IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Minutes
4th April 2019 /1:00 P.M. – 2:30 P.M. UTC
Teleconference

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 13:06 UTC
   A quorum has been established and noted.

2. **Roll call and Disclosure of Affiliation**
   The list of attendees present is attached.

3. **Approval of April Agenda**
   Motion to approve the meeting agenda from 4th April 2019. The agenda was approved as submitted without objection.

4. **IEEE Patent Policy** (Call for Patents)
   The call for patents was raised; no one raised any concerns or any comments for consideration.

5. **Approval of 28th Feb-1st March meeting minutes**
   Motion to approve the minutes from 28th Feb and 1st March 2019. The minutes from the meeting were approved without objection.

6. **Announcements**
   I.   Reminder that we have a slack workspace to facilitate collaborative team work.
        The idea is to use it for active communication when working on new content for the document. Some communication so far but likely to pick up in the streams for subgroups
        Action: Ansgar to send current Slack link to email list
   II. P70xx coordination group is looking for a liaison person (not chair) from each P70xx working group to help coordination between groups – who is interested?
        The liaison will connect with the other standards, to keep up to date, identify overlaps and connections, and make sure there is coordination between them to present a coherent framework around ethical design. There would be a co-ordination group call roughly once a month of the liaisons from each of the working groups, to communicate to the other groups what p7003 has been doing, and hear back from them. This should not be the chair, in order to

lessen the load of the chair. Ansgar asked for expressions of interest and Allison Gardner volunteered.
Action: Ansgar will pass the info on to get this going

III.   Indicated interest in [local face-to-face groups](#) of co-located P7003 members
It would be good for people who happen to be co-located anyway, eg some in London, Berlin etc, to meet up face-to-face where possible. Ansgar has made a Google form to indicate interest, so we can coordinate people in the same space and let each other know.
Action: If interested, please fill out google form in link above.

IV.   Intention to have more frequent regional face-to-face meetings
      i. Next one 2nd week of July in Asia?
The face-to-face meeting last month was a very productive way of generating content and progress, but there is an issue in setting up as we are a global group so it's hard to set up across multiple timezones. Suggestion that it might be good to have more frequent meetings across different places, roughly every 3~ months. Ansgar suggested one in Asia around the 2nd week of July, and asked for feedback. Adam agreed this would be a good thing to do if we can figure out how it fits with the activities of the whole group getting things done. Chris pointed out would be good to have options to call into the meeting if there are face-to-face in other countries. Edmon noted that he can probably help with organization of this, pointing out that the Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum is happening July 16-19 2019 in the east end of Russia in Vladivostok: https://www.aprigf.asia/. Potential to co-locate there? Alternatives include Hong Kong/Singapore? Doesn't necessarily have to be these dates.
Action: Ansgar to send request for support to mailing list.

7. Discussion of candidate recommendations for new master document

I.   High Level Flow diagram (discuss multiple versions)
Ansgar presented the current draft versions of the flow diagrams, for comment. Three versions exist, the original by Adam, a version Ansgar derived from the new document structure, and an update of that created by Yohko. General consensus indicated preference for the version Yohko created. The flow shows the user of the standard how the different sections relate to each other and roughly where they are within the process, taking into account it is iterative. Adam suggested that the term 'roles' is used rather than 'teams' so as not to exclude small firms. The terms are meant to suggest which kind of experts might want to take leadership at different stages. There was also discussion of what was meant by an ethical review board, and whether we should define it, especially considering recent news coverage. This related predominantly to clause 9 and 10; Ansgar explained this indicates that the kind of expertise you would look for when doing your assessment would be ethical experts for example. Chris suggested we point people towards the task being performed rather than who is performing it, and Edmon added to the chat *who is performing is somewhat important as in not-in-the-team, but agree that we should avoid "board" or "external" so it doesn't feel distant for small companies/startups… just put "Ethical Review" and then explain somewhere that it should be by a person/team that is not directly involved in the*

development/project?" Adam also posted GDPR article 38 suggestion for guidelines.

Action: Ansgar to amend the wording in the diagram

II.   General outline of document: (normative) Clauses & Informative Annexes Clauses (C) are the normative sections of the document, and the main processes and content of the standard. The Informative Annexes (AI) provide ethical/managerial/technical overviews. These therefore include the Taxonomy, Legal, Psychology, and Culture sections. The annexes are strongly referred to in C1, which presents action oriented operationalizations of them. IAs are for the rest of the document to refer to.

