them), and surprisingly there are even fewer user options to save whatever the user toggles (8%). Roughly 17% of these purpose controls are pre-checked by default, another design choice that is firmly established as non-compliant [1]. A notable proportion of interfaces (9%) lack any options altogether, which means these are likely merely notification banners that inform users about the use of cookies.

There is considerable homogeneity in the labels that are used for the user options (see Table 5). For each category, only four or five phrases represent nearly all labels that are used across ~170,000 websites. The most commonly used labels clearly indicate what clicking the option will do (“Accept all”, “Change settings”), but there are some notable exceptions. For example, more than a quarter of all reject options (27%) use the rather ambiguous “Accept necessary” text (or comparable variations). Similarly, for settings labels, phrases like “See details” or “Learn more” do not clearly convey that clicking will lead to more controls.

4.3.1 User options across countries. The proportion of accept options is relatively consistent across all countries, ranging from 94% (Finland and Denmark) to 73% (Slovenia), with a standard deviation of 4.3 percentage points. In contrast, there are substantial

variations in other user options. For reject options, the difference is much larger, with Denmark leading at 72% while Bulgaria and Slovenia lag behind at just 20%, and a standard deviation of 12.6 points. This is similar for settings options (Czech Republic: 73%, Slovenia: 22%, $\sigma = 12.6$). The option to pay for website access is clearly a country-specific practice, only meaningfully present in six out of thirty-one countries. Even in these cases, their prevalence is usually below 1%, with the exception of Germany, where they are present on 2.28% of interfaces. Purpose controls are also relatively scarce on the initial screen, with the exception of Denmark where more than half of all interfaces (53%) include toggles or checkboxes. The countries with a higher proportion of purpose controls also have a noticeably higher share of save options and, in the case of Denmark, also a significantly lower number of settings options, suggesting there is a dominant design pattern. Pre-selected purposes are present in all countries, but the Netherlands stands out as an outlier with 40% of purpose controls pre-selected, significantly higher than second-ranked countries Hungary and Bulgaria with 30%.

4.3.2 User options across popularity ranks and CMPs. The popularity of a website does not seem to have a very large impact on what kind of user options they have in their interface—percentages are mostly stable—with the exception of setting options which are more prevalent in the top 3,000 and checkboxes which are slightly less prevalent on the top 1,000 (see Figure 3). The main differences can be seen between interfaces that use a CMP or those without a CMP (that we could detect): non-CMP consent interfaces consistently have fewer user options. Non-CMP interfaces also show more variation across popularity ranks: there are more accept and reject options in the top 1,000 most popular sites before dropping off and leveling out.

4.4 How compliant are consent interfaces?

4.4.1 Defining compliance. The compliance of consent interfaces with the GDPR and ePD depends on more things than what we measure here. Some requirements are not included in our analysis—such as what is present on the second layer of the interface, the ability to withdraw consent at a later stage, or whether any processing happens before a user has given their answer—while other requirements cannot be automated because they rely on qualitative interpretation—such as the quality of the information provided to the website visitor. Instead, we take a generous approach to compliance and only consider measurable design choices that serve as a minimum threshold. These conditions for minimal compliance are:

- *Accepting is as easy as rejecting:* the interface has both an accept and reject option on the first layer and their visual prominence is similar;
- *No pre-checked purposes:* the interface does not have any optional purpose controls which are already toggled on;
- *Granular controls:* the interface gives the option to consent to specific purposes or vendors through checkbox controls on the first layer or a settings option that we assume gives access to granular controls.

Meeting these conditions gives insight in the *maximum* level of compliance, but the real compliance rate is likely lower when other obligations are taken into account.

Table 5: Prevalence of user interface elements in consent interfaces. The table is ordered based on the compliance score. Compliance is defined as an interface with both an accept and reject option that are visually equally as prominent (if not identical), and has either a settings option or purpose controls without anything pre-checked. The ‘score’ is the median of all the elements’ visual prominence. The ✓ is the number of checkboxes with at least one optional purpose already pre-checked. Countries marked with * have ePD and/or GDPR regulators which have issued guidance [12, 78], and † have imposed fines [77].

	Interfaces	Compliant		No options		Accept			Reject			Settings			Save			Pay			Purpose controls			
		n	%	n	%	n	%	score	n	%	score	n	%	score	n	%	score	n	%	score	n	%	✓	%
Spain [†]	6869	1894	28	401	6	6312	92	1.55	3983	58	1.13	4462	65	0.56	325	5	1.67	86	1.25	0.77	579	8	119	21
Slovakia	7388	1815	25	333	5	6828	92	1.59	4075	55	0.95	5355	72	0.52	397	5	1.63	-	-	-	1199	16	133	11
Italy [†]	6562	1536	23	466	7	5935	90	1.74	3637	55	1.10	4337	66	0.77	457	7	1.78	58	0.88	-0.10	990	15	122	12
France [†]	6626	1539	23	752	11	5602	85	1.56	4196	63	0.72	4464	67	0.58	179	3	1.44	29	0.44	1.18	303	5	63	21
Austria*	7180	1485	21	269	4	6452	90	1.80	3781	53	1.24	4388	61	0.67	1724	24	1.48	10	0.14	1.20	1761	25	170	10
United Kingdom [†]	6782	1416	21	545	8	6028	89	1.55	2872	42	1.10	4448	66	0.55	382	6	1.64	2	0.03	3.26	762	11	188	25
Ireland*	6075	1217	20	522	9	5430	89	1.47	2926	48	0.99	3862	64	0.47	507	8	1.74	1	0.02	3.26	738	12	102	14
Germany*	7362	1430	19	302	4	6616	90	1.95	3955	54	1.19	4809	65	0.60	1328	18	1.31	168	2.28	1.56	1457	20	131	9
Luxembourg*	1436	265	18	110	8	1285	89	1.47	793	55	0.86	810	56	0.52	117	8	1.37	-	-	-	154	11	27	18
Finland*	6116	1087	18	229	4	5777	94	1.96	3815	62	1.33	3429	56	0.69	921	15	1.80	-	-	-	1411	23	161	11
Cyprus	946	166	18	96	10	828	88	1.33	449	47	0.76	517	55	0.26	76	8	1.31	-	-	-	122	13	30	25
Denmark [†]	7149	1210	17	279	4	6710	94	2.05	5119	72	1.25	1750	24	0.43	1699	24	1.66	48	0.67	0.25	3766	53	311	8
Czech Republic*	6054	1046	17	243	4	5554	92	1.66	2732	45	0.82	4416	73	0.45	265	4	1.34	-	-	-	1189	20	113	10
Iceland	1775	280	16	190	11	1544	87	1.34	507	29	1.25	718	40	0.59	25	1	1.78	-	-	-	44	2	9	20
Belgium [†]	6414	1057	16	594	9	5516	86	1.62	2977	46	0.91	3551	55	0.55	515	8	1.43	1	0.02	3.31	863	13	169	20
Sweden*	6342	881	14	323	5	5874	93	1.83	3119	49	1.29	3847	61	0.63	852	13	1.91	-	-	-	1662	26	259	16
Latvia*	5297	688	13	725	14	4373	83	1.44	2000	38	1.11	2465	47	0.32	236	4	1.79	-	-	-	603	11	134	22
Greece*	6105	782	13	424	7	5592	92	1.25	2534	42	0.75	3144	51	0.35	406	7	1.46	-	-	-	709	12	169	24
Portugal*	5759	711	12	795	14	4820	84	1.33	2059	36	0.86	2462	43	0.46	267	5	1.13	1	0.02	3.27	457	8	80	18
Liechtenstein	41	5	12	4	10	37	90	1.47	25	61	1.50	16	39	0.34	7	17	1.59	-	-	-	7	17	1	14
Malta	600	71	12	76	13	516	86	1.20	215	36	0.73	302	50	0.24	20	3	1.44	-	-	-	33	6	7	21
Romania [†]	6811	807	12	712	10	5872	86	1.53	2477	36	0.99	3339	49	0.36	325	5	2.05	1	0.01	-0.18	817	12	269	33
Norway	5884	624	11	625	11	5033	86	1.83	3005	51	1.07	2382	40	0.58	709	12	1.69	-	-	-	1578	27	237	15
Lithuania	5750	604	11	423	7	5165	90	1.25	1651	29	0.72	2088	36	0.37	290	5	1.87	-	-	-	584	10	136	23
Poland	6790	658	10	1062	16	5437	80	1.75	1980	29	1.04	3763	55	0.58	351	5	2.08	-	-	-	1177	17	317	27
Croatia [†]	6336	658	10	731	12	5330	84	1.39	2137	34	0.90	3234	51	0.36	312	5	1.51	-	-	-	660	10	85	13
Netherlands [†]	6802	620	9	475	7	5944	87	1.97	2904	43	0.97	3848	57	0.60	804	12	1.65	1	0.01	3.31	1150	17	462	40
Estonia	3946	318	8	349	9	3485	88	1.39	1436	36	0.86	1757	45	0.28	185	5	1.79	-	-	-	394	10	76	19
Hungary [†]	6216	466	7	502	8	5440	88	1.52	2240	36	0.78	3335	54	0.43	278	4	1.87	2	0.03	-0.18	681	11	203	30
Bulgaria	5812	255	4	734	13	4912	85	1.36	1134	20	0.89	2194	38	0.41	237	4	1.17	1	0.02	-0.87	424	7	127	30
Slovenia	6676	198	3	1478	22	4897	73	1.20	1313	20	0.73	1484	22	0.40	43	1	1.32	-	-	-	595	9	92	15
Total	169901	25789	15	14769	9	149144	88	1.61	76046	45	1.02	90976	54	0.52	14239	8	1.62	409	0.24	0.98	26869	16	4502	17

4.4.2 Compliance across countries, CMPs, and website popularity.

The average compliance rate of consent interfaces is only 15% (see the column *Compliant* in Table 5). Compliance rates do not appear to be correlated with the popularity rank of the website (see Figure 3). Compliance rates do vary considerably between countries: Spain has the highest compliance rate with 28% of consent interfaces, while only 3% of interfaces are compliant in Slovenia ($\sigma = 5.9$). The main reason for non-compliance is the lack of a reject option (56%, see Figure 4), but many interfaces are also missing granular consent controls (30%) or have reject options that are harder to see than accept options (24%). Compliance rates vary even more across CMPs ($\sigma = 17.5$, see Table 7). In the top twenty most compliant CMPs, the compliance rate ranges from 65% for Shopify (an e-commerce platform that offers an integrated consent interface for their business clients), to merely 4% for Osano (a platform that offers automated cookie classification and integrates with many

other services). Usercentrics and CookieYes – the most and second-most used services responsible for nearly a third of all CMPs – have a compliance rate of merely 17% and 8%.

