



Community Safety Report

Appendix

A. Terms

- **Lyft's Safety team:** This team is currently comprised of nearly 400 specialists who respond to rider and driver concerns and pursue ways to create safer ride experiences¹.
- **Use of the terms "survivor" and "victim":** Both of these terms refer to individuals who have experienced a sexual assault. In this report, we use the term "survivor." We discussed and validated this approach with anti-sexual violence experts, including representatives at RAINN and It's On Us. There is one exception to this approach: when discussing our program with the National Organization of Victims Assistance, we use the term "victim" for consistency with NOVA's terminology.
- **Reporting parties:** All safety reports are classified according to "reporting party" to track who reported the incident.
 - The majority of incidents are reported by drivers or riders².
 - A portion of incidents are reported by third parties³. Such third parties may be, but are not limited to, law enforcement officials, regulators, family, friends or media reports.
 - Between 2017 and 2019, the reporting parties across the five sexual assault categories included in this report were as follows: Drivers: 38%; Riders: 52%; Third parties: 10%.
- **Lyft users:** The term "user" refers to anyone using the Lyft app. In this report "user" or "users" encompasses both riders and drivers.
- **Incident frequency rates:** The prevalence rates for sexual assault and fatal physical assaults are calculated based on the raw number of reports of incidents and raw number of total U.S. rides ($X = \text{incidents/rides}$). For brevity, rates have been rounded to the nearest ten or hundred thousandth of a percent (as applicable) and rides have been rounded to the nearest tenth of a million.
- **Lyft "trips" or "rides":** For the purposes of this report, "trips" and "rides" refer to rides given or taken on our core rideshare platform in the U.S., including Lyft, Lyft XL, Lyft Black, Lyft Black XL, LyftLux and Lyft Shared (formerly known as Lyft Line) rides. This report does not include rides taken on Lyft's Bikes, E-bikes, or Scooters.

B. Working with Law Enforcement

We share critical data with law enforcement through a careful legal process.

Process for requesting information from Lyft: Every case is unique, but we abide by the same general principles. Before we can disclose any records, we require:

- Valid and sufficient legal process in the form of a subpoena, issued in connection with an official criminal investigation.
- A search warrant issued under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or an equivalent state warrant.
- A showing of probable cause to compel our disclosure of certain communications between people using Lyft or GPS location information.
- Exceptions may be made for emergency and exigent requests, where a user has provided consent, or for requests not requiring a warrant, where other legal or regulatory standards apply.

Submitting a request to Lyft: Requests are submitted to the Lyft team through the Law Enforcement Online Request System. Lyft is unable to process broad, vague or unduly burdensome requests, including requests:

- For records of all drivers in a large geographical area.
- For records of all cars of a particular make and model in a large geographic area.
- To search for users by name only.

1. Lyft Internal Data, June 22.

2. Lyft classified reports as being reported by a rider or driver based on the Lyft User ID connected to the report. All Lyft drivers and riders have Lyft User IDs.

3. Lyft classified a report as being reported by a third party if there was not a Lyft User ID connected to the report.

- Seeking data for overly broad time periods.

To ensure a prompt and detailed response, requests should be:

- Typed.
- Signed and stamped by the appropriate law enforcement officer who is empowered by local law to represent the law enforcement unit that is making the request.
- In compliance with local and U.S. law.
- Addressed to Lyft, Inc. directly.

Information to include in the request:

- All known email addresses, names and aliases of the data subject or all known physical addresses and telephone numbers of the data subject.
- Requester's name, department, title, address, phone number and official government email.
- The nature of the crime, investigation or specific event that took place.
- Specific date/time/location(s).
- What information is requested and why, and how it pertains to the investigation.
- The Non-Disclosure Order issued by a court or relevant legal authority (if applicable).
- The act or law under which the data is being requested.

Potential business records stored by Lyft:

- We maintain information per our Privacy Statements and Terms of Service. When riders and drivers sign up and use Lyft, certain information may be obtained and maintained, including: phone number, email address, name, account start and end date, registration IP address, status, rating, payment method, and customer service communications. For drivers, additional details may include: license plate, vehicle information, address, insurance information, agreements, a photo and some GPS location data.
- Law enforcement may find that a user can directly provide the best evidence. We email users a receipt after each trip with detailed information including: date, time, pickup and drop off locations, route, distance, duration, fare breakdown, method of payment and user names.

How Lyft handles emergency requests:

- While we respond to all inquiries promptly, some situations require expedited support. We work to expedite requests when there is an immediate threat of death or serious bodily harm. When evidence of such a situation is provided, we may produce information in the absence of a subpoena or warrant. In such events, we require valid and sufficient legal process be produced within three days of production of the information.
- Requestors should submit emergency requests through the Law Enforcement Online Request System accessible on the Lyft website, select the emergency disclosure button, and upload a detailed description of the emergency.

