

Roundtable Findings, Feedback Analysis, and Evidence-Based Revisions

A. Roundtable findings summary

1) Tier 1–2 priorities were broadly endorsed, with two key refinements

Participants generally agreed the Tier 1 set is “in the right spot” , and emphasized that **undisclosed listening/recording is an unacceptable privacy violation** . A specific refinement was to **elevate “privacy-protective defaults + meaningful consent”** (Tier 2-3 in v0.1) because most people do not change defaults .

2) Consent must be addressed before recording begins, and not only for the primary user

Multiple participants stressed that users should be **informed and consenting before recording starts** , and that systems can capture **multiple people in the room**, making bystander/shared-space consent salient .

3) Recording-state indicators should support accessibility and reduce accidental activation

Participants valued at-a-glance cues, and explicitly raised accessibility: visual-only indicators do not work for users with visual impairment; an **audio/alternate cue** was suggested . Concerns about accidental triggers and unintended actions were also raised as a practical harm case .

4) Retention/deletion needs clearer limits plus stronger “proof” (with a usability tension)

Participants asked for **clearly stated retention periods** and a more confidence-building deletion experience, including a **graphical representation/clear confirmation** . At the same time, there was a tension between reassurance (e.g., reminders/notifications) and clutter/overload .

5) Third-party sharing was treated as high concern but the hardest to guarantee and verify

Participants emphasized that deletion is incomplete if data has been shared downstream; users should be told **what third parties receive and whether third-party deletion is possible** . Cross-border/international handling and ecosystem/API complexity were raised as core barriers . A related governance concern was avoiding youth age-identification mechanisms that require uploading IDs .

B. Analysis of forms/rating feedback

What we received: six completed participant feedback forms (PDFs) with detailed short answers and ratings.

Overall rating pattern (consistent across forms):

- Strong agreement that Tier 1 is right: multiple “5” ratings on Item 1
- Very high support for **recording status + rapid stop controls** (Item 2) and **data labels** (Item 5), frequently rated 5
- The lowest feasibility item was consistently **third-party sharing/cross-service boundaries** (Item 6), including ratings of 3 in multiple forms

Short-answer themes that materially shaped revisions:

- **“Quick-start guide” request:** explicitly recommended to improve usability and adoption
- **Concrete verification evidence:** participants asked for observable UI and audit-task evidence (persistent indicator + physical mute confirmation; visible voice history and delete; auto-delete timeline; simple sharing toggle default off)
- **Ecosystem complexity barrier:** cross-platform data flows and aligning retention/deletion/sharing across layers was identified as the biggest barrier, and a **standardized data-flow map requirement** was proposed as a practical enabler
- **Move “defaults/consent” up:** explicitly suggested in a form (and echoed in the transcript)
- **Verification governance suggestion:** “government approved verifier service” was proposed as acceptable evidence

C. Recommended revisions from v0.1 to v1.0 (evidence-based)

1. **Elevate “privacy-protective defaults + meaningful consent” to Tier 1**
Rationale: participants argued defaults drive real-world outcomes because users typically do not change them , and a completed form explicitly recommended moving it to Tier 1 .
Revision made: C7 treated as Tier 1 in v1.0; guideline moved into Tier 1 set.
2. **Strengthen G1 to include pre-recording notice + shared-space consent + accessibility cue options**
Rationale: need notice/consent before recording begins , recognition of multi-person capture , and explicit non-visual cue suggestion .
Revision made: v1.0 adds shared-space cue expectations and optional audible/non-visual cues.
3. **Upgrade retention/deletion guidance with stronger deletion “proof,” while addressing the clutter tension**
Rationale: request for clear retention + more confidence-building deletion confirmation/representation ; suggestion for reminders/notifications vs. concern about overwhelm/clutter .

- Revision made:** v1.0 strengthens deletion receipts and makes notifications **optional opt-in** to avoid overload.
4. **Make third-party sharing guidance more explicit about downstream deletion limits and cross-border realities**
Rationale: deletion is incomplete if third parties retain data; users need clear terms and expectations . Cross-border/API governance limitations were flagged and reflected in low feasibility ratings .
Revision made: v1.0 requires a readable **data-flow map** and explicit disclosure of third-party deletion limits; also incorporates the “attestation/verifier” concept as an optional governance mechanism .
 5. **Refine “data labels” toward a visual, two-column, standardized pattern**
Rationale: participants explicitly proposed “what you get vs what we collect” and avoiding ambiguity , and called for standardization plus trusted links ; audio summaries were suggested for youth .
Revision made: v1.0 updates G5 accordingly.
 6. **Clarify Privacy Hub scope and add “trusted helper / get help” pathway**
Rationale: a participant proposed a designated trusted party as a youth-centred support mechanism , while another form flagged ambiguity around what “easy access” means at scale .
Revision made: v1.0 adds a “trusted helper / get help” pathway and keeps the hub task list intentionally limited.
 7. **Add a Quick-start guide for immediate post-setup actions**
Rationale: explicitly requested in a completed form .
Revision made: v1.0 adds Section 2.1 Quick-start.

D. Updated Toolkit v1.0

We updated the toolkit (link: <https://csci-viu.github.io/privyouth-smart/toolkit.html>) to a roundtable-refined **v1.0** and incorporated the changes above while preserving the v0.1 structure as the foundation.