4.4.3 Explaining variations in compliance. The compliance of a consent interface is significantly predicted by the CMP that a website uses. We conducted an ANOVA to examine the impact on compliance of 1) the CMP, 2) the existence of regulatory guidance, 3) a history of fines, and 4) the website’s popularity rank (categorised into buckets of 500, e.g., 1–500, 501–1,000, and so on).⁹ It showed there was a significant effect of the CMP ($F(115, 270052) = 489.9, p < 0.001$), website popularity ($F(19, 270052) = 2.2, p = 0.002$), and guidance ($F(1, 270052) = 681.8, p < 0.001$), but no effect from fines

⁹We chose these bin sizes because the popularity ranking is based on a combination of four top lists that use different ranking methodologies and bucket ranges (see Section 3.1.3), so smaller bins would misrepresent the precision of the ranking while larger bins would hide variance. We excluded country as an independent variable due to its high multicollinearity with guidance and fines. This overlap made it difficult to isolate the unique effect of country, as the variation in compliance explained by country was largely accounted for by guidance and fines.

Table 6: The most common labels for different user options. The labels were translated using deep-translator [6] with the Google Translator engine, fuzzy matched using RapidFuzz [7], and then manually clustered.

Accept label	%	Settings label	%
Accept/allow/enable/approve/agree (all)	65	Change settings/preferences	44
Accept cookies	20	See details/learn more/more info	32
Ok	5	Customize/adjust/personalize/configure/manage	13
I see/understand	4	More options	5
Consent	2	Set/configure cookies	2
Other	4	Other	4
Reject label	%	Pay label	%
Reject/refuse/deny/decline/disagree (all)	65	Ad-free for €x/month	42
Accept (only) necessary/essential/mandatory (cookies)	27	(Refuse and) subscribe	25
I don't accept/do not allow	4	Log in with contentpass	13
Continue without accepting	2	Buy access	12
Other	2	Reject and pay	8
Save label	%		
Allow/accept selection/choice	78		
Save settings/preferences	19		
Other	3		




Figure 3: Frequency of user options and compliance across website popularity ranks and CMPs. Solid lines are options from interfaces where a CMP was detected. Dashed lines are either not a CMP or undetected. The plot uses bins of size 200. The grid lines show the edges of the bins.



Figure 4: Distribution of the reasons a consent interface is considered non-compliant. The set sizes represent the total count for each individual condition, while the intersections display the exclusive combinations of conditions. The green bar represents interfaces that do not meet any condition and are considered compliant [59, 66].

Table 7: The compliance rate of identified consent management platforms. This table shows only the top twenty most compliant CMPs (accounting for 78% of all CMPs detected), ranked from most to least compliant.

CMP	Compliance		Prevalence	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Shopify	927	65	1431	1.26
tarteaucitron	623	54	1153	1.02
iubenda	1036	48	2143	1.89
CookieHub	501	47	1068	0.94
CookieConsent	702	45	1573	1.39
CIVIC	219	44	499	0.44
OneTrust	3729	41	9101	8.03
consentmanager.net	528	29	1830	1.62
Borlabs	304	28	1069	0.94
Shoptet	364	27	1372	1.21
Moove	767	26	2990	2.64
TermsFeed	1072	26	4164	3.68
Cookie-Script	812	23	3502	3.09
Usercentrics	3404	17	19549	17.26
Didomi	373	17	2208	1.95
Cookie Information	361	10	3556	3.14
Complianz	591	9	6444	5.69
CookieYes	1126	8	14102	12.45
InMobi	208	8	2678	2.38
Osano	359	4	8037	7.10

($F(1, 270052) = 0.8, p = 0.357$).¹⁰ To estimate the contribution of each variable to the compliance rate, we performed separate linear regressions. This showed that CMPs explain 17.8% of the variance in compliance ($F(115, 270253) = 509.9, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.178$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.178$), guidance accounts for 0.8% of the variance ($F(1, 270367) = 2052.0, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.008$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.008$), and website popularity explains 0.1% of the variance ($F(19, 270349) = 14.1, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.001$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.001$).

We conducted a multiple linear regression to examine the direction and strength of the effects of individual CMPs, website popularity, and guidance on the compliance rate, while including fines to account for its potential confounding effects. We used non-CMP consent interfaces as the reference category for CMPs (i.e., consent interfaces likely created by the website owner themselves), because we assume that a CMP developed by an expert third-party should considerably increase its compliance. We used an absence

¹⁰The reader should be aware that there is no official complete dataset of regulator guidance and fines, nor are fines always made public, which affects the quality of this independent variable. Other factors that likely affect whether regulatory activity would have a visible impact are the time since guidance or fines were given out and this data was collected, the height of the fine, the media attention it received, etc. These results should be interpreted with caution and not as proof that fines are ineffective.

of guidance and fines, and the first popularity ranking bin (top 500) as the reference category for the other variables.

The model is statistically significant ($F(136, 270232) = 437.7, p = 0.00$) and explains 18.1% of the variance in compliance ($R^2 = 0.181$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.180$). The intercept of 0.0255 indicates that, for websites that do not use a third-party CMP, are ranked in the top 500, and are located in countries without guidance or fines, the compliance rate is 2.6%.

The model shows that the compliance rate increases by 2.8 percentage points if the regulator has released guidance ($\beta = 0.0284, p < .001$). It also shows that websites that fall outside the top 500 most popular sites are less compliant, but not increasingly so. The compliance rate is between -1.4 points (rank 2000-2500, $\beta = 0.0135, p < .001$) and -0.7 points (rank 9000-9500, $\beta = 0.007, p = 0.033$) lower than the most popular websites. Additionally, the model shows substantial differences in how specific CMPs impact compliance. The effect sizes range widely, from strongly positive (up to +97 percentage points) to slightly negative (-5 percentage points). Among the twenty most commonly used CMPs—covering 82% of all identified CMPs (see Table 7)—Shopify stands out with the

largest positive association ($\beta = 0.611, p < .001$), followed by CookieHub ($\beta = 0.438, p < .001$). In contrast, Osano ($\beta = 0.011, p < .001$) and InMobi ($\beta = 0.037, p < .001$) had the lowest coefficients, with a mere 1-3 points improvement in compliance compared to not using a CMP. The second most popular CMP CookieYes, representing 13% of all consent interfaces, was similarly associated with only a minor improvement ($\beta = 0.048, p < .001$). Usercentrics, the most used CMP, increased compliance by 13.6 percentages ($\beta = 0.136, p < .001$) points and OneTrust, the third most, by 36.9 points ($\beta = 0.369, p < .001$).

These results indicate that websites in countries where national authorities have provided guidance tend to have slightly higher compliance rate, but that the choice of third-party CMP can have wildly varying effects, with some services increasing compliance by as much as 97 percentage points, while others reduce it by up to 5 percentage points, relative to not using a CMP. Notably, the top three most commonly used CMPs—accounting for 40% of those analysed—were decidedly mediocre at improving compliance.

5 Discussion

5.1 How have consent interfaces changed over time?

5.1.1 Consent interfaces. Our findings reveal 67% of websites have consent interfaces, a higher prevalence compared to all previous studies (see Table 1), although it is unclear whether this reflects differences in detection methods or an actual increase in their adoption. For instance, Rasaii et al. [85] reported that 47% of websites had pop-ups in 2023, using a detection method which they report had a 99% accuracy. The 20-point difference with our results may stem from their inclusion of non-EU countries, making it difficult to conclude whether the increase is due to temporal trends or geographic differences. On the other end, Degeling et al. [25] reported a similar prevalence of 63% already back in 2019, based on a manual analysis of the top 500 across all EU countries. It is unclear whether the similarity with our results means that little has changed in the intervening years, or whether consent interfaces were mostly prevalent on the most popular sites and the other 9,500 sites have now caught up.

5.1.2 CMPs. We find significantly more consent management platforms compared to previous work: 67% of all consent interfaces, or 45% of all websites. The previously highest detected proportion was 15% by Degeling et al. [25] in 2019, while the most recent study in 2024 by Zhang et al. [104] found only 8%. Earlier research generally focused on fewer CMPs [76] or specific frameworks like the IAB TCF [71], so our broader detection method is likely the reason for this considerable increase. Previous work by Hils et al. [41] found that CMPs were primarily used by websites in the 100-10,000 segment of popularity. This sounded reasonable: one would expect the top 100 popular websites, likely belonging to organisations with significant resources, to implement their own compliance mechanisms rather than outsource such important designs. Instead, our data shows that CMPs are actually most prevalent in the top 100 and their popularity decreases steadily across popularity ranks. This could be explained by the fact that Hils et al. [41] only looked at six CMP companies, while we considered more, except that three

of the companies they considered were also included in our study – OneTrust, InMobi (previously QuantCast), and Cookiebot (now absorbed by Usercentrics) – and these are actually some of the most popular in the 100. This suggests that, between 2020 and 2024, popular websites have now also started to use consent interfaces developed by external companies.

5.1.3 Accept options. Our results show that 88% of interfaces include accept options, a level consistent with findings from prior studies examining consent interfaces. Keeping all the methodological differences in mind, it is noteworthy to see that the average proportion of accept options has remained relatively similar across multiple studies since 2020 [73].