Lyft's User Disclosure Policy: It is our policy to notify users before producing their information to law enforcement unless:

- We are prohibited by law.
- We believe the subject's account has been compromised, notice could go to the wrong person, or notice would be counterproductive or would create a risk to safety.
- It is an emergency request and prior notice would be impractical (in which case we may provide notice after the fact).
- If the officer does not want their request disclosed, they must provide an appropriate court order prohibiting notice or demonstrate that the request meets one of the exceptions above. Without appropriate non-disclosure authority or sufficient justification for non-disclosure, Lyft may disclose the request to the user and provide the user three days to object to the request.

C. Detailed Methodology for Three Reporting Categories

Motor Vehicle Fatalities:

How we classify crashes in accordance with the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS): FARS is an annual, nationwide report on fatal motor vehicle traffic crashes. FARS data is available to the public and contained in a database that is operated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)⁴.

- FARS data includes specific details about every incident, including the make and model of the car, the date, time and location of the crash and the driver's vehicle identification number (VIN).
- For the purposes of this report, we reviewed the FARS database for 2017, 2018 and 2019 to match crash details from our Lyft dataset to corresponding FARS records.
- Crashes for which we were unable to find a corresponding FARS record were excluded from the report.

Use of the term "crash": For the purposes of this report, we adhere to the definition of a "crash" used by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for inclusion in the FARS database.

- That definition is as follows: "a crash must involve a motor vehicle traveling on a trafficway customarily open to the public and must result in the death of at least one person (occupant of a vehicle or a non-motorist) within 30 days of the crash⁵."

How fatality rates are calculated:

- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): The national standard for calculating motor fatality rates uses a measurement unit of vehicle miles traveled. VMT refers to the amount of miles traveled by all vehicles over a certain period of time.
 - National VMT: Reflects all miles traveled by all vehicles in the U.S.
 - Lyft VMT: Reflects all miles traveled during a ride obtained through the Lyft app, which includes the miles traveled after accepting the ride, but before picking up the passenger.
- The fatality rates presented in this report reflect the number of fatalities per 100 million VMT.

How we determine if a fatal crash was related to the use of the Lyft platform: A fatal crash was included if it met the following criteria:

- The crash involved a vehicle engaged in a ride obtained through the Lyft app, or traveling to a pickup location after a ride was accepted. Fault for the crash is not considered here.
- The fatality or fatalities occurred within 30 days of the crash.

A fatal crash could be deemed related to the use of the Lyft platform even if the fatalities were not occupants in the vehicle engaged in a ride on the Lyft platform.

Fatal Physical Assaults: This category is defined as a fatal physical altercation involving an individual using the Lyft platform. A fatal physical assault is determined to be Lyft-related if it meets the following criteria:

- The incident occurred between individuals who were matched through the Lyft app, and
- The incident occurred within 48 hours of the end of the ride.

4. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). <https://www.nhtsa.gov/research-data/fatality-analysis-reporting-system-fars>

5. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). April 2014. What is the Fatality Analysis Reporting System? (pg. 2) <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/811992#:~:text=To%20be%20included%20in%20FARS>

While not included in this report, physical assaults that do not result in a fatality are addressed by our Safety Specialists.

Sexual Misconduct and Violence Taxonomy:

In November 2018, RALIANCE announced the Sexual Misconduct and Violence Taxonomy, a new form of categorization that created a uniform standard for reporting and classification of reported safety incidents for the rideshare industry. Lyft categorizes incident reports according to this taxonomy to better understand, analyze, prevent, respond to and address safety incidents.

The taxonomy classifies sexual assault and misconduct into the below 21 categories. The final five categories below are included in the report.

SEXUAL MISCONDUCT:

Non-physical conduct (verbal or staring) of a sexual nature that is without consent or has the effect of threatening or intimidating a user against whom such conduct is directed. This includes explicit or non-explicit verbal comments (or non-verbal, non-physical) such as flirting, personal comments on appearance and inquiries on relationship status. Catcalling (shouting, yelling, whistling) is also defined as sexual misconduct.

Staring or Leering: Someone gazes at a user in an unpleasant, uncomfortable, prolonged or sexual manner. Staring or leering is constant and unwavering. This includes viewing both sexual and non-sexual body parts.

Comments or Gestures: Asking Personal Questions: Someone asks specific, probing and personal questions of the user. This would include questions about the user's personal life, home address, contact information (e.g. phone, email, social media), romantic or sexual preferences.

Comments or Gestures: Comments About Appearance: Someone makes uncomfortable comments on the user's appearance. This includes both disparaging and complimentary comments.

Comments or Gestures: Flirting: Someone makes verbally suggestive comments to the user about engaging in romantic or non-romantic activities. This also includes non-verbal, suggestive flirting, including becoming physically close to a person in a way the user felt was sexual or flirtatious.

Comments or Gestures: Explicit Gestures: Someone made sexually suggestive gestures at the user.

Comments or Gestures: Explicit Comments: Someone described or represented sexual activity or body parts in a graphic fashion.