III.   Review of "essential" content for each section (as listed in the P7003_section_content_checklist)

This document is designed to be a checklist and reference point so everyone knows what is going on. It is also for the teams that are writing the sections to check back to make sure they are covering everything that they need to, including comments from others on what needs to be done. Suggested rewording of C1 title to 'initiation' or 'conceptualisation'. It was noted that Assessment of Resilience section has been suggested for removal as it is outside of the scope of p7003, and the important points for this standard (eg human-in-the-loop) should already be in previous sections. Allison highlighted that we need to make sure those things are included, and points should be added to the doc to make sure this is the case. The Transparency and Accountability section has also been separated from the Documenting section, and there was a suggestion that it should be moved c9 to c4, before go/no go.

Action: Everyone to add comments etc about content and structure of the standard in this document.

IV.   Appointing of team leaders who take responsibility for each section

The subsections have been split into teams of people, which sometimes cover several sections. Psychology and Culture teams have been joined for example because they have a lot of crossover, so it's a good idea if the participants are the same group and can communicate more. We still need leaders for Go/No-Go, and Documenting. Go/no go should be someone from risk and impact assessment probably – Allison happy to do it if no one else steps up. Sukanya also pointed out that input from the Evaluation team would also be useful there. The documentation section needs to provide clear guidance on how to do the documenting – Sukanya offered to take the lead on this.

V.   Appointing of team members for working on each section

People can continue to work where they have been, but we didn't want to assume that they would want to. Vicky volunteered to do the internal consistency checking. It is important that we know who is working in which teams so that everyone knows who to ask and who is involved where. Populate in the next week or so please! Teams should also use Slack to do the development of the content.

URGENT Action: Everyone to add their names to sections they will contribute to, even if they have already been working on that section.

VI.   Request to identify and notify missing expertise required to develop each section

This request was made by Ansgar. Sukanya asked about educating the end user but feeling that it is separate to the standard development. IEEE Global Initiative

on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent System (which the standards work is part of) is starting a separate activity on education initiatives.

    VII.   Commitments for progress to be made by May 2nd
        i.   Ansgar to draft updated "scope" text

Jennifer commented *"Regarding the scope section of the standard, IEEE has very specific requirements for this. It must be directly aligned (= identical) to the PAR. It is not intended to be an essay on the document."*

8. Conferences and Whitepapers

Sukanya emailed a couple of interesting conferences – AI for social good (April 22 https://aiforsocialgood.github.io/icml2019/), AI for climate change (April 30 https://www.climatechange.ai). There may already be something from last year that can be reworked and resubmitted to AI for Social good.

Action: Anyone with any use cases or other ideas for either call, get in touch with Ansgar/Sukanya

Chris highlighted the US NSF calls related to algorithmic bias and fairness in AI.

Action: If at a US academic or non-profit educational institution, and interested in working with Chris on a proposal to NSF in algorithmic fairness, please send him an email (clifton@computer.org).

9. Any Other Business

Maroussia highlighted the importance of finding funding for people who aren't industry supported. We should try and make sure we can have as many people from all walks involved in the standard. IEEE does not fund this although we've tried to support people where we can. It is important that everybody's voices are heard, so please keep sharing funding opportunities to allow us to widely discuss this with as many parties as possible. Ansgar mentioned the EU funding calls. Pascal suggested we created a document for collecting funding opportunities, including regional, national, subgroup (young scholars etc) and other specific options.

Action: Ansgar created spreadsheet "Potential funding sources to support P7003 participation"

10. Future Meetings

The meeting platform join.me has several options for UTC, including UTC London which can lead to confusion as we have moved to British Summer Time. In future UTC will be the standard as recognized globally (currently 1pm UTC = 2pm BST (UK time) = 3pm CEST (e.g. Paris time)).

Thursday, May 2nd, 3:00pm – 4:30pm (UTC)
Thursday, June 6th, 5:00pm – 6:30pm (UTC)

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 14:48 UTC

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Carrier	Ryan	For Humanity	

Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	**X**
Chire	Josimar	Self	
Chung	Edmon	DotAsia	
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	**X**
Costley	Jennifer	New York Academy of Sciences	**X**
Courtney	Patrick	tec-connection	**X**
Dechesne	Francien	Leiden University	**X**
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	**X**
Gardner	Allison	Keele University	**X**
Hailey	Victoria	VHG	**X**
Hatada	Yohko	EMLS_RI	**X**
Hense	Peter	Spirit Legal	
Jurgens	Pascal	U of Mainz, Germany	**X**
Koene (Chair)	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	**X**
Kostopoulos	Lydia	Digitial Society Institute	
Lévesque	Maroussia	Independent	
Mandal	Sukanya	Self	**X**
Nadel	Larry	NIST	**X**
Smith	Adam L	Piccadilly Group	**X**
Stender	Mathana	Self	**X**
Troncosco	Christian		
Bahn	Christy	IEEE-SA (staff)	