5.1.4 Reject options. Reject options show an upward trend, from less than 10% across most studies in 2020 [15, 73, 93] to somewhere between 22-61% in recent work [16, 39, 55]. The average of those numbers seems to align with our results, where we find 45% of consent interfaces have reject options. While a positive development, this is still only about half of the number of accept options, and our visual analysis shows they are consistently designed to be less prominent.

5.1.5 Purpose controls. The proportion of pre-checked purpose controls, although relatively understudied, has shown a downward trend across previous work, starting at roughly ~50% [71, 76]. This design pattern was one of the early battlegrounds after the GDPR went into effect, even though the GDPR specifically mentioned that “pre-ticked boxes [...] should not therefore constitute consent” [33], a point reinforced by case law [1]. Our results now show an average of 17% of pre-checked purposes controls, suggesting some improvement.

5.2 How do consent interface designs impact users?

This paper provides the most comprehensive and robust analysis of consent interfaces to date on 250,000 websites across thirty-one countries, drawing from and innovating on efforts and methodological insights from a large body of academic studies. But what do these statistics mean in practice? How do the design choices of consent interfaces influence user behaviour, and what are the implications for people’s data protection and privacy?

5.2.1 Interfaces vs. other factors. Controlled and natural experiments consistently show that the design of consent interfaces significantly impacts user decisions, more so than other factors studied [17], which means that quantitatively measuring the prevalence of these interfaces is essential to assess the scale of user manipulation and the extent to which individuals’ data protection rights are compromised. Beyond the interface, studies show device type also plays a role, with higher consent rates on mobile devices [8, 10, 17, 99], likely because consent interfaces block more content on smaller screens. A longitudinal natural experiment across hundreds of websites further indicates that EU and UK users have lower consent rates than other geographic areas, and that Android users are less likely to consent than iOS users [50]. Other factors, such as privacy attitudes [10, 69] and risk appetite [20] show some effects, while self-reported technology and security

expertise [10, 17] show mixed results. There is no evidence that age or gender is correlated with consent choices [17, 40].

5.2.2 Presence of user options. The initial screen of the consent interface, which we focus on in our study, is crucial to understand user behavior, as multiple studies indicate that users rarely engage with secondary pages that require additional clicks [17, 50, 76]. This implies that any choice options that are not on the first page might as well not exist. For example, our study reveals that roughly 60% of consent interfaces do not have a reject option on the initial screen, and multiple user studies have clearly demonstrated that this significantly inflates consent rates and increases unwanted processing of people's personal data. Nouwens et al. [76] found that removing the reject button from the first page increased acceptance rate by 22 percentage points (from 55% to 77%), Bielova et al. [11] found it increased acceptance by 13 points (from 83% to 96%), Habib et al. [40] by 30 points (from ~60% to 90%), and Jha et al. [50] by 19 points (from 79% to ~98%). While they all report different effect sizes, they consistently demonstrate that removing the reject option from the first page substantially increases consent.

5.2.3 Design of user options. In addition to requiring more clicks, another way in which interfaces are designed that makes options more or less prominent is through their visual design, such as contrast, colour, or clickability. Our study shows that, on average, accept options are designed to be 1.5 times more prominent than reject options and 3 times more prominent than settings options. Results from user studies strongly suggest this will nudge people to allow more data processing than if options were equally as prominent. The most impactful is when one option is designed as a button and the other as a link in the text: Bouma-Sims et al. [17] find participants are roughly six times more likely to edit their settings if this option is presented as a button rather than a link, and Berens et al. [9] find that participants are between five and twelve times more likely to reject consent if it is a button. There is conflicting evidence whether making the background colour of one button more prominent nudges people compared to two buttons with the same background: Utz et al. [99] showed that highlighting the accept button increased consent on mobile devices (and non-response on desktop), Bielova et al. [11] found no effect of highlighting the accept button but instead found a significant increase in rejections when the reject button was more prominent, while Berens et al. [9] found no effect either way. The choice of colour might also matter: Bielova et al. [11] showed that using red-orange-green to signal semantic meaning (where green equals reject) made participants 2.3 times more likely to reject consent (using these specific "traffic light" colours has been deemed non-compliant by the Danish authority [22]). When combined, these unequal designs might also exacerbate each other: Bauer et al. [8] find a 17 percentage point difference in acceptance rate when comparing a completely equal design to a design where accept is a green button and reject is a link in the text.

5.2.4 Labels of user options. The text labels on the choice options is another design element that seems to affect users' consent behaviour. Our study shows that 65% of reject options use clearly descriptive labels such as "reject", "decline", or "disagree", while

27% instead label the option as accepting some "necessary", "essential", or "mandatory" cookies. Perhaps counter-intuitively, Berens et al. [9] found participants were less likely to use clearly labelled options (e.g., "reject" or "no additional cookies"), while ambiguous labels like "only necessary cookies" increased rejection rates, possibly due to fears of losing access or functionality if they chose to reject cookies. This fear-driven behaviour aligns with Ma and Birrell [68], who showed that labels explicitly stating how a choice would "degrade your experience" reduced rejection rates more than "deny cookies." Conversely, labels highlighting the negative consequences for the participant's privacy were able to nudge users toward privacy-preserving decisions [11, 68]. For instance, Bielova et al. [11] found that labels like "accept being tracked" or "continue without being tracked" increased rejection rates by as much as 30 points. Ambiguous language appears less impactful for accept options; Habib et al. [40] found no difference in consent rates between the labels "Okay" (which we found on 5% of accept options) and "Allow all cookies" (found on 65%).

5.2.5 Presence of granular choices. The presence of granular options on the initial screen of the interface, such as the purposes for which data is collected, has multiple positive effects on user behaviour and experience. However, our results show that such options are actually quite rare and only present on 16% of interfaces. Having granular options is associated with greater user engagement in decision-making [40] and lower consent rates [40, 76]. Paradoxically, these effects exist even though very few participants actually interact with the options (merely 1.3% [76], 2.7% [40], and ~3% [16]). Importantly, these positive effects are negated if options are pre-selected by default, which our study shows is the case in 17% of interfaces. Controlled experiments show that preselected purposes or vendors dramatically increase consent rates, from less than 0.1% to 10% on desktops [40], and from less than 0.1% to around 30% on mobile devices [99]. The biasing effect of such default states, in interfaces and more broadly, is well documented [3, 52, 63, 96].

5.2.6 Affective experience. In general, what user studies indicate is that consent interfaces are experienced as disempowering and do not help people control their personal data in line with their preferences. For example, Habib et al. [40] report that less than half of participants (45%) who participated in their experiment felt the answer they gave was actually their ideal answer, Nouwens et al. [76] reported that 63% were not satisfied with their answer, Bielova et al. [11] show how the level of participants' satisfaction decreased the more the interface nudged towards more data sharing, and Machuletz and Böhme [69] described that participants exposed to more deceptive interfaces had higher levels of regret. In line with these self-reported affective experiences, multiple studies demonstrate that when given the chance users overwhelmingly ignore consent interfaces altogether when they do not block too much of the screen [17, 40, 42, 61, 68, 76, 99] and that it is difficult to encourage intentional interactions [36, 86], likely because the repetitive nature of these interfaces has habituated users into simply repeating the same interaction pattern (referred to as "consent fatigue") [18], which early evidence suggests might already have developed after just two exposures to an interface [11].

Ultimately, the statistical results of this study combined with the empirical insights from user studies demonstrate that some of the most common design choices of consent interfaces on the European web are oriented towards maximising the consent rate of people using deceptive designs.

Further user studies on the effect of dominant designs are important, for example to compare how users from different countries experience them, or to go beyond individual features and instead study interfaces holistically (perhaps from specific CMPs). To establish what designs are most prevalent, quantitative overviews such as this study provide the necessary empirical grounding. However, building scrapers and detection algorithms requires a high level of technical expertise and resources. To address this barrier, we developed `consent-observatory.eu`, an online scraping service powered by our open source detection code. This platform allows users to provide a list of URLs and choose which elements they want to analyse, making the study of consent interfaces more accessible to a broader audience.

5.3 Untangling the influence of CMPs

The online tracking ecosystem is marked by a complex web of intermediaries between website owners who want to sell advertising space and advertisers who seek to promote products [100]. It includes tracking services, publishers, supply-side platforms, auction houses, data brokers, demand-side platforms, standard-setting bodies, and other ad-tech vendors. Consent interfaces, often provided by consent management platforms, are supposed to be the main gateway through which the collection and processing of all the (personal) data is controlled by the user and brought into compliance. Generally, CMPs can be divided into four types of organisations: 1) comprehensive CMPs that offer a variety of services (such as analytics and website scanning) across different devices and integrated with various platforms for a monthly subscription fee (e.g., Usercentrics, OneTrust); 2) plug-in CMPs with basic features that integrate with popular platforms such as WordPress (e.g. CookieYes, Complianz); 3) Integrated solutions developed by the platforms themselves (often eCommerce, e.g., Shopper, Shoptet), and; 4) open source CMPs that are basic scripts developed by entrepreneurial individuals (e.g., tarteaucitron, CookieConsent). Our analysis shows that all these types of CMPs are present in the top three across countries.

Because there are so many actors involved in collecting and processing the (personal) data for online tracking, it becomes difficult to understand who is actually in control and how liability is distributed. This has allowed many actors to plausibly dodge responsibility by arguing that, actually, someone else is in control. The Internet Advertising Bureau (IAB), for example, a standard-setting body that provides technical infrastructure and legal frameworks for (among others) CMPs, has long denied they are a controller. However, in European law, the concept of ‘joint controllership’ [70] captures situations where more than one actor contributes to determining the how and why of a data processing practice, and therefore shares responsibility for it in some configuration. Case law has shown courts take an expansive view on the concept of joint controllership: it also includes situations where a controller never has access to the data but has influence on what and how

other actors collect and process data downstream [79]. The CJEU recently clarified that IAB was indeed not just a mere bystander, but a joint-controller because of the influence it exerted through its development of the Transparency and Consent Framework (TCF), which establishes guidelines and technical standards for obtaining, recording, and managing consent, effectively shaping how personal data was processed across participating websites [80].

