Below is a grouped list of all elements raised by stakeholders and listed on the flip charts during the facilitated discussion at the July 12, 2012 privacy multistakeholder meeting. Images of the flipcharts are available here. The list includes minor NTIA edits for clarity; edits appear within brackets.

If an element was polled during the meeting, the polling results are listed beside the element using the following format: (1/2/3/4). 1 indicates "absolute/critical/must," 2 indicates "significant/should," 3 indicates "somewhat/might," and 4 indicates "not at this time." In-room poll results are listed first, followed by poll results from the conference call.

For example, the entry "common consumer friendly vocabulary (18/10/30/3 4/3/2/1)" means that a stakeholder suggested that a code of conduct for mobile application transparency include provisions for a common, consumer-friendly vocabulary. The element was polled, with approximately 18 in-room stakeholders viewing the element as critically important, approximately 10 in-room stakeholders viewing the element as significantly important, approximately 30 in-room stakeholders viewing the element as somewhat important, and 3 in-room stakeholders viewing the element as not a good candidate at this time. 4 stakeholders who remotely participated *via* conference call viewed the element as critically important, 3 remote stakeholders viewed the element as significantly important, 2 remote stakeholders viewed the element as somewhat important, and 1 remote stakeholder viewed the element as not a good candidate at this time.

Some similar elements were polled together. For example, one stakeholder suggested that a code of conduct for mobile application transparency be technology neutral. Another stakeholder suggested that a code of conduct be platform agnostic. These elements were the subject of a single poll, and are noted below as "Technology neutrality / Platform agnostic (85/25/0/1 4/0/1/1)."

NB: The number of stakeholders attending the meeting decreased in the afternoon. Polls conducted in the morning tend to have higher total polling responses than afternoon polls. We did not estimate abstentions.

The groups below are an attempt to group similar elements into initial working lists and provide a basis for stakeholders to continue facilitated discussions of substance and process at the August 22, 2012 and August 29, 2012 meetings. At the August meetings, we encourage stakeholders to propose additions, deletions, consolidation of elements, or re-grouping of the working lists.

Working Question: "Please identify in simple language key elements of mobile app transparency that are either already being advanced today or should be advanced?"

Poll of Stakeholders: "Which elements might be developed first?"

Group 1	
Element	*Poll*
Just in time notification / Just in time re: location / Notice in context	(50/25/5/0 3/3/1/0)
Prioritizing key elements (not overloading consumers with too much	(30/30/15/2 1/2/5/0)

info)	
Prior to install notice	
Preload / Install / Real time	

Group 2	
Element	*Poll*
Functional description of data use	(100/15/0/0 5/3/0/0)
Size of privacy policy / simple language answers	(80/15/5/1 3/3/0/1)
Common consumer friendly vocabulary	(18/10/30/3 4/3/2/1)
Consistency across apps	(15/20/25/7 5/2/2/0)
Short script / Iconography / Icons	(20/30/10/5 1/4/1/1)
App must have privacy policy	
Understandable to all	
Standardized definitions established	
Standardized definitions of mobile permissions + APIs	
Standardization	

Group 3	
Element	*Poll*
What data outside of app functionality (*e.g.* contact list)	(110/3/0/0 6/2/0/0)
Transparency of specific behaviors	(6/30/50/10 2/3/3/0)
Categorization of data	(10/20/25/10 1/4/0/1)
Categorization of practices	(4/8/20/15 2/3/2/0)
[Data] types	
[Data] uses	
[User] Choices	
Why data is collected	
Disclosure of risk / Risk assessment	
Tracking other uses of device	

Group 4	
Element	*Poll*
Clarity on who is being transparent	(25/40/15/1 6/5/0/0)
Identify all players	

Group 5	
Element	*Poll*
Machine readable disclosure (Actionable disclosure)	(10/10/20/10 2/1/4/1)
Tools for data transparency	(2/3/10/30 2/2/3/1)
Dashboard for data uses	

Group 6	
Element	*Poll*
Safeguards for teens / Understandable to teens [and] kids for sites aimed at […] teens and kids	(12/4/22/20 2/1/0/1)
Transparency to policymakers / Transparency to advocates	