Displaying Indecent Material: Indecent material, including pornography or other sexual images, was seen by the user.

Indecent Photography Without Consent: Someone has taken, without consent, an inappropriate photograph of a user's sexual body part (e.g. down shirt, up skirt, etc.).

Soliciting Sexual Act: Someone directly asks for a kiss, displays of nudity, sex or contact with a sexual body part (breast, buttock, genitals). This could be a direct solicitation or a solicitation in exchange for money or favors.

Masturbation / Indecent Exposure: Someone has exposed genitalia and/or is engaging in sexual acts in presence of a user. This excludes public urination where no sexual body part (buttock, penis, breast) was exposed.

Verbal Threat of Sexual Assault: Someone directed verbal explicit/direct threats of sexual violence at a user.

SEXUAL ASSAULT:

Physical or attempted physical conduct that is reported to be sexual in nature and without the consent of the user. Note:

1. Sexual body parts are defined as the mouth, female breasts, buttocks or genitalia. The phrase "between the legs" is considered to reference a sexual body part. All other body parts are characterized as non-sexual.
2. When only a non-sexual body part is involved, either of the following provides context for the "sexual nature" of the contact/attempted contact:
 - Sexual misconduct of any type
 - Reporter's explicit perception that the contact was either flirtatious, romantic or sexual

Attempted Touching: Non-Sexual Body Part: Someone attempted to touch, but did not come into contact with, any non-sexual body part (hand, leg, thigh) of the user, and the user perceived the attempt to be sexual.

Attempted Kissing: Non-Sexual Body Part: Someone attempted to kiss, lick or bite but did not come into contact with any non-sexual body part (hand, leg, thigh) of the user, and the user perceived the attempt to be sexual.

Non-Consensual Touching: Non-Sexual Body Part: Without explicit consent from the user, someone touched or forced a touch on any non-sexual body part (hand, leg, thigh) of the user.

Attempted Touching: Sexual Body Part: Someone attempted to touch, but did not come into contact with, any sexual body part (breast, genitalia) of the user, and the user perceived the attempt to be sexual

Attempted Kissing: Sexual Body Part: Someone attempted to kiss, lick or bite but did not come into contact with the breast(s) or buttock(s) of the user, and the user perceived the attempt to be sexual.

Non-Consensual Kissing: Non-Sexual Body Part: Without consent from the user, someone kissed, licked or bit or forced a kiss, lick or bite on any non-sexual body part (hand, leg, thigh) of the user.

Non-Consensual Touching: Sexual Body Part: Without explicit consent from the user, someone touched or forced a touch on any sexual body part (breast, genitalia, mouth, buttocks) of the user.

Non-Consensual Kissing: Sexual Body Part: Without consent from the user, someone kissed or forced a kiss on either the breast or buttocks of the user. This would include kissing on the lips or kissing while using tongue.

Attempted Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration: Without explicit consent from a user, someone attempted to penetrate the vagina or anus of a user with any body part or object. Any attempted removal of another person's clothing to attempt to access a sexual body part will be classified as 'Attempted Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration.' This also includes attempted penetration of the user's mouth with a sexual organ or sexual body part; however, it excludes kissing with tongue or attempts to kiss with tongue.

Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration: Without explicit consent from a user, someone penetrated, no matter how slight, the vagina or anus of a user with any body part or object. This includes penetration of the user's mouth with a sexual organ or sexual body part. This excludes kissing with tongue.

Determining if an incident was Lyft-related: A reported incident is determined to be Lyft-related if it matches either of the following descriptions:

- The reported incident occurred during a ride obtained through the Lyft app, or
- The reported incident occurred within 48 hours of a ride's completion, between individuals who were matched through the Lyft app

For the purposes of this classification effort, Lyft did not implement time-specific limitations. Lyft included any incident reported in 2017, 2018 or 2019, regardless of when the incident was reported to have occurred. Lyft deemed all incidents that were reported to have occurred during a Lyft ride as Lyft-related, even if it occurred between individuals who were not matched through the Lyft app (e.g. between a rider who called the ride and their guest rider).

D. Lyft's Data Classification, Auditing and Quality Assurance

Within Lyft, this work was spearheaded by Lyft's Safety Analytics team, whose goals were to:

- Classify Lyft safety reports in accordance with the taxonomy provided by the RALIANCE.
- Provide standardized data, the time frame and categories to match what has been released by our largest U.S. peer company.
- Classify to a consistently high degree of accuracy.
- Ensure an effective audit process.

In order to do that, we:

- Required all auditors to receive mandatory, in-person training with audit project leaders before the classification process began. This included a training from Lyft's legal team, self-care training and extensive taxonomy-specific training. All auditors were also required to read the full RALIANCE report on taxonomy and worked for several days on practice audits and calibrations.
- Provided strict guidance to auditors on how to classify reports in accordance with taxonomy. This ensured auditors had a careful set of steps to follow when analyzing a report and at no point were required to render a personal judgement on the validity of a report.
- Required auditors to participate in multiple calibrations each week with audit team leaders to measure for variance. Those with consistently low calibration scores were asked to leave the auditing group.
- Required auditors to participate in weekly spot-checking sessions, where individuals were asked to re-audit a section of anonymized already-classified interactions. This helped ensure accuracy and help all auditors adhere to the same classification processes.