Similarly, CMPs have traditionally held they simply provide a technological service and the website owner is in full control of the configuration and thus “determines the means and purposes” of the data collection. Our results provide evidence that consent management platforms are in fact influential actors and have an impact on the compliance rate of consent interfaces. Firstly, our analysis shows that CMPs are central to the online tracking industry: at least 67% of all consent interfaces are provided by CMPs rather than built by website owners themselves. The proportion of CMPs is particularly high on the most popular websites where web browsing is most heavily concentrated, meaning they intermedicate a significant portion of all web traffic (the number one ranked website in a country typically represents 20% of all page loads [87]). Secondly, 37% of the CMP use is concentrated in the hands of just three organisations: Usercentrics, CookieYes and OneTrust (i.e., 25% of all consent interfaces, or 17% of all websites). This concentration is also present at a national scale, where in extreme cases three CMP intermediaries hold 64% of the market. Thirdly, there is a significant correlation between consent management platforms and compliance of the interface – more than guidance or fines – and specific CMPs have a sizeable positive or negative effect on compliance.

This evidence strengthens the case made by other studies that consent management platforms are not merely neutral facilitators. Toth et al. [98] show how CMPs often nudge their clients toward less compliant, data-maximizing configurations: the default designs when first configuring a CMP have no or less prominent reject buttons, they often only scan a website once a month for any new trackers for which consent is required, they make marketing claims about maximizing consent, and they provide A/B testing services to compare the consent rates of different interface designs. Santos et al. [89] provide a techno-legal analysis and discuss how CMPs act as controllers when they add additional processing activities to their tools (for example, when they add their own tracking pixels), when they automatically sort installed trackers into specific purpose categories, and when they automatically include pre-populated lists of third-party vendors in the interface. These dynamics raise important questions about the rule-taking nature of website owners, who may simply follow industry defaults rather than actively shaping their own compliance strategies, and the position of CMPs as joint-controllers rather than mere service providers.

Researchers and regulators must take an infrastructural perspective on the problem of online tracking. Going after a website might seem tempting, and can give a detailed understanding of what compliance looks like and what technologies are used, but such a whack-a-mole approach has limited transformative potential, and brings huge enforcement costs through investigation time and duplicated legal proceedings. Consent management platforms should be considered points of leverage, and viable targets for regulation in different ways. The exact legal classification and strategy may change depending on the features and integration level of the

CMP, as described at the start of this section. As ‘joint controllers’ co-deciding on data processing, CMPs can be targeted directly by regulators in the same jurisdiction. As data processors (entities that only do what they are told), they have fewer legal obligations, but must still inform controllers of potential illegal instructions, which could be creatively interpreted and used. Even as just openly published code (such as in free website templates), regulators could signal that they will use certain bad code as a flag for potential website or app investigation, disincentivising their use. This study helps all these aims by highlighting which CMPs take a central role in what jurisdiction, identifying significant leverage points for regulatory action. In particular, this is the case where there is either an internationally widespread CMP in a specific jurisdiction, or a highly prevalent national CMP.

5.4 Beyond better interfaces

More than two-thirds of European websites now have consent interfaces. A lot of effort has been spent, both by researchers and regulators, to try and improve consent interfaces by measuring their designs, demonstrating their impacts, evaluating their compliance, or proposing new and more empowering designs. Slowly, haltingly, over the course of 15 years, consent interface designs have evolved from purely informational notifications, to cookie walls without reject buttons, to banners with, and then without, pre-checked purposes [76], to pop-ups with boldly coloured accept buttons besides ambiguous reject buttons, to interfaces where, even when consent is rejected, the same processing continues under the basis of legitimate interest [62], and, most recently, the invention of consent-or-pay designs, where rejecting costs money [75].

While the focus has been on improving this most visible aspect of online tracking, studies show that data is already collected and shared before users interact with the interface [83, 88], that once given consent answers are sometimes ignored [16], and that attempts to revoke it later never propagate through the networks [101]. It begs the question whether any improvements to the interface ultimately result in improvements to people’s privacy and data protection, or whether this tug-of-war over the interface simply creates performative, surface-level consent theatre while the difficult to observe but structurally more consequential practices remain under-examined and unquestioned.

Caught up in the narrative that better interfaces are the answer, we risk losing sight of the fact that disempowerment is not a design flaw, but an inherent feature. The law does not require it—consent in EU law is a last-resort when no other legal basis can be established, not an important prerequisite. Because online tracking cannot be legalised in any other way in Europe, the industry response to a *de facto* legal prohibition has been to use design to stretch consent to and beyond its conceptual limits. The ineffectiveness of enforcement compounds the problem. Guidance and fines have so far failed to foster substantial compliance, and the persistent frustration erodes public trust in the regulation and regulators. A narrative has emerged in which the GDPR is blamed for both the rise of consent interfaces and the failure to eliminate them. The public frustration has fuelled political calls for stronger measures, including proposals from the EDPB [28] and members of the European Parliament [67] to ban behavioural advertising entirely.

What such efforts need are not better interfaces, but counter narratives and alternative visions. For example, recent work has evaluated the usability and proposed interfaces for browser-level consent interfaces and HTTP header signals [105, 106]. Future work could consider the performance and financial viability of contextual advertising (as demonstrated in at least the case of the Dutch public broadcaster [95]), or critically examine the actual effectiveness of online tracking based targeting and personalisation, for which little independent evidence exists. The goals of these studies should be to provide the necessary knowledge to immunise policy makers and citizens against unsubstantiated claims about the demise of free services, shift the window of discussion, and break out of the current myopic interpretation of what the Web can be.

6 Conclusion

Online tracking remains a controversial practice on the Web that, despite years of effort, legislators and regulators struggle to bring into legal compliance or moral alignment with their populations. Consent interfaces are the most visible component of this industry and, as such, have received the most attention from researchers, journalists, politicians, and regulators. Over the years, automated methods to study these interfaces have improved. Quantitative data on the prevalence of consent interfaces and whether they meet some metric of compliance have helped focus attention on specific designs and informed regulatory interventions.

In this paper we present robust methods to detect the presence, design, and suppliers of consent interfaces. We provide consent-observatory.eu: a web service that makes these methods accessible for a wider audience to further evaluate consent interfaces. Using these methods, we scraped the top 10,000 most popular websites for 31 countries across Europe where the ePrivacy Directive and General Data Protection Regulation are in effect. We detected the presence of consent interfaces, identified the use of consent management platforms (CMPs), and analysed the proportion and visual prominence of user options such as accept, reject, settings, save, and pay buttons and purpose-level controls such as checkboxes and their checked status.

We find that 67% all websites now have consent interfaces, and that two-thirds of those are provided by CMPs. In particular the most visited websites are likely to use CMPs, which means that the vast majority of web traffic flows through their products. There is significant concentration in the use of CMPs: only three organisations supply 37% of all CMPs used on the web. Compliance rates of these interfaces continue to lag behind, and there is little effect of guidance and fines on compliance. Only 15% of interfaces meet our very limited definition of compliance, which is as a banner where accepting is as easy as rejecting, there are granular consent options, and there are no pre-checked purposes. Most non-compliance stems from not having a reject option on the first layer, and most of the variance in compliance is explained by the use of particular CMPs.

We suggest that future studies on consent interfaces that might use consent-observatory.eu should be careful not to think of non-compliance and disempowerment as an unintentional design problem that better interfaces can resolve. Instead, studies should map the different actors in this space and their relative power, with an eye to provide insight into the leverage points for impactful action.

