IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Notes
3rd June 2021 / 5:00 AM. – 7:00 A.M. UTC
Teleconference

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 05:10 UTC

2. **Roll call and Disclosure of Affiliation**
   The list of attendees is attached. A quorum was not achieved.

3. **Approval of June Agenda**
   Quorum not reached so no motion to approve

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 1st April meeting minutes**
   Quorum not reached so no motion to approve.

7. **Announcements**

8. **Structural review of P7003 document**
   I.   Vote regarding role and format of Taxonomy section
        On the full day meeting did not really get the key folk from this discussion together, wanted to put this to a conclusion today but cannot do this without quorum. We may however decide to put this out to a written vote, so that we can ask people to vote through the mailing list to get this finalized. We need to get clarity about what we want to be doing with the taxonomy section. We have effectively two kinds of proposals for what the taxonomy section should be contributing to the overall standard: the initial idea was to put forward the kinds of bias that might affect algorithmic systems to provide users of the standard guidance and better understanding of bias, however as new people joined there was a move towards thinking there needs to be a grander assessment of how the whole standard is organized and this would be a basis for that. The format would include a table/tree/database so you

could see the relationships between the different bias forms. We need a decision about which way this will go, to resolve this so that people can usefully work on it. This should be a formal vote because it is an important decision. Could put it in the next full group meeting, specifically asking everyone who has been strongly involved to attend and vote.

II. Outcomes of May 14th virtual writing workshop
This was quite productive. Will need to look to have another one in early July to keep momentum going. It was suggested that we could do some more formal scheduling, eg via Google docs, allowing groups to suggest when they might be able to attend to do their section, would allow others to attend when they were most interested as well. A good chunk of the day was on reviewing sections that were mostly complete, reviewing the human factors section which hadn't been touched for a while, stakeholder id, risk impact assessment, and the reviewing was quite useful, we identified some ideas about how to use the current content of the HF section to fit with the rest of the draft. We also did an update of legal section. Stakeholder ID also needed some more clarification.

III. List of open items that require attention.
We want to go back to using a table of open issues to identify things that need to be sorted out. There is one in the shared folder, but it hasn't been getting a lot of use. We should start using that again.
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18mD1brsBaC-fS0Io2gRzPL4y-OD6eNX5qROIGwXYwuo/edit#gid=0
Need to check that the things that are in there are addressed/still to be addressed. Some new issues below red line in row 100: Consistency of terminology eg accountable vs responsible in relation to the people involved in building the algorithmic systems; Risk section distinguishes levels of risk, but we had the question of whether any other section is doing something with that kind of distinction? Section numbering to be updated; only current versions of documents should be editable.
This is for things that we need to draw attention to for others to look at.
The master document needs to be updated with our edits from the day, Ansgar to do that asap.
Need to also make sure the normative sections (first 5) contain relevant links to the informative sections (last 4).

9. Updated Outline Discussion – Update on progress
If you are not currently focused on a group please consider joining one especially that needs more people.

i. Requirements – *More people needed*
Had a call and Lyria in particular made some new additions to that section, needs to be cleaned up and they need more regular calls to push forward, needs to be one of the sections that will need to be pushed on during the next full day writing session. Some more people joining the group so can start to make some progress.

ii. Stakeholder Identification
Did a detailed walkthrough in the workshop, so those points will be addressed by the team.

iii. Risk and Impact Assessment

As above. Q about whether we are linking to both of these sections effectively within the other sections.

iv. Data representation – M*ore people needed*
Going through recommendations that came out of the writing day, trying to find good times to meet. Could do with some help on the informative sections in particular, but the whole section has had a reboot, could do with some fresh eyes on it. Many times things that are brought up relate strongly to another section, trying not to double up on things but make sure that everything is still there. Can also make sure other things are pulled back into this section rather than moved.

v. Performance evaluation – M*ore people needed*
Meeting twice a week – normative subsections in fairly good shape, need to read through for consistency. Recently working on choosing metrics. Working on several different documents which will be updated. Bias/fairness/discrimination distinctions. In the final standard those terms need to be used consistently. We will be putting definitions into the standard.

vi. Taxonomy
See above

vii. Legal frameworks
Identified some things to potentially update or check in on, and has been some follow up work since the day.

viii. Human Factors – *More people needed*
Liz has been meaning to go through the rest of the section to comment and suggest rearranging of the section. Mainly about how cognitive bias and internal processes contribute to bias, also provides a list of the most common human biases and ties this to conceptual thinking. Both already present in the document, there are many complicated diagrams that need simplification and clarification.

ix. Cultural aspects
They have cut a lot of words, but they should be used somewhere else as there is a lot of good content, anyone who has use of it is welcome to it! Clare/Liz to send email to the list.

10. Any Other Business
If anyone has any trouble sending things to the mailing list, email Liz or Ansgar to send it (liz.dowthwaite@nottingham.ac.uk, Ansgar.koene@ieee.org)

11. Proposed dates/times for Future Meetings
- Thursday 1st July 2021 @ 1300 UTC
- Thursday 5th August 2021 @ 2100 UTC
- Thursday 2nd September 2021 @ 0500 UTC
- Thursday 7th October 2021 @ 1300 UTC
- Thursday 4th November 2021 @ 2100 UTC
- Thursday 2nd December 2021 @ 0500 UTC

12. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 06:02 UTC

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Bennett Moses	Lyria	University of New South Wales	X
Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	
Chung	Edmon	DotAsia	X
Courtney	Patrick	Tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Gardner	Allison	Keele University	X
James	Clare	Independent	X
Koene	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	X
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	X
Loughran	Roisin	Dundalk Institute of Technology	
Prasad	MS	Amity University, India	
Szczekocka	Ewelina	Independent	
Whitaker	Jessica	Howard University	