E. Expert Review

To ensure data collection and analysis were as accurate as possible, Lyft's internal teams also worked with external experts. The Chertoff Group, an internationally recognized leader in security and risk management advisory services, conducted an analysis of how Lyft trains its Specialists to handle reported safety incidents, as well as our overall commitment to classification. RALIANCE, a national sexual violence prevention organization, analyzed how Lyft classifies and processes safety reports. Both groups provided the same services for our peer company's U.S. safety report. The executive summaries from each group are included at the end of the appendix.

F. Lyft's Background Check Process

Before giving their first ride, driver applicants in the U.S. are screened for criminal offenses and driving incidents. The only exception to the process detailed in the report is in the State of New York, where the New York Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) oversees licensing and permissions for all rideshare drivers.

Today, any driver who does not pass the initial background check, annual check and continuous monitoring is barred from our platform. Drivers may be ineligible to drive on the Lyft platform if background check results reveal:

Driving-related incidents⁶

- Any major violation in the past three years (like driving on a suspended license or reckless driving).
- Any DUI or other drug-related driving violation in the last seven years.
- Any driving-related convictions in the last seven years (like a hit-and-run or felony involving a vehicle).
- More than three minor violations in the past three years (including collisions and traffic light violations).

Criminal incidents⁷

- A driver is listed on the National Sex Offender Registry database.
- A conviction at any time of a disqualifying violent crime (such as homicide, kidnapping, human trafficking, arson, burglary, carjacking, robbery, or aggravated assault).
- A conviction at any time of a sexual offense (such as rape, sexual assault, or child pornography).
- A conviction at any time of an act of terror.
- A conviction of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs in the past seven years, or longer in some jurisdictions.
- A conviction of a disqualifying fraud-related offense in the past seven years for most jurisdictions, although this time frame may be longer, or shorter, in certain jurisdictions.
- A conviction of a disqualifying drug-related offense in the past seven years for most jurisdictions, although this time frame may be longer, or shorter, in certain jurisdictions.
- A conviction of a disqualifying theft or property damage offense in the past seven years for most jurisdictions, although this time frame may be longer, or shorter, in certain jurisdictions.

Laws governing disqualifying convictions vary significantly by jurisdiction, and the above list is not inclusive of all disqualifying convictions. Drivers may be found ineligible to drive with Lyft based on other types of records.

Lyft uses a multi-tiered criminal screening process, facilitated by two of the top background check companies in the country. This process provides Lyft with comprehensive criminal history reports using personally identifiable information (PII) to search wide-ranging national and local sources. We do not use fingerprint-based checks for two core reasons: fingerprinting relies on a federal database that is unreliable and incomplete, and it is shown to have potential discriminatory effects on minority communities.

Unreliable and incomplete database: Fingerprint-based background checks rely on the FBI's Criminal Justice Information System, a database of state- and municipality-submitted arrest records. This database is often incomplete.

- **Not all records in the FBI database are complete:** States and counties have no mandate to update the database with final case outcomes, meaning the database often lacks up-to-date records and final court dispositions – whether someone was charged, convicted or acquitted. A [2015 GAO report](#) estimated that up to 50% of arrest records lack final dispositions. Instead of relying on a singular database and biometric features, Lyft's comprehensive background check process pulls from multiple criminal databases and inputs.
- **The FBI database is not subject to the same regulations:** Our independent, third-party background check companies are subject to the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA)⁸, which requires consumer reporting agencies to ensure their background check information is accurate, up-to-date and complete. In contrast, FBI records are not subject to consumer protection laws including the FCRA. These records often lack PII and are not subject to the same accuracy and completeness standards.
- **Not all records are included in the FBI database:** Some records do not meet the standards for inclusion in the database

6. Lyft, Driver Requirements: DMV Check, <https://help.lyft.com/hc/en-us/articles/115012925687-Driver-requirements#dmv>

7. Lyft, Driver Requirements: Background Check, <https://help.lyft.com/hc/en-us/articles/115012925687-Driver-requirements#bgc>

8. Under the FCRA, consumer reporting agencies can only report information that is complete, accurate and not obsolete. End users of reports (such as Lyft) are not permitted access to records that are not verified as such.

because the fingerprints are poor quality. Some may become missing or lost when transferred between departments.

Discriminatory against minority communities: Fingerprint-based background checks have shown to have a discriminatory impact on communities of color.