References

- [1] Advocate General Szupunar. 2019. Case C-673/17 *Planet49 GmbH v Bundesverband der Verbraucherzentralen und Verbraucherverbände – Verbraucherzentrale Bundesverband e.V.* ECLI:EU:C:2019:246, Opinion of the Advocate General.
- [2] Juna Alhumaidi Alharbi, Abdulmohsen Saud Albeshar, and Heider Ahmad Wahsheh. 2023. An Empirical Analysis of E-Governments' Cookie Interfaces in 50 Countries. *Sustainability* 15, 2 (Jan. 2023), 1231. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021231>
- [3] Reza Ghaiumy Anaraky, Bart P Knijnenburg, and Marten Risius. 2020. Exacerbating mindless compliance: The danger of justifications during privacy decision making in the context of Facebook applications. *AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction* 12, 2 (2020), 70–95.
- [4] Article 29 Working Party. 2018. *Guidelines on Consent under Regulation 2016/679 (WP259 rev.01)*. European Union.
- [5] Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens. [n. d.]. AP pakt misleidende cookiebanners aan. <https://autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl/actueel/ap-pakt-misleidende-cookiebanners-aan>
- [6] Nidhal Baccouri. [n. d.]. *RapidFuzz*. <https://pypi.org/project/deep-translator/>
- [7] Max Bachmann. [n. d.]. *RapidFuzz*. <https://pypi.org/project/rapidfuzz/>
- [8] Jan M. Bauer, Regitze Bergstrøm, and Rune Foss-Madsen. 2021. Are you sure, you want a cookie? – The effects of choice architecture on users' decisions about sharing private online data. *Computers in Human Behavior* 120 (July 2021), 106729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106729>
- [9] Benjamin Maximilian Berens, Heike Dietmann, Chiara Krisam, Oksana Kulyk, and Melanie Volkamer. 2022. Cookie disclaimers: Impact of design and users' attitude. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. 1–20.
- [10] Carlos Bermejo Fernandez, Dimitris Chatzopoulos, Dimitrios Papadopoulos, and Pan Hui. 2021. This website uses nudging: Mturk workers' behaviour on cookie consent notices. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 5, CSCW2 (2021), 1–22.
- [11] Nataliia Bielova, Laura Litvine, Anysia Nguyen, Mariam Chammat, Vincent Toubiana, and Estelle Hary. 2024. The Effect of Design Patterns on (Present and Future) Cookie Consent Decisions. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 2813–2830.
- [12] Nataliia Bielova, Cristiana Santos, and Colin M Gray. 2024. Two worlds apart! Closing the gap between regulating EU consent and user studies. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology* 37, 3 (2024).
- [13] Eleanor Birrell, Jay Rodolitz, Angel Ding, Jenna Lee, Emily McReynolds, Jevan Hutson, and Ada Lerner. 2024. SoK: Technical Implementation and Human Impact of Internet Privacy Regulations. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 673–696.
- [14] Dino Bollinger, Karel Kubicek, Carlos Cotrini, and David Basin. 2022. Automating Cookie Consent and GDPR Violation Detection. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. 2893–2910. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/bollinger>
- [15] Rico Bornschein, Lennard Schmidt, and Erik Maier. 2020. The Effect of Consumers' Perceived Power and Risk in Digital Information Privacy: The Example of Cookie Notices. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 39, 2 (April 2020), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743915620902143>
- [16] Ahmed Bouhoula, Karel Kubicek, Amit Zac, Carlos Cotrini, and David Basin. 2024. Automated Large-Scale Analysis of Cookie Notice Compliance. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 1723–1739. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity24/presentation/bouhoula?utm_source=LawyerExMachina&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=post-eclipse
- [17] Elijah Robert Bouma-Sims, Megan Li, Yanzi Lin, Adia Sakura-Lemessy, Alexandra Nisenoff, Ellie Young, Eleanor Birrell, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Hana Habib. 2023. A US-UK Usability Evaluation of Consent Management Platform Cookie Consent Interface Design on Desktop and Mobile. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Hamburg Germany, 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580725>
- [18] Cristian Bravo-Lillo, Lorrie Cranor, Saranga Komanduri, Stuart Schechter, and Manya Sleeper. 2014. Harder to ignore? revisiting {Pop-Up} fatigue and approaches to prevent it. In *10th Symposium On Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2014)*. 105–111.
- [19] Patrick Breyer. [n. d.]. Political advertising: EU fights cookie banners, but not voter manipulation and microtargeting. <https://www.patrick-breyer.de/en/political-advertising-eu-fights-cookie-banners-but-not-voter-manipulation-and-microtargeting/>
- [20] Lynne M Coventry, Debora Jeske, John M Blythe, James Turland, and Pam Briggs. 2016. Personality and social framing in privacy decision-making: A study on cookie acceptance. *Frontiers in psychology* 7 (2016), 1341.
- [21] Datatilsynet. 2022. Alvorlig kritik af JP/Politikens samtykkelse på [www.eb.dk](https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/okt/alvorlig-kritik-af-jppolitikens-samtykkelse-paa-wwwwebdk). <https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/okt/alvorlig-kritik-af-jppolitikens-samtykkelse-paa-wwwwebdk>
- [22] Datatilsynet. 2022. Alvorlig kritik af JP/Politikens samtykkelse på [www.eb.dk](https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/okt/alvorlig-kritik-af-jppolitikens-samtykkelse-paa-wwwwebdk). <https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/okt/alvorlig-kritik-af-jppolitikens-samtykkelse-paa-wwwwebdk>
- [23] Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés. [n. d.]. Deliberation of the restricted committee No. SAN-2021-024 of 31 December 2021 concerning FACEBOOK IRELAND LIMITED. https://www.cnil.fr/sites/cnil/files/atoms/files/deliberation_of_the_restricted_committee_no_san-2021-024_of_31_december_2021_concerning_facebook_ireland_limited.pdf
- [24] Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés. 2020. Recommendation "Cookies et autres Traceurs". <https://www.cnil.fr/sites/cnil/files/atoms/files/recommandation-cookies-et-autrestraceurs.pdf>
- [25] Martin Degeling, Christine Utz, Christopher Lentzsch, Henry Hosseini, Florian Schaub, and Thorsten Holz. 2019. We Value Your Privacy ... Now Take Some Cookies: Measuring the GDPR's Impact on Web Privacy. In *Proceedings 2019 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, San Diego, CA. <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2019.23378>
- [26] Nurullah Demir, Tobias Urban, Norbert Pohlmann, and Christian Wressnegger. 2024. A Large-Scale Study of Cookie Banner Interaction Tools and their Impact on Users' Privacy. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2024, 1 (Jan. 2024), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.56553/popets-2024-0002>
- [27] Rob van Eijk, Hadi Asghari, Philipp Winter, and Arvind Narayanan. 2019. The Impact of User Location on Cookie Notices (Inside and Outside of the European Union). In *Workshop on Technology and Consumer Protection (ConPro '19)*. Rochester, NY. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3361360>
- [28] European Data Protection Board. 2021. Statement on the Digital Services Package and Data Strategy. https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2021-11/edpb_statement_on_the_digital_services_package_and_data_strategy_en.pdf
- [29] European Data Protection Board. 2023. Guidelines 2/2023 on Technical Scope of Art. 5(3) of ePrivacy Directive. https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2023-11/edpb_guidelines_202302_technical_scope_art_53_eprivacydirective_en.pdf
- [30] European Data Protection Board. 2024. Opinion 08/2024 on Valid Consent in the Context of Consent or Pay Models Implemented by Large Online Platforms. https://www.edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2024-04/edpb_opinion_202408_consentorpay_en.pdf
- [31] European Union. 2002. Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) OJ L 201.
- [32] European Union. 2009. Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) OJ L 337.
- [33] European Union. 2016. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), OJ 2016 L 119/1.
- [34] Imane Fouad, Cristiana Santos, Feras Al Kassar, Nataliia Bielova, and Stefano Calzavara. 2020. On Compliance of Cookie Purposes with the Purpose Specification Principle. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*. IEEE, Genoa, Italy, 326–333. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW51379.2020.00051>
- [35] Gen Digital Inc. [n. d.]. *I don't care about cookies*. <https://www.i-dont-care-about-cookies.eu/>
- [36] Nina Gerber, Alina Stöver, Justin Peschke, and Verena Zimmermann. 2024. Don't Accept All and Continue: Exploring Nudges for More Deliberate Interaction with Tracking Consent Notices. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 31, 1 (Feb. 2024), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3617363>
- [37] Graham Greenleaf. 2023. Global Data Privacy Laws 2023: International Standards Stall, but UK Disrupts. *Privacy Laws & Business International Report* 183 (2023), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4530145>
- [38] Graham Greenleaf. 2023. Global Tables of Data Privacy Laws and Bills (8th Ed.) 2023.
- [39] Ralf Gundelach and Dominik Herrmann. 2023. Cookiescanner: An Automated Tool for Detecting and Evaluating GDPR Consent Notices on Websites. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. ACM, Benevento Italy, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3600160.3605000>
- [40] Hana Habib, Megan Li, Ellie Young, and Lorrie Cranor. 2022. "Okay, whatever": An Evaluation of Cookie Consent Interfaces. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501985>
- [41] Maximilian Hills, Daniel W. Woods, and Rainer Böhme. 2020. Measuring the Emergence of Consent Management on the Web. In *Proceedings of the ACM*

- Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419394.3423647>
- [42] Yavuz Inal, Frode S. Volden, Camilla Carlsen, and Sarah Hjelmtveit. 2024. My Eyes Don't Consent! Exploring Visual Attention in Cookie Consent Interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (ETRA '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3649902.3653352>
- [43] Integritetsskyddsmyndigheten. 2022. Information om Kakor. <https://pts.se/sv/bransch/internet/integritet/information-om-kakor/#omkakor>
- [44] Interactive Advertising Bureau Europe. [n. d.]. Appendix A: Definitions Of Purposes, Features And Categories Of Data. <https://iabeurope.eu/iab-europe-transparency-consent-framework-policies/>
- [45] Interactive Advertising Bureau Europe. 2024. *Transparency & Consent Framework*. <https://iabeurope.eu/transparency-consent-framework/>
- [46] Interactive Advertising Bureau Europe. n.d. CMP List. <https://iabeurope.eu/cmp-list/>
- [47] Irish Council of Civil Liberties. [n. d.]. Europe's hidden security crisis. <https://www.iccl.ie/digital-data/europes-hidden-security-crisis/>
- [48] F. J. Zuiderveen Borgesius, S. Kruikemeier, S. C. Boerman, and N. Helberger. 2017. Tracking Walls, Take-It-Or-Leave-It Choices, the GDPR, and the ePrivacy Regulation. *European Data Protection Law Review* 3, 3 (2017), 353–368. <https://doi.org/10.21552/edpl/2017/3/9>
- [49] Lakshmi Narayanan Jayakumar. 2021. Cookies 'n' Consent: An empirical study on the factors influencing of website users' attitude towards cookie consent in the EU. *DBS Business Review* 4 (Dec. 2021). <https://doi.org/10.22375/dbr.v4i0.72>
- [50] Nikhil Jha, Martino Trevisan, Marco Mellia, Rodrigo Irazrazaval, and Daniel Fernandez. 2023. I Refuse if You Let Me: Studying User Behavior with Privacy Banners at Scale. In *2023 7th Network Traffic Measurement and Analysis Conference (TMA)*. IEEE, Naples, Italy, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.23919/TMA54822.2023.10198936>
- [51] Nikhil Jha, Martino Trevisan, Luca Vassio, and Marco Mellia. 2022. The Internet with Privacy Policies: Measuring The Web Upon Consent. *ACM Transactions on the Web* 16, 3 (Aug. 2022), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555352>
- [52] Eric J Johnson, Steven Bellman, and Gerald L Lohse. 2002. Defaults, framing and privacy: Why opting in-opting out. *Marketing letters* 13 (2002), 5–15.
- [53] Meg Leta Jones. 2024. *The Character of Consent: The History of Cookies and the Future of Technology Policy*. MIT Press.
- [54] Georgios Kampanos and Siamak F. Shahandashiti. 2021. *Accept All: The Landscape of Cookie Banners in Greece and the UK*. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, Vol. 625. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 213–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78120-0_14
- [55] Rishabh Khandelwal, Asmit Nayak, Hamza Harkous, and Kassem Fawaz. 2023. Automated cookie notice analysis and enforcement. In *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Conference on Security Symposium (SEC '23)*. USENIX Association, USA, 1109–1126.
- [56] Daniel Kirkman, Kami Vaniea, and Daniel W. Woods. 2023. DarkDialogs: Automated detection of 10 dark patterns on cookie dialogs. In *2023 IEEE 8th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, Delft, Netherlands, 847–867. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP57164.2023.00055>
- [57] David Klein, Marius Musch, Thomas Barber, Moritz Kopmann, and Martin Johns. 2022. Accept All Exploits: Exploring the Security Impact of Cookie Banners. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. ACM, Austin TX USA, 911–922. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3564625.3564647>
- [58] E. Kosta. 2013. Peeking into the cookie jar: the European approach towards the regulation of cookies. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 21, 4 (Dec. 2013), 380–406. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eat011>
- [59] Michal Krassowski. 2020. ComplexUpset. <https://github.com/krassowski/complex-upset>
- [60] Chiara Krisam, Heike Dietmann, Melanie Volkamer, and Oksana Kulyk. 2021. Dark Patterns in the Wild: Review of Cookie Disclaimer Designs on Top 500 German Websites. In *Proceedings of the 2021 European Symposium on Usable Security*. ACM, Karlsruhe Germany, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3481357.3481516>
- [61] Oksana Kulyk, Annika Hilt, Nina Gerber, and Melanie Volkamer. 2018. “This Website Uses Cookies”: Users' Perceptions and Reactions to the Cookie Disclaimer. In *Proceedings 3rd European Workshop on Usable Security*. Internet Society, London, England. <https://doi.org/10.14722/eurosec.2018.23012>
- [62] Lin Kyi, Sushil Ammanaghatta Shivakumar, Cristiana Teixeira Santos, Franziska Roesner, Frederike Zufall, and Asia J. Biega. 2023. Investigating Deceptive Design in GDPR's Legitimate Interest. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Hamburg Germany, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580637>
- [63] Yee-Lin Lai and Kai-Lung Hui. 2006. Internet opt-in and opt-out: investigating the roles of frames, defaults and privacy concerns. In *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM SIGMIS CPR conference on computer personnel research: Forty years of computer personnel research: achievements, challenges & the future*. 253–263.
- [64] Victor Le Pochat, Tom Van Goethem, Samaneh Tajalizadehkhoo, Maciej Korczyński, and Wouter Joosen. 2019. Tranco: A Research-Oriented Top Sites Ranking Hardened Against Manipulation. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2019.23386>
- [65] Ronald Leenes and Eleni Kosta. 2015. Taming the cookie monster with Dutch law – A tale of regulatory failure. *Computer Law & Security Review* 31, 3 (June 2015), 317–335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2015.01.004>
- [66] Alexander Lex, Nils Gehlenborg, Hendrik Strobelt, Romain Vuillemot, and Hanspeter Pfister. 2014. UpSet: visualization of intersecting sets. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 20, 12 (2014), 1983–1992.
- [67] Natash Lomas. 2021. Inside a European push to outlaw creepy ads. <https://techcrunch.com/2021/10/21/inside-a-european-push-to-outlaw-creepy-ads/>
- [68] Eryn Ma and Eleanor Birrell. 2022. Prospective Consent: The Effect of Framing on Cookie Consent Decisions. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519687>
- [69] Dominique Machuletz and Rainer Böhme. 2020. Multiple Purposes, Multiple Problems: A User Study of Consent Dialogs after GDPR. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2020, 2 (April 2020), 481–498. <https://doi.org/10.2478/popets-2020-0037>
- [70] Rene Mahieu, Joris van Hoboken, and Hadi Asghari. 2019. Responsibility for Data Protection in a Networked World: On the Question of the Controller, Effective and Complete Protection and Its Application to Data Access Rights in Europe. *Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology and Electronic Commerce Law* 10, 1 (2019), 84–104.
- [71] Célestine Matte, Natalia Bielova, and Cristiana Santos. 2020. Do Cookie Banners Respect my Choice?: Measuring Legal Compliance of Banners from IAB Europe's Transparency and Consent Framework. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 791–809. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00076>
- [72] Torsha Mazumdar, Daniel Timko, and Muhammad Lutfur Rahman. 2023. Are Current CCPA Compliant Banners Conveying User's Desired Opt-Out Decisions? An Empirical Study of Cookie Consent Banners. In *Cryptology and Network Security*, Jing Deng, Vladimir Kolesnikov, and Alexander A. Schwarzmann (Eds.). Springer Nature, Singapore, 186–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-7563-1_9
- [73] Maryam Mehrnezhad. 2020. A Cross-Platform Evaluation of Privacy Notices and Tracking Practices. In *2020 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*. IEEE, Genoa, Italy, 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW51379.2020.00023>
- [74] Victor Morel, Cristiana Santos, Viktor Fredholm, and Adam Thunberg. 2023. Legitimate Interest is the New Consent - Large-Scale Measurement and Legal Compliance of IAB Europe TCF Paywalls. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. ACM, Copenhagen Denmark, 153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3603216.3624966>
- [75] Victor Morel, Cristiana Santos, Yvonne Lintao, and Soheil Human. 2022. Your Consent Is Worth 75 Euros A Year - Measurement and Lawfulness of Cookie Paywalls. In *Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. ACM, Los Angeles CA USA, 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3559613.3563205>
- [76] Midas Nouwens, Ilaria Liccardi, Michael Veale, David Karger, and Lalana Kagal. 2020. 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*. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376321>
- [77] noyb – European Center for Digital Rights. [n. d.]. *GDPRhub*. <https://gdprhub.eu/>
- [78] noyb – European Center for Digital Rights. 2024. *Consent Banner Report: Overview of EU and national guidelines on dark patterns*. https://noyb.eu/sites/default/files/2024-07/noyb_Cookie_Report_2024.pdf
- [79] Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). 2018. Jehovah's Witnesses. Judgment of 10 July 2018.
- [80] Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). 2024. IAB Europe v Gegevensbeschermingsautoriteit. Judgment of 7 March 2024.
- [81] Kieron O'hara and Wendy Hall. 2018. Four internets: The geopolitics of digital governance. *The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)/Chatham House* (2018).
- [82] Sean O'Connor, Ryan Nurwono, Aden Siebel, and Eleanor Birrell. 2021. (Un)clear and (In)conspicuous: The Right to Opt-out of Sale under CCPA. In *Proceedings of the 20th Workshop on Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. ACM, Virtual Event Republic of Korea, 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3463676.3485598>
- [83] Emmanouil Papadogiannakis, Panagiotis Papadopoulos, Nicolas Kourtellis, and Evangelos P Markatos. 2021. User tracking in the post-cookie era: How websites bypass gdpr consent to track users. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2021*. 2130–2141.
- [84] Ali Rasaii, Devashish Gosain, and Oliver Gasser. 2023. Thou Shalt Not Reject: Analyzing Accept-Or-Pay Cookie Banners on the Web. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Montreal QC Canada, 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3618257.3624846>
- [85] Ali Rasaii, Shivani Singh, Devashish Gosain, and Oliver Gasser. 2023. Exploring the Cookieverse: A Multi-Perspective Analysis of Web Cookies. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Passive and Active Measurement Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978->

- 3-031-28486-1_26
- [86] René van Bavel and Nuria Rodríguez Priego. [n. d.]. Testing the Effect of the Cookie Banners on Behaviour. <https://doi.org/10.2791/22197>
 - [87] Kimberly Ruth, Aurore Fass, Jonathan Azose, Mark Pearson, Emma Thomas, Caitlin Sadowski, and Zakir Durumeric. 2022. A world wide view of browsing the world wide web. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Nice France, 317–336. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517745.3561418>
 - [88] Iskander Sanchez-Rola, Matteo Dell'Amico, Platon Kotzias, Davide Balzarotti, Leyla Bilge, Pierre-Antoine Vervier, and Igor Santos. 2019. Can I Opt Out Yet?: GDPR and the Global Illusion of Cookie Control. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, Auckland New Zealand, 340–351. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3321705.3329806>
 - [89] Cristiana Santos, Midas Nouwens, Michael Toth, Natalia Bielova, and Vincent Roca. 2021. Consent Management Platforms under the GDPR: processors and/or controllers?. In *Annual Privacy Forum*. Springer, 47–69.
 - [90] Cristiana Santos, Arianna Rossi, Lorena Sanchez Chamorro, Kerstin Bongard-Blanchy, and Ruba Abu-Salma. 2021. Cookie Banners, What's the Purpose?: Analyzing Cookie Banner Text Through a Legal Lens. In *Proceedings of the 20th Workshop on Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. ACM, Virtual Event Republic of Korea, 187–194. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3463676.3485611>
 - [91] Ashley Sheil and David Malone. 2022. Fianán, Cuacha: Irish Cookie Banners. In *2022 33rd Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC)*. IEEE, Cork, Ireland, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSC55427.2022.9826167>
 - [92] Ashutosh Kumar Singh, Nisarg Upadhyaya, Arka Seth, Xuehui Hu, Nishanth Sastry, and Mainack Mondal. 2022. What Cookie Consent Notices Do Users Prefer: A Study In The Wild. In *Proceedings of the 2022 European Symposium on Usable Security*. ACM, Karlsruhe Germany, 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3549015.3555675>
 - [93] Than Htut Soe, Oda Elise Nordberg, Frode Guriby, and Marija Slavkovic. 2020. Circumvention by design - dark patterns in cookie consent for online news outlets. In *Proceedings of the 11th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Shaping Experiences, Shaping Society*. ACM, Tallinn Estonia, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419249.3420132>
 - [94] Daniel J Solove. 2024. Murky consent: an approach to the fictions of consent in privacy law. *BUL Rev.* 104 (2024), 593.
 - [95] STER (Foundation for Ether Advertisement). [n. d.]. A future without advertising cookies? https://www.ster.nl/media/h5ehvtx3/ster_a-future-without-advertising-cookies.pdf
 - [96] Richard H Thaler and Shlomo Benartzi. 2004. Save more tomorrow™: Using behavioral economics to increase employee saving. *Journal of political Economy* 112, S1 (2004), S164–S187.
 - [97] The EasyList authors. [n. d.]. *EasyList Cookie List*. <https://easylist.to/>
 - [98] Michael Toth, Natalia Bielova, and Vincent Roca. 2022. On dark patterns and manipulation of website publishers by CMPs. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2022, 3 (July 2022), 478–497. <https://doi.org/10.56553/popets-2022-0082>
 - [99] Christine Utz, Martin Degeling, Sascha Fahl, Florian Schaub, and Thorsten Holz. 2019. (Un)informed Consent: Studying GDPR Consent Notices in the Field. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, London United Kingdom, 973–990. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3354212>
 - [100] Michael Veale and Frederik Zuiderveen Borgesius. 2022. Adtech and Real-Time Bidding under European Data Protection Law. *German Law Journal* 23, 2 (2022), 226–256. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2022.18>
 - [101] Michael Veale, Midas Nouwens, and Cristiana Santos. 2022. Impossible Asks: Can the Transparency and Consent Framework Ever Authorise Real-Time Bidding After the Belgian DPA Decision? *Technology and Regulation* 2022 (2022), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.26116/techreg.2022.002>
 - [102] Vera Wesselkamp, Imane Fouad, Cristiana Santos, Yanis Boussad, Natalia Bielova, and Arnaud Legout. 2021. In-Depth Technical and Legal Analysis of Tracking on Health Related Websites with ERNIE Extension. In *WPES 2021 - 20th Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*. Seoul, South Korea. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3463676.3485603>
 - [103] Dong Zhang, Sophie C Boerman, Hanneke Hendriks, Margot J van der Goot, Theo Araujo, and Hilde Voorveld. 2024. “They Know Everything”: Folk Theories, Thoughts, and Feelings About Dataveillance in Media Technologies. *International Journal of Communication* 18 (2024), 21.
 - [104] Mingxue Zhang, Wei Meng, You Zhou, and Kui Ren. 2024. CSChecker: Revisiting GDPR and CCPA Compliance of Cookie Banners on the Web. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, Lisbon Portugal, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597503.3639159>
 - [105] Sebastian Zimmeck, Eliza Kuller, Chunyue Ma, Bella Tassone, and Joe Champeau. 2024. Generalizable Active Privacy Choice: Designing a Graphical User Interface for Global Privacy Control. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2024).
 - [106] Sebastian Zimmeck, Oliver Wang, Kuba Alicki, Jocelyn Wang, and Sophie Eng. 2023. Usability and enforceability of global privacy control. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2023, 2 (2023).

