

**IEEE P7003 Working Group
Meeting Notes
7th October 2021 / 05:00 AM UTC – 7:00 AM UTC
Teleconference**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 05:06 UTC

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

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

3. Approval of October Agenda

No amendments to the agenda

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 July meeting minutes

No quorum

7. Announcements

- I. Result of “write-in” vote regarding proposed restructuring of the Taxonomy work
Ansgar working to put out an e-ballot regarding the proposal, because we need to get votes from a quorum of voting members, and they have not been on the call recently. It’s a fairly involved process so it hasn’t been sent out yet but will be as soon as possible. Questions regarding process or new thoughts regarding this? The intent is to deal with the question as to what exactly we want to have in the taxonomy section, whether it be a taxonomy section as such, how we deal with the material that was previously created that wasn’t exactly a taxonomy. The proposal is to take work previously created and use that as an informative section retitled e.g. understanding the causes of bias, because there is some interesting and useful material in that which will help users of the standard to better understand the inherent challenges that are related to formalizing problem statements into ways that algorithmic processes can deal with them, which will inherently introduce

some bias. The other part was more the definitions of the kinds of bias that is being referred to in the parts of the standard, for that part there is a question still open whether we should be pursuing an actual taxonomy or whether the definitions list that is required will be sufficient. Vote on two sections: understanding bias, and definitions list. What is the alternative to creating the understanding bias section? Would we drop the work completely and start again? That is an option but unpopular. What is the taxonomy of? – a taxonomy of the standard is not completely clear that it's needed. The group feel is that we should be focusing on 'what is bias'?

- II. IEEE 7000-2021 Standard addressing ethical concerns during system design has been published and can be viewed (free) at <https://engagestandards.ieee.org/ieee-7000-2021-for-systems-design-ethical-concerns.html>

Would be good for us to look at how it is written and structured to help us to develop our standard. Please take the time to look at it. It's the first standard of this type that has been published (7010 is a guide, more of an informative document than a direct normative standard).

8. Structural review of P7003 work

- I. Establishing channels for inter-meeting discussions on issues to drive forward development of the P7003 standard

The energy has become a bit low in the group, need to get participation back up and back on track creating content. We have good material already. This is still considered to be one of the most important topics around AI ethics, but we need to get our focus back and get back to pushing forward towards the finish line. We need to have a good way of having interactions between these monthly calls. Occasionally discussions start on the mailing list, but the mailing list is not intended for this; we should be using the iMeet discussion function but that's still very quiet. You need to separately request access to it, signing to the mailing list does not give you access. Either we need to find a way to get everyone to have access and interest in using it or we need a new channel for inter-session calls. Ideas for additional actions for re-energising the working group?

In the past we have submitted proposals for panels/workshops/papers, which got people more engaged. This is a parallel activity but uses the like-mindedness of the people in the WG in jointly thinking about these issues (cf copyright).

Shashidhara brought up whether there was enough in the standard about non-human bias and seems to focus on human user bias. Types of bias – are they relevant if the end-user is a person vs if the end-user is another system? Each section should consider if their bias also relates to feeding into subsystems. M S also has something on this idea. Perhaps this is something that could get people on each section thinking again.

Individual groups have been working well with small calls and separate emails, but the cross-group conversations don't really currently happen.

Action: Going forward, people to put forward the initial idea for discussion to the mailing list (e.g. a brief description of the problem or issue), and then ask people to move over to iMeet to discuss, providing a link to the conversation if possible.

Action: Please can everyone check they have access to iMeet (voting and non-voting members) and request access if not.

- II. Discussion on AI life cycle (and other) diagram(s)
We have been trying to present a visualisation of the different stages that you go through in creating and using AI systems as a way of helping to anchor the different bias concerns that are in the standard. Terminology of life cycle may not be the right terminology to use, do we have a clear alternative? A diagrammatic way of helping people to understand how to use the standard relative to how they are using and developing AI systems is felt to be needed. Life cycle tends to be used for software, there are other terms/ways of thinking for AI development. There is an informal group working on this, potentially we need a new subgroup for working on this. Randy started a discussion in iMeet - <https://ieeesa.imeetcentral.com/7003/folder/WzIwLDg2NjE1ODNd/WzIsODA3NzUwNDZd/>
- III. List of open items that require attention.
No new items added recently, some were addressed in the last call. Any additional items?

9. Updated Outline Discussion

- i. Requirements
No progress from Ansgar, has anyone else picked up on working on this again? Needs work to be re-energised here.
- ii. Stakeholder Identification
Effectively complete
- iii. Risk and Impact Assessment
Review underway
- iv. Data Representation
No update
- v. Performance evaluation
Regular meetings and adding their observations of different types of bias to the master document. They have reached a point where it is felt that it is ready but needs editing/reviewing. Currently analysing different types of bias from different sources to increase understanding and getting different viewpoints, but this is different from finalising the actual document text. Could be used for understanding bias section, to link to this section. Type of bias, qual/quant, can/how to measure, reflections. Definitely relevant to the understanding of the standard.
- vi. Taxonomy
As above
- vii. Legal frameworks
Effectively complete
- viii. Human Factors
Still needs reorganising and lots of editing. Potentially could be combined/complementary to an understanding of bias section. After e-ballot can consider integration with section or what else to do with it. Don't want to duplicate the work between the two sections
- ix. Cultural aspects

Effectively complete, been editing and so on but took a break over summer and will come back to it now.

10. Any Other Business

Hopefully by next meeting we will have established an effective way to have side discussions (through iMeet), especially on life cycle and remaining sections. There continues to be strong interest in having a standard for bias.

11. Proposed dates/times for Future Meetings

- Thursday 4th November 2021 @ 1300 UTC
- Thursday 2nd December 2021 @ 2100 UTC

12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 06:05 UTC

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Courtney	Patrick	tec-connection	X
Dongre	Shashidhara	L&T Technology Services	
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Koene	Ansgar	University of Nottingham	X
Leppala	Jussi	Valmet	X
Prasad	MS	Amity University, India	X
Szczekocka	Ewelina	Independent	X
Whitaker	Jessica	Howard University	X