- Nearly 50% of African American men and 44% of Latino men are arrested by age 23 nationwide⁹, and one-third of felony arrests do not result in conviction¹⁰. Basing background checks on incomplete arrest records with no final disposition is unfair and discriminatory to communities of color, who are more likely to come into contact with the police.
- Fingerprint-based background checks also require applications to be fingerprinted at a location with notary services. This places an additional burden on applicants in rural areas and small towns, who are forced to travel long distances to complete this process.

Maintaining and ensuring a welcoming and diverse community has always been critical to Lyft. Because it is possible to conduct comprehensive initial background checks, annual checks and continuous monitoring without the use of fingerprinting checks, there is no reason to use a screening technique that would threaten the diversity of our community.

G. Lyft's Safety Advisory Council Members

Jordan Brooks, Executive Director of the United State of Women (USoW). Ms. Brooks is the former Deputy Executive Director and Policy Advisor to the White House Council on Women and Girls in the Obama Administration. As Executive Director of USoW, Ms. Brooks leads the national organization's efforts to convene, connect and amplify voices in the fight for full gender equity. Lyft and USoW share the view that equitable transportation is crucial to the advancement of women, who deserve safe and reliable options when it comes to getting around.

Jay Brown, Senior Vice President of Programs, Research and Training at Human Rights Campaign (HRC). Mr. Brown is a longtime advocate for transgender equality, with over 20 years of experience. As the largest national lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) civil rights organization, HRC advocates for a world where LGBTQ people are ensured of their basic equal rights. At HRC, Mr. Brown oversees programming that spans a range of issues, including the workplace; children, youth and LGBTQ families; health and aging; HIV and AIDS; religion and faith; and the global LGBTQ movement. Lyft has partnered with HRC since 2017, when HRC became one of our first national LyftUp partners. Since then, Lyft and HRC have collaborated on a variety of initiatives to advance LGBTQ equality in our workforce and company policies, on our platform for riders and drivers, and externally through public policy advocacy and Pride campaigns.

Melanie Campbell, President and CEO of the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation and Convener of the Black Women's Roundtable (BWR). Ms. Campbell is a leader in the social justice movement, who has spent over 20 years advocating for civil, youth and women's rights. As convener of the BWR, Ms. Campbell brings together some of the nation's most influential Black women leaders to discuss and advocate for policies that support and advance women. Ms. Campbell was instrumental in the appointment of Black women to key positions within the Obama Administration, and is a recipient of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's Emerging Leaders Legacy Award for her work on election reform. Lyft has partnered with BWR in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, providing access to thousands of rides nationwide through the BWR network. As a LyftUp Alliance member, BWR has helped extend critical transportation resources, such as food access, to vulnerable seniors.

Kym Craven, Executive Director at the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE). Ms. Craven has over 30 years of experience in law enforcement, with a focus on public safety and community engagement initiatives. Throughout her career, she has advised over 350 municipalities and state agencies. Lyft and NAWLEE have partnered on a number of initiatives, working together to address roadway safety, gender issues, transportation equity, human trafficking and domestic violence.

Dwayne A. Crawford, Executive Director at National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE). Mr.

9. Brame, R., Bushway, S. D., Paternoster, R., & Turner, M. G. (2014). Demographic Patterns of Cumulative Arrest Prevalence by Ages 18 and 23. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(3), 471–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001128713514801>

10. Thomas H. Cohen, J.D., Ph.D. and Tracey Kyckelhahn, M.A. (2010). Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, 2006. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. <https://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fdluc06.pdf>

Crawford's experience lies in executive law enforcement policies and administration. As NOBLE's Executive Director, he is responsible for overseeing NOBLE's external and internal activities. Lyft and NOBLE have focused on a number of efforts, including transportation equity, Lyft's background check policies and driver and rider safety.

Tracey Vitchers, Executive Director, and Silvia Zenteno, Director of Education and Training, at It's On Us. It's On Us was founded in the Obama administration as a sexual assault prevention initiative aimed at college campuses. Ms. Vitchers was selected to lead It's On Us as a nonprofit organization following its departure from the White House. Vitchers is a nationally recognized expert on youth sexual violence, with unique experience developing technology to combat sexual assault. Ms. Zenteno is a survivor activist and an expert in national campus sexual assault programs. Her work is rooted in improving access to sexual assault response and prevention services for students to ensure they are relevant and effective. It's On Us is Lyft's newest partner on safety, launching a new initiative this year to amplify safety education around ridesharing on college campuses.

Jessica Leslie, Interim Vice President of Victim Services at RAINN. Ms. Leslie has spent more than 15 years advocating and providing leadership in the fields of gender equality and gender-based violence. Ms. Leslie provides strategic and operational leadership to the National Sexual Assault Hotline and public and private-sector clients, including Lyft, as well as the victim services clinical and training programs.