Appendices

A Top lists

The list of top 10,000 domains scraped for each country can be found at the following permanent links:

	Permalink to domain list
Austria	https://tranco-list.eu/list/N3YKW/10000
Belgium	https://tranco-list.eu/list/7X7VX/10000
Bulgaria	https://tranco-list.eu/list/LJ8Q4/10000
Croatia	https://tranco-list.eu/list/KJ3QW/10000
Cyprus	https://tranco-list.eu/list/83K4V/10000
Czech Republic	https://tranco-list.eu/list/G6KJK/10000
Denmark	https://tranco-list.eu/list/XJL6N/10000
Estonia	https://tranco-list.eu/list/24PZ9/10000
Finland	https://tranco-list.eu/list/4QPWX/10000
France	https://tranco-list.eu/list/58L7N/10000
Greece	https://tranco-list.eu/list/3N5LL/10000
Germany	https://tranco-list.eu/list/PNX9J/10000
Hungary	https://tranco-list.eu/list/66WKX/10000
Iceland	https://tranco-list.eu/list/83KGV/10000
Ireland	https://tranco-list.eu/list/PNXQJ/10000
Italy	https://tranco-list.eu/list/YXWNG/10000
Latvia	https://tranco-list.eu/list/93VX2/10000
Liechtenstein	https://tranco-list.eu/list/N3YQW/10000
Lithuania	https://tranco-list.eu/list/QGJQ4/10000
Luxembourg	https://tranco-list.eu/list/J93QY/10000
Malta	https://tranco-list.eu/list/LJ8P4/10000
Netherlands	https://tranco-list.eu/list/4QPJX/10000
Norway	https://tranco-list.eu/list/W8VY9/10000
Poland	https://tranco-list.eu/list/7X72X/10000
Portugal	https://tranco-list.eu/list/58LZN/10000
Romania	https://tranco-list.eu/list/KJ3PW/10000
Slovakia	https://tranco-list.eu/list/V9KYN/10000
Slovenia	https://tranco-list.eu/list/G6KNK/10000
Spain	https://tranco-list.eu/list/XJLQN/10000
Sweden	https://tranco-list.eu/list/Z378G/10000
United Kingdom	https://tranco-list.eu/list/3N54L/10000

B Consent Interface Detection Corpus

The words used to check potential consent interfaces (based on heuristics) and determine whether it is indeed a consent interface.

	Trigger words
International	cookie, cookies, gdpr
Austria	alle akzeptieren, einstellungen verwalten, zwecke anzeigen, ablehnen, datenschutzerklärung
Belgium	accepter, en savoir plus, akkoord, meer informatie, alle cookies aanvaarden, paramètres, accepteren, d'accord
Bulgaria	политика за поверителност, приемане, затваряне, настройки, отхвърли всички, приеми всички, научете повече, приемане и затваряне, приемам, към сайта, опции за управление, подробни настройки, продължи, бисквитки, бисквитките, приемоте, политика за защита на личните данни, политика за бисквитките, съгласие, научете повече, политика за използване на бисквитки, други възможности, приемоте, декларацията за поверителност, съгласявате, персонализираме съдържанието
Croatia	prihvati i zatvori, prihvaćam, saznaj više, saznajte više, prihvati sve kolačiće, prihvaćam sve, postavke, postavke kolačića, slažem se, pogledajte naše partnere, upravljanje opcijama, ne prihvaćam, više informacija, politika privatnosti, pravila privatnosti, odbaci sve, prihvati i zatvori, prihvati, na stranicu, opcije za upravljanje, detaljne postavke, nastavi, kolačići, kolačići, prihvati, pravila o kolačićima, pristanak, pravila o kolačićima, druge opcije, prihvaćam, izjava o privatnosti, slažem se, prilagodite sadržaj
Cyprus	αποδοχή όλων, διαδοχή όλων, απορριψη όλων, συμφωνω, ρυθμίσεις σοοικεις, αποδοχή όλων, διαφωνω, προτιμησεις, πολιτική απορρήτου
Czech Republic	podrobné nastavení, povolit vše, souhlasím, odmítnout, rozumím, povolit nezbytné, další volby, přijmout vše, upravit mé předvolby, nastavení, zásady ochrany osobních údajů
Germany	datenschutz, akzeptieren, stimme zu, zustimmen, berechtigtes interesse, privatsphäre
Denmark	privatliv, samtykke, acceptér, tillad, legitim interesse
Estonia	nõustun, keeldu, luba kõik, kohanda, küpsiste seaded, küpsiste sätted, küpsised, nõustu, halda, privaatsus, küpsiseid, küpsistega, küpsistest, privaatsuspoliitika, sulge, seaded, rohkem teavet, keeldun, kuva eesmärgid, muudan küpsiste seadistusi, küpsiste seadetege, sain aru, loen veel, privaatsuspõhimõtete, nõustun kõigi küpsistega, selge, lisainfo, isikupäramiseks, isikupärastatud, isikupärasem, seaded, tingimused, tingimustega, seadistusi
England	privacy, consent, accept, agree, legitimate interest
Spain	privacidad, acept, aceptar, acordar, interés legítimo
Finland	evästeitä, evästeiden, tietosuoja, hyväksy, hylkää, asetukset, suostumustasi, suostumuksesi
France	confidentialité, accepter, accord, intérêt légitime
Greece	περισσότερες επιλογες, συμφωνω, διαφωνω, αποδοχη, απορριψη, περισσότερα, απορρητην, πολιτική απορρήτου
Hungary	cookie-kat, elfogadom, további opciók, nem elfogadom, további információ, elfogadás és bezárás, beállítások, beállítások kezelése, hozzájárulás, összes engedélyezése, mindent elfogadok, adatvédelmi szabályzat, elfogadás, adatvédelmi szabályzat, sütik, az ön adatainak védelme fontos számunkra, tartalom testreszabása, lehetőségek, további lehetőségek, részletek, cookie-k, információ, cookie-szabályzat, kapcsolódó sütikkel kapcsolatos információk
Iceland	vefkökur, kökur, vafrakökur, samþykkingja, hafna, vefköku stillingar, leyfa, vista val, fótspor
Ireland	fianáin, cuacha, lean ar aghaidh, cosanta sonraí, socruithe fianán, glac le gach fianán, diúltú neamhriachtanach, bainistigh fianáin
Italy	politica, consenso, accetta, concordare, interesse legittimo

