

**IEEE P7003 Working Group  
Meeting Agenda  
4<sup>th</sup> November 2021 / 13:00 PM UTC – 15:00 PM UTC  
Teleconference**

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 13:04 UTC

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

The list of attendees is attached. A quorum was reached and noted.

**3. Approval of November Agenda**

***Motion to approve the agenda for the November meeting.*** The agenda was approved without change

**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 1<sup>st</sup> July meeting minutes**

***Motion to approve the minutes from the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 meeting.*** The motion to approve the minutes from the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 meeting was approved

**7. Announcements**

**8. Structural review of P7003 work**

- I. Ensuring increased pace of progress of work  
Ansgar has had to reduce his time spent on this, so need to think about some additional support for moving this forward. Suggest an editorial review that can help with going through the standard that we have and picking up on the comments. Need some volunteers to take this on and agree to take on this review and answer comments – maybe two people. We used to have a Technical Editor to take on questions, but he has had to step back. Needs someone with sufficient understanding of the processes to take this on. Randy is working through the entire document at the moment, suggests that we have people to commit to work on particular sections to report back next month. Gerlinde pointed out that working on specific sections may miss

things happening or referenced in other sections. Some comments seem to have already been addressed by other sections. Need to make sure our cross-referencing is accurate as well, make sure everything is referenced as relevant. Some people felt they did not have the experience to contribute on their own but could work in pairs to think about eliminating ambiguity. Might also be good if people work on sections they haven't previously been working on. Spent some time putting people in groups to work together. Ansgar will send out an email to this effect.

- II. Vote regarding proposed restructuring of the Taxonomy work  
We still have two versions of the taxonomy going on, the original work that was done under the leadership of Mathana et al, which was focusing more on understanding where does bias come from, not really a taxonomy, more about background causes of bias. Then we had a new work stream put forward to say that we need an actual taxonomy however it was always unclear whether this was a taxonomy of bias or of the standard, and the question to what extent we need a true taxonomy of bias as opposed to the explanation of terminology that is a requirement in every standard that provides definitions for the various types of bias.  
Vote on a) splitting out the older taxonomy work into an informative section; b) what to do with the newer taxonomy section  
**Motion to modify the current Annex IA1 into an informative section and change the name to remove reference to taxonomy.** The motion was passed with no objection.  
**Motion to set aside the formal taxonomy until we have more clarity on what content is going in the first section.** The motion was passed with no objection.
- III. Establishing channels for inter-meeting discussions on issues to drive forward development of the P7003 standard  
There has been increased use of iMeet since the last meeting. This should continue, and if people have topics to discuss they could provide a summary via email and invite people to comment on it outside the mailing list.
- IV. Discussion on AI life cycle (and other) diagram(s)  
Last time we discussed whether we should have a WG looking at the life cycle issues – did this happen?  
Document shared by MS Prasad looking at ML and traditional life cycles. Randy also provided some illustrations. The key is to think about where and when bias might occur. Suggestion to use the term life cycle as it's common way to discuss processes, but make it clear that we are talking about life cycle in terms of where bias might influence the development of an AI model. It's a way of communicating the story. For example, end of life wouldn't make sense to a lot of people in the context of AI.  
Tension between thinking about 'algorithmic bias' which is our broad remit, and ML/AI/different types of development which have various different accepted processes.
- The meeting was adjourned at this point.
- V. List of open items that require attention.

## 9. Updated Outline Discussion

- i. Requirements
- ii. Stakeholder Identification
- iii. Risk and Impact Assessment
- iv. Data Representation
- v. Performance evaluation
- vi. Taxonomy
- vii. Legal frameworks
- viii. Human Factors
- ix. Cultural aspects

## 10. Any Other Business

## 11. Dates/times for Future Meetings

- Thursday 2nd December 2021 @ 2100 UTC

## 12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 14:33 UTC.

### Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Boujema	Nozha	Inria	
Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	X
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Duarte	Tania	Independent	
James	Clair	Independent	X
Koene	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	X
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	X
Loughran	Roisin	Dundalk Institute of Technology	X
Padget	Julian	University of Bath	X
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide	X
Rannow	Randy K	Silverdraft Supercomputing	
Szczekocka	Ewelina	Independent	X
Weger	Gerlinde	Independent	