

**IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Notes
4th March 2021 / 5:00 A.M. – 7:00 A.M. UTC
Teleconference**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 05:09AM UTC

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

The list of attendees is attached. A quorum was not established.

3. Approval of March Agenda

No approval due to no quorum

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 4th February meeting minutes

No approval due to no quorum

7. Announcements

The new IEEE Computer Society based AI standards committee chaired by Ansgar had its inaugural meeting last week Monday – for any standard that is being considered under the IEEE CS related to AI this will be the new home for those. Some 70xx will move to that. P7003 is under the Software & Systems Engineering Standards Committee and there is currently no particular reason to move it. Moving WG one committee to another does not materially impact on the work. It affects balloting, Trish asks if the CS would have more awareness of the work of these standards. Members get notified of standards in their IEEE society, but we can indicate which societies we want to let know specifically to sign up for ballot. Mostly the role of the standards committee is to perform a preliminary review of the standard to make sure all the procedures have been followed, e.g. the produced standard document matches the scope that is defined in the PAR.

8. Structural review of P7003 document

- I. Graphical representations of P7003 structure and concepts

Ansgar presented some of the work being done by a group on the visual representations of the processes involved in the standard.

Comment that this life cycle is specific to machine learning so we may need companions that deal with other types of systems as the standard is not only machine learning. This is primarily because of the terminology of 'modelling'. More general terms might be more appropriate. 'System' might generalize it or could be part of a suite of diagrams.

- II. Review of gaps in P7003 development that require attention.
Are there important gaps in the way that the standard is structured, that we need to address? From readings or experience. Can people who have not looked at it for a while or are new to the group and have looked at the doc, think of any questions that might trigger us to identify a gap?

9. Updated Outline Discussion

i. Requirements

Ansgar – the main update is that would like to request if someone else is available to support leading on the section, it needs some focus. It has a clear structure but needs to push for getting the team together and doing the work of filling out the content for that structure. Anyone on the call who would be interested? Or questions on what we are doing in that section? Pablo can potentially help someone; Chris Howard, Clare, Trish also volunteered to support. Ansgar will send out a call to the list. Ansgar ran through examples of what needs to be in the section. Clare suggested that there are a few people who could help a little bit so would be good to have a call to get some momentum and work going.

ii. Stakeholder Identification

Pretty much completed, barring the occasional disagreements on nomenclature, anything new to report? Trish – we feel it is done, as complete as we can make it for now. Energies more on evaluation section

iii. Risk and Impact Assessment

No update

iv. Representativeness of data

Last couple of sessions very low turnout, but also been wrapped into the evaluation section for now. Will likely get resurrected again after more concrete conclusion of performance evaluation. Need to get a feel where it sits within the wider evaluation and then come back to it. The core is there but needs to be worked into the wider schema.

Discussion of including part on synthetic data and how that might impact on the ultimate bias outcome of the AIS. Chris H and Chris C volunteered to have a look. Ansgar – yes as a minimum should recognise it can be useful but should be aware it can be a source of bias especially as data is generated for a particular purpose. Synthetic data may no longer properly represent the original patterns of the data it is built on. There is also cognitive bias that goes into the design thinking for the data – what attributes are seen as most prominent, etc. With synthetic data it is not enough to just do the things you do with regular data.

v. Performance evaluation

Met twice a week this year, gone through the doc as a group and merged some content from other former sections. Content is there in the four

subsections, now needs harmonising with the structure of each section. Expect to complete next week (Thurs).

vi. Taxonomy

Quite a bit of discussion on the Taxonomy section last time, and Ansgar has had a catch up with Paola since then. What is it we are trying to achieve with his section and how does this sit relevant to the section on Terminology which each standard has? Conclusion is much of the thinking Paola was bringing was more embedded in terminology. Previous work was looking at conceptualising and helping people to understand algorithmic bias – do we want to maintain that as an annexe with a different name eg Conceptual Understanding of Bias? Can be useful for people working in this space to reflect on. Feeling that it is still useful and there was a lot of work done in this previously.

vii. Legal frameworks

Complete

viii. Human Factors

Formerly known as psychology. The current state of that section was developed by Yohko who is not an active participant any more so it would be good if someone else can take a look at this and see what additional work needs doing to it. We need to keep in mind it is an informative section, and how the standard itself has been developed since this section was created. Does it fit with what is needed to match the rest of the standard? Does anyone have the time to do an assessment of where we are with this?

ix. Cultural aspects

Clare – got to the point where they need to speak to the other sections to see if anyone else would like some of the text that did not really belong in the culture section but might be useful. Suggestion to do a call to review the section, anyone who is able to support evaluating it relative to other sections. Might be more efficient to grab each section individually – Clare will put a call out to the mailing list. It would also be good to have a call with individual groups about how they might refer to the annexe and to make sure the content is useful.

10. Any Other Business

We are probably not going to be able to go to ballot on the next meeting call but will do a proper full review of where we are – Ansgar will do another update into the master document, pull in the current state of each of the sections, and walk through where we are with everything to see what kind of progress we made.

11. Future Meetings

- Thursday 1st April 2021 @ 1300 UTC
- Thursday 6th May 2021 @ 2100 UTC
- Thursday 3rd June 2021 @ 0500 UTC

12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 06:06AM

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Bennet Moses	Lyria	University of New South Wales	
Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	X
Chung	Edmon	dotAsia	
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Howard	Chris	Amazon Web Services	
James	Clare	Independent	X
Koene	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	X
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	X
Lewis	Ruth	Independent	
Rannow	Randy K	Silverdraft Supercomputing	X
Rivas	Pablo	Baylor University	X
Sen	Sujai	Hertie School	
Shaw	Trish	Beyond Reach	