Group 7	
Element	*Poll*
Need specificity	(10/3/4/50 0/1/3/1)
Not too granular - Seek broad based principles	
Concise	

Group 8	
Element	*Poll*
Notice can happen outside of app	(1/1/20/50 3/1/4/1)
Where info given	
Placement	
Device appropriate	

Group 9	
Element	*Poll*
Technology neutrality / Platform agnostic	(85/25/0/1 4/0/1/1)
Understand economics of data use	(80/30/1/0 4/4/1/0)
Identify common practices in use today	(60/6/1/0 5/1/0/0)
Maintain intermediary protections	(70/70/5/5 1/2/2/0)
Accountability / enforceable	(40/40/8/1 2/2/1/0)
Gather info on practices	(15/5/4/20 3/1/1/0)
Sliding scale for notice	(10/30/25/5 2/1/3/4)
Wide adoption – avoid exceptions	(10/10/8/12 3/2/2/2)
Clear statement of privacy rights [expand scope beyond transparency]	(12/3/15/35 8/1/1/0)
Consumer experience	(5/1/20/60 3/1/0/3)
Broader view of contemporary practices / Fact finding	
Look at platforms / Ad networks	
Mobile market data ecosystem	
Need to define mobile app	
Law enforcement angle	
Need other elements of FIPPs	
Capture all elements	
Transparency alone has value	
How to make actionable in global environment	
How to be effective on mobile devices	

Include all users	
Put consumers first	
Think like a developer	
Teachable	
Broader education / Awareness raising	
Need to establish dialogue	
Individual control	
Independent verification (of consumer understanding)	
Security	
Avoid limiting competiveness	
Consider with existing law	
Shared devices	
Careful about what might be prohibited	
Flexibility	
Benefit of data	
Transparency of app level	

Follow-up Question: "What might be included in the working methods for the first phase of a common process?"

Poll of Stakeholders: "To what extent might these working methods be supported?"

Group 1	
Element	*Poll*
Look at common / current practices	(80/5/2/0 1/1/0/0)
Involve app developers	(50/20/0/0 5/4/0/0)
Focus on end of process	(30/15/5/10 1/2/0/0)
Legislative output process	(8/4/8/40 1/3/1/1)
Need for senior level input	(10/10/12/4 2/2/1/0)
Factual research by staff	(4/15/20/8 2/1/3/0)

Group 2	
Element	*Poll*
Working groups - focus on sub issues	(70/30/0/2 3/4/0/0)
Small # of topics / Multiple competing drafts	(40/25/1/4 2/2/1/0)
Identify problem set	(40/20/0/1 5/1/0/0)
FTC involvement	(25/8/12/10 5/0/1/0)
NTIA representative involvement	(15/30/10/0 2/2/0/0)
Pull in prior written comments	(25/10/12/3 3/3/0/0)
Outline of potential focus areas	(12/10/7/3 3/0/1/0)
NTIA suggested timetable and milestones / NTIA provided room	(1/1/5/30 2/0/2/0)
Workshop re: data collection / fact gathering method	

Group 3	
Element	*Poll*
Notice of materials in advance	(65/0/0/0 4/3/0/0)
Remote participation	(35/8/3/0 4/1/1/0)
Balance of load for small participants	(12/15/12/3 3/2/2/0)
Hold events across country	(12/8/15/22 4/1/1/1)
List serve / Mailing List / Multiple Listserves	(8/15/20/20 5/1/3/0)
Adobe connect and other tech tools to facilitate decision / WC3 –like tools	(8/45/20/3 0/3/1/0)
Regular calls with IRC chat	(0/7/25/40 0/0/3/2)

Group 4	
Element	*Poll*
Full transparency / Open Process	(40/6/10/4 2/3/1/0)
Hybrid / Open	(40/3/4/20 2/2/0/0)
Parity for consumer groups	(20/7/20/1 3/1/2/1)
No numerical voting – other tools for consensus	(18/5/0/0 5/2/1/0)

Closed process	(0/5/0/35 1/0/1/5)
Archive	(2/6/10/30 1/4/0/1)
ANSI procedures	(1/0/3/30 0/0/3/0)
De-centralized process	