Sheriff John Whetsel, Chair of the National Sheriffs' Association's Traffic Safety Committee. Sheriff Whetsel has over 50 years of experience in law enforcement and a passion for road safety. Sheriff Whetsel served as the Sheriff of Oklahoma County for 21 years and is the former President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Lyft works closely with Sheriff Whetsel as part of our ongoing partnership with the National Sheriffs Association. Lyft and NSA have worked together on programs for roadway safety, safe elder mobility, anti-human trafficking efforts and supporting victims of domestic violence. As part of that work, the NSA is currently managing five local county grants, which provide rideshare transportation to victims of domestic violence and crime victim services.

Sheriff Kathy Witt, Sheriff of Fayette County, Kentucky. Under Sheriff Witt's leadership, Fayette County provides a variety of services to strengthen its public safety response including a Domestic Violence and Victim Services Division. As part of this work, Fayette County is a current recipient of Lyft's NSA partnership grant, which provides transportation for crime victim services and domestic violence victims.

Examining Lyft's Use of the Sexual Misconduct and Violence Taxonomy: **Executive Summary**

October 13, 2021

For information, contact:

Yolanda Edrington, RALIANCE Managing Director

yedrington@raliance.org

External Validation of Lyft Taxonomy Application

Background

In 2018, RALIANCE published a Sexual Misconduct and Violence Taxonomyⁱ (Taxonomy) to track and codify reports of sexual misconduct and sexual assault. RALIANCE developed the Taxonomy for organizations to identify and track reports of sexual misconduct and sexual assault within their systems for purposes of resolution and accountability, as well as to inform their internal sexual violence prevention efforts.

In 2019, Lyft Inc. (Lyft) initiated training on and use of the Taxonomy in order to better understand, analyze, prevent, respond to, and address reported safety incidents on the Lyft platform. Although Lyft has long had processes in place to identify, track, and ensure follow-up of these reports, application of the Taxonomy strengthened their training and systems of review. They applied the Taxonomy retrospectively from 2017 to 2019 and now seek to share publicly the data from their Taxonomy application for these years. To ensure high quality application of the Taxonomy, Lyft sought guidance from RALIANCE, a national partnership to end sexual violence. Lyft requested RALIANCE validate their Taxonomy application to identified reports. This report shares evaluation findings.

Purpose

The purpose of this work was to evaluate Lyft's codification of reported cases of sexual assault. RALIANCE conducted an external expert validation of trained Lyft auditors' application of the Taxonomy to reports identified in their Safety Report from 2017 to 2019.

Approach and Findings

External validation of Lyft auditors' application of the Taxonomy in coding types of sexual assault involved (1) independent coding of a randomly selected subsample of identified reported incidents from 2017 to 2019, and (2) statistical calculations of level of concordance or agreement between Lyft auditors and external expert auditors on coded data. We conducted multiple iterations of review as batches of reports were coded by Lyft by year, with a final batch consisting of a randomly selected oversampling of reports from five codes included in Lyft's Safety Report.

Three external expert coders independently coded each report. The expert coders included representatives from RALIANCE, Urban Institute, and a researcher from an academic research center with sexual violence prevention and intervention expertise. All expert coders had a minimum of four years of experience working in the area of sexual violence prevention and intervention research or practice. External coders met to discuss any disagreement in coding to achieve full concordance on all reports, to allow for comparison with the Lyft auditor codes.

Of the sexual violence reports identified and coded by Lyft over the 2017-2019 period, RALIANCE randomly selected approximately 9% of all reports for externally validated coding. Assuming a 5% error rate, the sample size was selected to assume outcomes are 95% accurate (i.e., fit within a 95% confidence interval). [This means we have 95% confidence with an error of 5% that our random selection from this sample would yield comparable report outputs with regard to the types of Taxonomy codes identified for validation with replication.] A higher than required sample size was reviewed in order to not only ensure a high confidence in random selection for the total sample but also for the subsample of reports with the five codes in Lyft's Safety Report. For this subsample of the five codes, RALIANCE externally validated 13% of reports. Assuming a 5% error rate, the validated sample size reflects 95% accuracy.

Once all external expert coding review and discussion was complete, we compared expert codes to Lyft auditor coding to assess concordance, and then reviewed discordant codes to determine if there were ambiguities in response. In cases of ambiguity, where Lyft auditors categorized a higher tier report than did external auditors, and we found justification for higher tier or equivalent categorization, we supported concordance with the Lyft team.

Subsequently, we found very high concordance (94% and higher) between Lyft and external auditor coding. However, to ensure that rate of concordance accounts for agreement attributable to chance, we also conducted a Cohen Kappa statistic at each iteration of review, for each batch annually and for the final batch of oversampled five codes. Kappa statistics across all years and for our oversampled final batch were kappa=0.87-0.94, again indicating high concordance and thus strong external validation of Lyft auditor reviews.

Conclusion

Based on our review of these data as noted above, RALIANCE believes Lyft is effectively coding these data to determine the nature of reports. The approach used can allow for quality generation of data for public reporting and as the basis of identifying reports for response. We recommend continued use of the Taxonomy coding process in place.

Credits

Sampling and statistical calculations were conducted by Urban Institute (2020) and Anita Raj, Ph.D. (2021).