	Trigger words
Latvia	piekrītu, pielāgot, papildu opcijas, uzzināt vairāk, atļaut visas sīkdatnes, apstiprināt, pārvaldības iespējas, apstiprināt, pārvaldības iespējas, согласен, nepiekrītu, дополнительные параметры, privātuma politika, piekrist, aizvērt, iestatījumi, noraidīt visu, pieņemt visu, uzzināt vairāk, pieņemt un aizvērt, piekrist, opcijas pārvaldība, detalizēti iestatījumi, turpināt, sīkfaili, pieņemt, piekrišana, uzzināt vairāk, sīkfailu politika, cits opcijas, es piekrītu, paziņojums par konfidencialitāti, es piekrītu, pielāgot saturu
Lithuania	sutinku, tvarkyti parinktis, leisti visus slapukus, daugiau pasirinkimų, atsisakyti visų, supratau, slapukų nustatymai, sutikimas, rodyti informaciją, patvirtinti, privatumo politika, rinktis, slapuku politikoje, nesutinku, tinkinti, priimti, slapukai, slapukų politika, privatumo pareiškimas, nustatymai, rodyti paskirtis, privatumas, slapukuose, tvarkyti parinktis, slapuku politikoje, nuostatos, rinkodara, slapukus
Luxembourg	j'accepte, je refuse, gérer les cookies, paramètres des cookies, accepter tout, afficher toutes les finalités, privatsphär
Malta	il-privatezza, il-cookies, tal-cookies, naqbel, naċċetta, aktar dwar il cookies, aċċetta, irrifjuta
Netherlands	accepteren, afwijzen, akkoord, instellen, toestemming, privacy-instellingen, instellingen, cookiebeleid, privacyverklaring
Norway	informasjonskapsler, personvern, godta, avvis
Poland	plików, plikach, akceptuję, odrzucenie wszystkich, zaakceptuj, orzduć, prywatność
Portugal	privacidade, consentimento, aceitar, concordo, interesse legítimo
Romania	cookie-uri, accept toate, vreau sa modific setarile individual, modific setările, mai multe opțiuni, respinge toate, gestionajți opțiunile, consimțământ, setari cookie-uri, setări cookies, politica de confidențialitate
Slovakia	pokračovať s nevyhnutnými cookies, nastavenia, súhlasím, prijať všetko, akceptovať, zamietnuť, nastavenie cookies, nastavenia cookies, ďalšie informácie, bližšie informácie, zásady ochrany osobných údajov
Slovenia	strinjam se, več možnosti, nastavitve, sprejmi, sprejmem, ne strinjam se, nastavitve piškotkov, sprejmem vse, dovoli vse in zapri, prilagodi, politika zasebnosti, zavrni vse, namesti vse, po meri, vi redu, razumem, piškotkov, piškotke, piškotki, piškotkih
Sweden	acceptera, godkänn, kakor

C CMP CSS selectors

Regex pattern	CMP provider
eightworks-cookie-consent	8works
acris-cookie-settings	Acris
amgdprcookie-button	Amasty (Magento plugin)
\^{}axeptio	Axeptio
\^{}borlabs	Borlabs
ccm-modal-inner	CCM19
ccc-overlay	CIVIC
cmplz	Complianz
cs-privacy-content-text	Consent Magic
cb-enable	Cookie Bar (generic script adapted by many)
cookieinfo-close	Cookie Info Script
\^{}coi	Cookie Information
cn-notice-text	Cookie Notice
\^{}cookiescript_	Cookie-Script
cm__desc	CookieConsent
cf3E9g	CookieFirst
cookiecontent	CookieHint
\^{}ch2-	CookieHub
-cli-	CookieYes
cookie-law-info-bar	CookieYes
cookie_action_close_header	CookieYes
\^{}cky	CookieYes
didomi	Didomi
\^{}CookieReports	Digital Control Room
cc-cookie-accept	Django Cookie Consent
eu-cookie-compliance-categories	Drupal
pea_cook_btn	FireCask (formerly Peadig)
__gomagCookiePolicy	Gomag
\^{}hs-en-cookie-	HubSpot
gdpr-cookie-accept	I Have Cookies by Ketan Mistry
iqitcookielaw	IQIT commerce
iai_cookie	IdoSell
qc-cmp2-ui	InMobi
cookie-settings-necessary	Jimdo
id-cookie-notice	Klaro
\^{}moove-gdpr	Moove
cookie-notification-text	Mozello CookieBar
ot-sdk-container	OneTrust
onetrust	OneTrust
optanon	OneTrust
cc-window	Osano
cc_container	Osano
cookieconsent:desc	Osano
osano	Osano
\^{}ppms_cm	Piwik
sf-cookie-settings	Serviceform
consents__advanced-buttons	Shoper
shopify-pc__banner	Shopify
nanobar-buttons	Shoprenter

Regex pattern	CMP provider
siteCookies	Shoptet
page-wrap-cookie-permission	Shopware
cookie-permission-container	Shopware
cookie-consent-header	Shopware
sp_message_container	Sourcepoint
sqs-cookie-banner-v2-cta	Squarespace
termly	Termly
cc_div	TermsFeed
cc-nb-text	TermsFeed
\^{}truste	TrustArc
ct-ultimate-gdpr-	Unidentified CMP (possibly createIT)
w-cookie-modal	Unidentified CMP 001
bemCookieOverlay	Unidentified CMP 002
consents__wrapper	Unidentified CMP 003
\^{}cookie-policy-overlay	Unidentified CMP 004
\^{}cookie-policy-details	Unidentified CMP 005
\^{}popup-text\\$	Unidentified CMP 006
lgcookieslaw	Unidentified CMP 007
module-notification-137	Unidentified CMP 008
cookieNoticeContent	Unidentified CMP 009
cNkVwm	Usercentrics
CybotCookiebot	Usercentrics
\^{}usercentrics	Usercentrics
\^{}uc-heading-title	Usercentrics
ccsu-banner-text-container	Wix
consent-banner-root-container	Wix
fusion-privacy-bar	WordPress Theme Avada
avia-cookie-	WordPress Theme Enfold
flatsome-cookies	WordPress Theme Flatsome
wd-cookies-inner	WordPress Theme WoodMart by xtemos
cmpwelcomebtnsave	consentmanager.net
cmpbox	consentmanager.net
\^{}cookiesplus	idnovate
iubenda	iubenda
eupopup-body	jQuery EU Cookie Law popup by wimagguc
tarteaucitron	tarteaucitron

D Detected consent management platforms

CMP	count	%	rank
Usercentrics	19549	17.26	1
CookieYes	14102	12.45	2
OneTrust	9101	8.03	3
Osano	8037	7.10	4
Complianz	6444	5.69	5
Cookie Notice	5090	4.49	6
TermsFeed	4164	3.68	7
Cookie Information	3556	3.14	8
Cookie-Script	3502	3.09	9
Moove	2990	2.64	10
InMobi	2678	2.36	11
Didomi	2208	1.95	12
iubenda	2143	1.89	13
Google	1992	1.76	14
consentmanager.net	1830	1.62	15
CookieConsent	1573	1.39	16
Shopify	1431	1.26	17
Shoptet	1372	1.21	18
CookieFirst	1192	1.05	19
tarteaucitron	1153	1.02	20
Sourcepoint	1146	1.01	21
Borlabs	1069	0.94	22
CookieHub	1068	0.94	23
TrustArc	589	0.52	24
Drupal	576	0.51	25
I Have Cookies by Ketan Mistry	576	0.51	26
Unidentified CMP 007	546	0.48	27
Amasty (Magento plugin)	534	0.47	28
Cookie Bar (generic script adapted by many)	501	0.44	29
Axeptio	499	0.44	30
CIVIC	499	0.44	31
Wix	498	0.44	32
Shoper	493	0.44	33
WordPress Theme WoodMart by xtemos	447	0.39	34
idnovate	442	0.39	35
Mozello CookieBar	389	0.34	36
Unidentified CMP 009	377	0.33	37
Django Cookie Consent	372	0.33	38
IdoSell	369	0.33	39
SIRDATA	355	0.31	40
Gomag	352	0.31	41
CCM19	326	0.29	42
Squarespace	324	0.29	43
WordPress Theme Avada	306	0.27	44
Objectis	301	0.27	45
WordPress Theme Flatsome	295	0.26	46
Clickio	294	0.26	47
Cookie Info Script	278	0.25	48

CMP	count	%	rank
Unidentified CMP 008	270	0.24	49
IQT commerce	257	0.23	50
Unidentified CMP 004	255	0.23	51
CookieHint	248	0.22	52
jQuery EU Cookie Law popup by wimagguc	246	0.22	53
WordPress Theme Enfold	242	0.21	54
Shopware	232	0.20	55
Piwik	227	0.20	56
Unidentified CMP 002	219	0.19	57
FireCask (formerly Peadig)	217	0.19	58
Consent Magic	216	0.19	59
Unidentified CMP 001	215	0.19	60
Termly	214	0.19	61
Unidentified CMP 005	210	0.19	62
Ezoic	176	0.16	63
HubSpot	166	0.15	64
Gravito	159	0.14	65
Traffactive	142	0.13	66
Mediavine Inc.	132	0.12	67
Jimdo	125	0.11	68
Seznam	103	0.09	69
AppConsent by SFBX	97	0.09	70
Serviceform	85	0.08	71
Klaro	71	0.06	72
Setupad	70	0.06	73
Transfon	68	0.06	74
Digital Control Room	60	0.05	75
DPG Media	56	0.05	76
Tri-table Sp. z o.o.	52	0.05	77
NextRoll	47	0.04	78
FastCMP	43	0.04	79
Pubtech	40	0.04	80
Wirtualna Polska Media S.A.	33	0.03	81
Snigel Web Services Limited	29	0.03	82
Gemius SA	25	0.02	83
Papoo Software & Media GmbH	25	0.02	84
devowl.io GmbH	24	0.02	85
Mozilor Limited	22	0.02	86
8works	17	0.02	87
Seven.One Entertainment Group GmbH	16	0.01	88
Ensignten/Cheq	16	0.01	89
ShareThis Inc.	15	0.01	90
Axel Springer Deutschland GmbH	14	0.01	91
TRUENDO Technologies GmbH	14	0.01	92
WebAds B.V	14	0.01	93
optAd360	13	0.01	94
Agilitation	12	0.01	95
AdOpt	11	0.01	96
Lawwwing	11	0.01	97
AVACY	10	0.01	98

CMP	count	%	rank
illow	8	0.01	99
Admiral	8	0.01	100
Ethyca Inc.	6	0.01	101
GG Software LLC	5	0.00	102
Associated Newspapers Ltd	5	0.00	103
Adnuntius AS	5	0.00	104
RCS MediaGroup S.p.A.	4	0.00	105
Cloudflare	4	0.00	106
Commanders Act	4	0.00	107
Clym Inc.	3	0.00	108
Onesecondbefore B.V.	3	0.00	109
SIBBO	3	0.00	110
Kleinanzeigen GmbH	2	0.00	111
mobile.de GmbH	2	0.00	112
CookieMan	1	0.00	113
Adlane LTD	1	0.00	114
Shoprenter	1	0.00	115