

**IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Notes
11th October 2019 / 1:00 P.M. – 2:30 P.M. UTC
Teleconference**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 13:01 UTC.
A quorum was not reached.

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

The list of attendees present is attached.

3. Approval of October Agenda

Motion to approve the meeting agenda from 11th October 2019. There is no quorum therefore this cannot be approved.

4. [IEEE Patent Policy](#) (Call for Patents)

The call for patents was raised; no one raised any concerns or any comments for consideration.

5. Outcomes of Berlin face-to-face P70xx meeting

Roughly 10 people from the group attended plus some others from other groups who spent quite a bit of time with us. Every group was given about a third of the time for official meeting spaces but people took lots of time outside of that to both meet and see the other groups.

- Discussion of the balloting procedure – one of the P70xx groups has been through balloting and obtained the required voting threshold, still have a lot of comments that they need to address but shows that this is possible! Rather than try to be a standard they thought about ‘best practice’. P7003 still focused on standard. Gregg (P7010) gave us some update on this; under standards there is Standard, recommended practice, and guidance. P7010 started going for the full standard, but were trying to recommend things which had not been done yet, so didn’t have best practice. Commenters agreed to go to recommended practice where ‘must and shall’ is replaced with ‘should and may’. Further down the road future versions can be elevated to full standard as people gain experience. Has to be stated as one of them when accepted, can’t be somewhere in between. As the standard is not a binding instrument, except in the sense that people declare they are abiding by it, it is good to aim for robust standard at the first point of call.

- Started to draft some normative sections, because at the moment a lot of what we have written has been informative. Much of this work has been captured in the google drive, either rewritten, substantially updated, or brand new, and there are new section specific documents
 - o Go No Go: completely new document. Much of the discussion there was that there is not a single go no go decision and the document should say you need to decide where you make go no go decision and document the action you take at those points. Design stages also got a complete rewrite, moving from normative. It is worth going through the google drive and taking a look at the new and updated documents. Need to see if this is an appropriate tone, if not we need to reconsider next steps. Under ECPAIS there is a corresponding certification group trying to go forward and this gives a reason to suggest that a standard is capable of being produced.
 - o Representativeness of data: quite a bit of discussion. Especially surrounding the ideas that data acquisition is not a one stage task, is ongoing, and there's things that need to be watched for at particular stages.
- Clare reminded us that the process of creating a standard can go wrong when groups don't follow the advice of IEEE and the stages put in place for development of a standard. Bias is inherent to us all and we need to recognize that and not get bogged down in the description of this, and get some recommendations that can be applied, that can be turned into 'shall' statements. We all gained a lot from sitting in on the other groups, particularly the need to keep things simple and not get overwhelmed.
- Abel emphasized that we have to connect the ethical portions with the risk assessments, because they are integrated but right now there is a gap – do we reference ethical certification or another framework to allow people using risk assessments to keep in mind the ethical framework? Maroussia asked if this would also be the case for legal frameworks. Abel clarified that yes, include legal, ethics and safety into everything. Maroussia pointed out that the legal section is positioned not as legal opinion but a backdrop of what is required at a very high level. Each jurisdiction is different, so it's not ensuring legal compliance. Chris confirmed that it is important to point out to people that they need to be conscious about the issues, without telling them the specific laws, ethics etc.
- Abel suggested creating a road map as part of the risk assessment to help the user to follow the routes through taking into account all of the issues in the standard. At the moment our drafts contain a lot of words but not many guidelines.
- Adam reiterated that we are not putting in any specific ethical principals to ensure international and cultural relevance. We also can't refer to legal frameworks in normative contexts. Abel added that we do at least have to write something that says people have to consider the ethical framework of wherever they are at the same time as creating the risk assessment. These need to be taken in parallel otherwise it will fail.
- Patrick highlighted that there are existing standards we should try and tap into, a lot of relevant documents already exist to help us – including categorization of bias.
- A lot of the last day was spent discussing sections that needed most work and get people on those teams.

- It is valuable for people who have questions about normative processes to share them, the questions were raised in the meeting with IEEE and they have a very clear set of processes and rules that must be followed.
 - o Randy pointed out that normative clauses should be verifiable
 - o Adam again offered his services for a call on the normative/informative parts of sections. We didn't get round to the discussion of metrics at the Berlin meeting so that needs to be looked at.
- We need to be careful about making certain statements, cannot tell people which ethics and laws to abide by. It was suggested to look at the IEEE ethical standards. Accountability implies two agents of responsibility, legal and ethical. We need to consider both in order to eliminate negative bias. Informative sections requiring people to identify ethics and legal issues is fine but not specific laws and ethics. It needs to ask people to think about and write down what points they are following, which forces people to document their decisions.
- Randy would like to start being able to include areas where normative statements can start to be introduced.
- Important to remember that this is not just AI, this is all algorithmic systems. This was something talked about a lot in Berlin
- Abhik pointed out that we need to make sure our standard is integrated within the whole standards family, so how can P7003 feed into P7010 for example, which has a wellbeing impact assessment.
- Clare also raised awareness of how it can go wrong at the end. Some standards have gotten all the way to the end of the process and someone has complained that the process wasn't followed eg if voices don't feel they are being heard or side groups go off and don't report back. Membership of the group should have appropriate representation from different areas of stakeholders. We have a responsibility to make sure this is the case.
- Mathana reported they have also been making good progress on case studies. They asked about image use with regards to rights, creative commons etc. IEEE can work with licenses, so it would be nice to be able to license our images as CC.

6. Any Other Business

No other business was raised

7. Future Meetings

Thursday 7th November 13:00 UTC

Thursday 5th December 15:00 UTC

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 15:31 UTC

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Almondo	Gino	AI Sustainability Centre, Stockholm	

Chaudhuri	Abhik	TATA Consultancy Services	X
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Courtney	Patrick	Tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Gunsch	Gregg	Independent	
Hailey	Vicky	VHG	X
James	Clare	Independent	X
Jurgens	Pascal	University of Mainz, Germany	
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	
Lévesque	Maroussia	Independentt	X
Luiso	Javier	Universidad de Buenos Aires	X
Mandal	Sukanya	Independent	X
Nadel	Larry	NIST	
Novak	Theodore		
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide	X
Rannow	Randy K	Silverdraft Supercomputing	
Ricanek	Karl		
Rivast	Pablo	Marist College	X
Smith	Adam L	Piccadilly Group	X
Stender	Mathana	Independent	X