

**IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Minutes
2nd July 2020 / 5:00 P.M. – 6:30 P.M. UTC
Teleconference**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 17:00 UTC
A quorum was established and noted.

2. Roll call and Disclosure of [Affiliation](#)

The list of attendees is attached.

3. Approval of July Agenda

Motion to approve the meeting agenda for July 2nd 2020. 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. [IEEE SA Copyright](#)

The copyright policy was presented.

6. Approval of 2nd April meeting minutes

Motion to approve the minutes from 2nd April 2020. The minutes from the April meeting were approved without objection.

7. Approval of 7th May meeting minutes

Motion to approve the minutes from 7th May 2020. The minutes from the May meeting were approved.

8. Announcements

- a) The group had a working session last month in place of monthly meeting. It was a pretty intensive day from 8am to 8pm UTC, very productive and worked having people dropping in and out, and using dedicated writing sessions. This will be repeated at some point. Had a total of 22 people across the day, including people who couldn't make meetings normally due to time zone issues. It was generally felt to be quite useful day, and feelings that opening up subgroups to the wider group was very beneficial. Suggestion to take a section each monthly call to work on for part of it, also generally

thought to be a good idea, or to have breakout sessions as part of the working group meeting.

- b) There was further discussion of the time of meetings and timezones; agenda item in Oct/Nov to discuss 2021 if needed.
- c) Request for people who are having subgroup calls to announce them so that people can join if they wish. Potential to use iMeet calendar for subgroup organisation.
- d) As we are coming up for the last six months hopefully, need to think about how to ensure that empty sections get progress – ‘evaluation of processing’ section, if there is no work or progress, is it relevant?
- e) Best practice for notes and comments on the working document? Go through in suggest mode and comment, they can then be resolved or added as needed. The Master document is currently in suggest only mode, only Ansgar can fully edit. It is increasingly important that we keep on top of what are the up-to-date documents. One suggestion was that we now all work from the same document. Question, do people feel that their unfinished sections are generally ready to go into the master document? Can we provide links to all the ongoing documents if not working in the master? There is a problem with consistency and messiness. Need to make sure people are working on latest document otherwise work is wasted.

Actions

- o Subgroups should announce meetings so that others can join
- o The current version of each subsection should be linked to the Master document, and should be updated in master document each month before working group meeting. Please make sure Ansgar knows which is the relevant document to link.
- o Also please introduce version control ie when each section in the master document was last updated.

9. Updated Outline Discussion

I. Update on Use Cases

Had a look at use case around NLP during writing session. Do we want it to develop further? Language as a cultural artefact and mode of expression. Could connect to cultural or psychology section, as introductory text.

Action: Is anyone interested in developing this further?

II. Topic updates – summaries and reflections on [open items](#)

i. Project Conceptualisation

Work done during working session. Included team diversity and the issue of setting up a project making sure you have a sufficiently diverse team so you can understand the impacts of the project from different groups. Good progress is being made.

Action: Please get in touch if interested in helping with this section.

ii. Stakeholder Identification

Good go at it after the working session looking at the section, now looking at some serious rejigging and taking out the informative components from the normative. Clearer in how they are dividing out the two types of stakeholders. Step back to sort this rearrangement before moving forward.

iii. Risk and Impact Assessment

To be revisited after much of the other sections have been done. In conjunction with outcomes evaluation, these sections should be closely tied together to mutually compliment.

iv. Go/No-Go

Need to discuss whether we need this section in its current form or if can integrate the core idea behind the section into the other existing sections, for example, 'if this is the case' reconsider your system. Decision whether to continue is so different at different stages of the project, so it is not as simple as saying there should be a go/no go decision at a particular point. Each section could suggest the questions that organisation should ask themselves at that point, feeling that this would be helpful. If standard is suggesting frequent risk and impact assessments, then incorporating go/no go questions might be a good idea. Also suggestion that maybe Go/No-go is the wrong term to use and should think in term of high risk or impact, and that would be the point to make such a decision. What can be implementable and technologically auditable? How to protect the end user, and help developers to not creep up into the unacceptable territory – what are the minimal conditions for this standard to be met? Should we be talking about disclosure thresholds?

v. Algorithmic system design stages

There has been lots of discussion about how to do this – it is difficult to figure out how this can be general enough and still useful. What is such a section going to mean given so many different design approaches, types of algorithm and algorithmic design? Potentially a lot of crossover with taxonomy.

Action: Need a longer discussion about the goal of this section – could be the focus of the August call

vi. Representativeness of data

Also had some work last month. Much of the discussion is around the importance of making sure of a good representative data set in order to avoid bias. Discussion outside WG often emphasises this as the source of all bias, but this is not the case. Suggestion that some of stakeholder ID group could work in this section too as there is a lot of connection.

Action: This group needs a new lead, potentially Gerlinde and Trish to take this on.

vii. Evaluation of processing

Removed and subsumed into next section and systems design section. Everything there currently fits into existing sections, unclear of added value.

viii. Outcomes evaluation

May be scope for renaming to a broader evaluation of systems.

Action: Potentially needs a new lead to take this forward.

ix. Transparency and Accountability

Not a priority section but important to include. Becomes more clear once we've hammered the other section. Need to consider P7000 here – it's currently in the comment stages of the ballot.

x. Documenting

No update

xi. Taxonomy

Just had a meeting before the call, at the stage where more regular discourse across the group would be beneficial. Who is this document for and how can we focus on minimum viable protection? They have quite a lot of work and will make sure the section is up to date for linking to main document. Mission for this month is to think about the temporal axis and how it relates to humans as well as the machine side of bias.

Action: Needs wider input from rest of the group to finalise this section

- xii. Legal frameworks
Pretty much done we believe.
- xiii. Psychology
No update
- xiv. Cultural aspects
Continuing with fortnightly calls and are making progress with editing, hope to finish soon and to help out on other sections. Ongoing wish to collaborate more with other sections for a unified message throughout the standard, common definitions and language.

10. Conferences and Whitepapers

11. Any Other Business

Suggestion that we reorganize how the monthly meeting is run (see section 8a) to get as much productivity as possible. Next month we will block out 2 hours and not 1.5, with the aim to have the first hour as a writing session and the second hour as the meeting proper. Potential for those who can to join in looking at a particular section, and others to join for the main meeting, but please join for as much you can.

- o **Action:** Next monthly meeting will be 2 hours, to include writing/discussion session for Algorithmic System Design Stages in the first hour.

12. Future Meetings

- Thursday 6th August 3PM UTC
- Thursday 3rd September 1PM UTC
- Thursday 1st October 3PM UTC
- Thursday 5th November 5PM UTC
- Thursday 3rd December 3PM UTC

13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 18:43 UTC

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	X
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Costley	Jennifer	New York Academy of Sciences	
Courtney	Patrick	Tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Hackman	Joseph	ASAPP	
Jurgens	Pascal	U of Mainz, Germany	
Koene (Chair)	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	X

Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	X
Nadel	Larry	NIST	
Nieves Delgado	Abigail	Independent	X
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide	X
Prasad	MS	Amity University, India	X
Ramlal	Babita	Independent	
Rannow	Randy K	Silverdraft Supercomputing	X
Rivas	Pablo	Marist College	
Shaw	Trish	Beyond Reach	X
Stender	Mathana	Independent	X
Weger	Gerlinde	Independent	X