ⁱ *Helping Industries to Classify Reports of Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, and Sexual Assault*, RALIANCE, 2018. <https://www.raliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/helping-industries.pdf>



AN EVALUATION OF SAFETY INCIDENT CATEGORIZATION CAPABILITIES FOR



FINAL REPORT SUBMITTED ON:

October 4, 2021

NOTICE: *It is expressly understood that this document is proprietary and is provided solely for evaluation by Lyft, and may not be used by any other entity or for any other purpose without the prior written consent of both Chertoff Group, LLC and Lyft, Inc.*

Executive Summary



The Chertoff Group LLC (TCG) was retained by Lyft, Inc. (Lyft) to conduct a strategic-level evaluation of Lyft's application of a sexual misconduct and sexual assault taxonomy, independently developed by RALIANCE, to the U.S. rideshare platform incident data set as identified by its team and its classification of incidents of physical assault or theft and robbery that result in fatality ("fatal physical assaults"). Lyft undertook this program to help the company and other key stakeholders better understand and address the prevalence of these incidents within its U.S. rideshare platform.

The TCG team was tasked with using its past experience overseeing the normalization and categorization of large incident and criminal justice system data sets to (1) notionally define key project risk and performance factors as they related to the classification; and then (2) evaluate the extent to which these factors have been incorporated into and mitigated by the company's approach. In developing criteria, TCG leveraged authoritative U.S. Government strategic requirements and planning guidance for how to translate desired outcomes into supporting capability descriptions, resource components (the ways and means of operationalizing a capability), and evaluative measures (that is, a means of verifying that the capability in question is operating as intended).

In particular, we developed evaluation criteria based on the core resourcing categories that, in our experience, taken together define an effective capability. While all aspects of Lyft's program are, of course, important, we determined that the following evaluation factors were of acute significance:

- The extent of leadership's commitment to the taxonomy classification project;
- The adequacy of training and education for the frontline auditors who validated the classification against Lyft's larger incident data set; and
- The successful implementation of the technological systems to support the program.

With respect to these critical factors, after a thorough examination of Lyft's activities (including review of relevant documents; multiple interviews with Lyft personnel; and a literature review) we reached the following conclusions:

- There is a substantial commitment within leadership to the taxonomy classification project, reflected in the level of attention given to the project by senior leadership (including at the Co-Founder/President level), in the alignment of safety management performance evaluations to key safety metrics and, going forward, in the creation of a new management structure for safety issues. Safety metrics are tracked at the Board-level, and the Executive Leadership Team is briefed specifically on the taxonomy classification effort every two weeks.
- Training and education for front-line auditors were treated as a critical factor by the program managers, resulting in the deployment of meaningful resources to the effort. While this novel taxonomy program is difficult to train for, we found that Lyft devoted significant effort to the development of the program; to the implementation of the taxonomy; and to evaluative measures that ensured alignment between auditors and program objectives.
- We also found that Lyft created a unique machine learning (ML) capability that was able to vectorize text from multiple sources and correlate it to relevant and non-relevant incidents.

Further, Lyft's Technology and Safety teams worked closely in creating their Engineering 2020 Support Plan as part of the company's technology roadmap. We have made several recommendations below for how Lyft could improve validation of effectiveness of its technology systems.

In Lyft's program we noted that there was: buy-in and resourcing of the effort from Lyft executives; recognition of the challenges and opportunities associated with implementing the classification system; establishment of defined objectives for the program; and creation of an integrated team of Lyft staff including Lyft associates who were the end-users of this taxonomy system. Lyft made significant efforts to align their taxonomy project with the RALIANCE taxonomy. Lastly, as with successful implementation of select federal incident-based data systems with which we are familiar, Lyft's taxonomy was created using a dynamic process and we expect it will continue to grow and improve over time.

In addition, we made the following general observations:

- Lyft had a meaningful taxonomy-related doctrine and policy development process, although it requires greater formality (as described in the body of our report);
- Initial efforts to manage the taxonomy program have continued to evolve with the creation of a Safety Council and Safety Leadership Committee who will be well-positioned to manage the taxonomy effort going forward;
- Adequately trained staff were assigned to the taxonomy audit program;
- Lyft is supplementing internal resources with outside expertise through the establishment of a Safety Advisory Council and the establishment of a consultative relationship with RALIANCE;
- Sufficient funding was in place for the effort;
- Suitable standards and processes were in place to help ensure the accuracy and calibration of the classification process for the incident data set as identified by its team;
- Lyft used an Internal Audit team to evaluate its processes and technology controls, making appropriate observations for continuous improvement; and
- We understand that Lyft not only created education modules for drivers to encourage a better understanding of the boundaries of appropriate behavior, but also made those modules mandatory as a condition of driving with Lyft – we noted Lyft was the first US ride-hailing company that has made such education mandatory.

