IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Notes
6th May 2021 / 9:00 PM. – 11:00 P.M. UTC
Teleconference

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 21:02 UTC

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

3. Approval of May 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
Brief discussion of EU AI regulations: Concern over how many people are required to implement them, uncertainty about how risk management will work. There seems to be a lack of clarity around data governance. Estimate is 1.5-2 years through parliament. UNESCO also working on AI rules but working very slowly as there is a very small staff.
Randy has been engaged in bias conversations over the past month with various entities; perhaps some self-actualization
Gerlinde asked if the ISO standard on bias was included on the list of background materials – that standard is currently in draft. Ansgar answered that IEEE cannot access the draft.
Randy mentioned that a different standard WG was able to obtain access to a draft ISO standard, so it might be possible.
Lyria pointed out that the ISO/IEEE liaison was meant to switch to WG level (it was originally top level). So this WG can pursue a relationship with ISO WG3
(trustworthiness). Lyria is involved in the ISO standards so if we want to pursue that, happy to help.

8. **Structural review of P7003 document**
   
   I. Program for May 14th full-day virtual workshop
      Aim to have breakout rooms available. Gerlinde suggests a separate small group for full first pass, and we need to establish priority for section level writing e.g., Stakeholders good, requisites needs work, or pick some that can be "finished". We perhaps need to schedule time with high involvement to pick such nearly complete ones
   
   II. Review of gaps in P7003 development that require attention.
      
      i. What needs working on
      ii. Where to find it
      iii. How to do it (just edit? Propose changes? etc.?)
         - see Gerlinde’s email
         Don’t throw things away. In note, don’t just raise concerns, but give more details and possibly suggested rewrites. Leave ability for updates to be rejected. Comments are very useful. For people who’ve been out of it for a bit, there needs to be easy way to catch up. Ansgar will work on inventory, picking up from something Adam had started. Will be place at top level of Google drive, shared to mailing list
   
9. **Updated Outline Discussion**
   
   i. Requirements
      Call earlier this week, 8 in attendance. There seems to be considerable energy coming out of the call. Subsections being worked on. Discussion of structure, goal of each section. Distinguish between what project does and doesn’t have control over (e.g., may not have control over organizational structure).
   
   ii. Stakeholder Identification
      Fairly complete (subteam feels done). Other sections should review Stakeholder ID, seems to be some other sections that may be inconsistent. Gerlinde or Ted (co-leads) should make 5/14 meeting
   
   iii. Risk and Impact Assessment
      Gerlinde or Allison (co-leads). Gerlinde feels informative at 85%, but ready for others to read to stay aligned
   
   iv. Representativeness of data
      Chris Howard, Gerlinde. Need to make sure we are clear that "representiveness of data" is not viewed as "data representation". Representativeness can come across as evaluation - adjusting this section to avoid overlap with evaluation. Considerable discussion on this topic. Several examples of how data being represented (or not represented) may impact evaluation, to capture how these sections are disjointed.
   
   v. Performance evaluation
      Julian. Subgroup had meeting with Gerlinde, worked out boundary between data representation and performance evaluation (needs some work, but becoming clearer). Also had similar meeting with stakeholder ID subgroup (Gerlinde). Learning more about what needs to be done on alignment with these sections, and other sections - this will require
significant review and revision. Content is perhaps 90% there, becoming coherent. Ansgar asked if any particular support was needed? Julian thinks that much of this can happen at 5/14 meeting. 1-1 subgroup meetings have been helpful, would be particularly valuable with requirements

vi. Taxonomy ⟷ propose new name for this section
There is concern about a lack of consensus in working on this section, and a lack of clarity in what needs to be done. Perhaps a meeting needed on this section. Ansgar will plan discussion of this for 5/14 meeting. It was conceived of as informative section, background on what algorithmic bias means. Alternate perspective is that this taxonomy should be guiding the P7000 series standards, it is to guide the standards development rather than informative for standards users

   Suggestion: Poll to pick time for 5/14 meeting for this discussion

vii. Legal frameworks
Largely complete but may need to be revisited in light of recent AI legislation

viii. Human Factors
Need to review if current form matches rest of standard.

ix. Cultural aspects
Making good progress. Clare (via email) updated that they are on their final edit and read through.

Need to get people to review other sections to understand how they relate to what people are working on. Representation and evaluation need to be discussed together, to ensure these work together well. Plan a joint working group for 5/14 meeting.

10. Any Other Business
Randy shared slide on high-level view of bias that captures several issues, came up in conversation of mitigating bias. Discussion of how we can get good visual aids for our document

11. Future Meetings
- Friday 14\textsuperscript{th} May 2021 – all day meeting 0700 – 2100 UTC
- Thursday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 2021 @ 0500 UTC
- Need to get feedback on scheduling for times of meetings post June.

12. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 22:32 UTC
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