It should be noted that the retroactive nature of this project carries several important limitations with it: first, sexual assault and sexual misconduct suffer from chronic underreporting across sectors, and no classification effort can categorize incidents that simply are not reported. Second, the specificity of retroactive classification is – by its nature – limited by the level of detail captured during the underlying incident response process. Third, there are inherent limitations in identifying relevant data sets out of IT architectures and business processes not originally designed to capture this data.

Based on our initial review and follow-up discussions, we made some recommendations to Lyft to strengthen its retrospective classification effort, including keyword sampling to verify automated natural language processing safety classifications as well as exclusions based on other block factors (e.g.,

purportedly inapplicable Submission Reasons, Resolution Reasons and other uncategorized tickets), which we understand that Lyft has implemented.

As regards Lyft's forward-looking program, we also made some recommendations to Lyft to strengthen its program planning and implementation. In addition to the need for a more formalized policy process and better change management practices, we recommend that Lyft:

- Augment its data model to have greater granularity of information – e.g., on victim and perpetrator attributes – and therefore greater utility;
- Formalize a feedback loop to intake associates so that lessons learned from the taxonomy program can be incorporated into initial screening;
- Consider expanding classification efforts to Spanish-language reports, to the extent volumes of Spanish-language reports grow; and
- Work to assure continued stability in the auditor cadre to enable continuity within the project, as Lyft has done with auditor leadership and its auditor training program.

We believe such measures will not only benefit efforts to classify incidents according to the RALIANCE taxonomy and assault-related fatalities, but also broader initiatives to characterize safety incidents of a critical nature – for example public health events and serious non-fatal criminal activity (e.g., carjackings).

As the Lyft taxonomy classification project matures, we suggest that it: a) adopt a more formal policy structure around the taxonomy effort to provide governance and policy guidance in a documented manner; and b) adopt a more rigorous change management process to document the consideration, adoption, and deployment of modifications to the taxonomy classification system.

Notwithstanding these issues, based on our examination of Lyft's program (and as limited in the next paragraph), ***our opinion is that Lyft's efforts to apply the taxonomy to the incident data set identified by its team for 2018 and 2019 were reasonable and made in good faith.*** Because the 2017 classification effort was not fully completed during our review period, we were unable to conduct a complete review of this effort, but the training, calibration and audit leadership being applied to the effort is consistent with the 2018-2019 approach. We are further of the opinion that, given the time and resource constraints that necessarily attend any effort to characterize a database of this size, scope, and complexity, the baseline taxonomical analysis is, when supplemented with our recommendations, a reasonable starting point for the iterative process of further taxonomical development and application to other databases.

Limitation of Work: *Given the limited scope of the review requested by Lyft, our opinion is restricted to a qualitative assessment of the taxonomy classification program as of the date hereof to evaluate the reasonableness of Lyft's application of the taxonomy to its selected data set and the company's identification of fatal physical assaults as they relate exclusively to the company's U.S. rideshare platform for the 2018-19 timeframe. In addition, Lyft did not ask us to extend this review to its Canadian rideshare platform, or any other historical timeframes. Our review did not evaluate the initial screening or response process per se. Nor did the company ask us to conduct any quantitative analysis of the underlying incident data set or the data as categorized using Lyft's methodologies, as we understand that*

such a review was conducted by RALIANCE. Lyft also did not ask us to evaluate Lyft's substantive efforts to prevent, respond to, or otherwise address sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual assault, and fatal physical assaults – or more general safety risks – in its platform.

About The Chertoff Group Team: The Chertoff Group is an internationally recognized leader in security and risk management advisory services and applies its unmatched industry insights around security technology, global threats, strategy and public policy to enable a more secure world. It starts from the proposition that there is no such thing as risk elimination and the firm helps clients understand risk and address the fundamentals of security risk management. Members of The Chertoff Group's assessment team included: **Thomas Bush**, an advisor to The Chertoff Group and former Assistant Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) who spent much of his career designing, managing, and evaluating case management systems, including the design and management of the FBI case management system and N-DEx, the national database of criminal justice data; **Joseph Ford**, an advisor to The Chertoff Group, former Associate Deputy Director of the FBI and former Chief Security Officer for Bank of the West, who has extensive experience in the use of case management systems both in law enforcement and commercial environments; **Adam Isles**, a Principal at The Chertoff Group and former Deputy Chief of Staff at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) who works with clients across industries to build security risk management programs and was the principal drafter of the firm's security risk management methodology, which was approved by DHS for SAFETY Act designation in 2017; and **Paul Rosenzweig**, a senior advisor to The Chertoff Group and former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy at DHS who has extensive knowledge on data management and has developed policy, strategic plans, and global approaches to homeland security, ranging from immigration and border security policies to avian flu and international rules for data protection. The Chertoff Group report was reviewed by **Michael Chertoff**, the Executive Chairman of The Chertoff Group, a former Secretary of Homeland Security, and federal judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and **Jayson Ahern**, a Principal at The Chertoff Group and former acting Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection at DHS.