

**IEEE P7003 Working Group  
Meeting Minutes  
2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 / 18:00 PM UTC – 20:00 PM UTC  
Teleconference**

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 18:04.

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

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

**3. Approval of March Agenda**

***Motion to approve the agenda for 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 meeting.*** The motion was 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. [IEEE SA Copyright](#)**

The copyright policy was presented.

**6. [Participant Behaviour](#)**

The participant behaviour slides were presented.

**7. Approval of 2<sup>nd</sup> February meeting minutes**

***Motion to approve the minutes from the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023 meeting.*** The motion to approve the minutes from the February meeting was approved.

**8. Structural review of P7003 work**

I. Status of February vote

The vote did not go ahead as hoped, will vote on stakeholder ID this month instead. The content is complete so the working committee are asked to review this section and vote on accepting it. Risk and Impact also up for vote this month. Note that you must be a voting member to vote through myProject. Voting members are those that have attended at least two out of the prior four working group meetings.

II. March vote

***Motion to put Stakeholder ID section into the full draft of the standard.***  
The motion was approved. This will go out first for approximately 10 days.

**Motion to put Risk and Impact Assessment into the full draft of the standard.** The motion was approved. This will follow the first vote after a brief gap.

Links to both sections to be sent to Christy to open the vote.

Clean version of master document is in iMeet. Content for section drafts are in Google Drive, once there is a finished clean version of each section this will be moved into iMeet for review and voting on by the group.

III. Review of Data Representation Section

The clean document is accessible in iMeet – review documents in the Google docs file,

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/16yaRIgFKuM5WSsCjfRBbsrajYPhNVGAggX12KPFF068/edit#heading=h.bwy01x3uyy5d>

*Do not add comments suggesting edits, make the edits directly and then add a comment about why it is needed/an improvement.*

This version is significantly shorter than it has been.

Starts with glossary to collate for whole standard.

A lot of this section is about mapping data to impacted stakeholders that have already been identified.

Ran through completed document in iMeet.

Q: Business case is left open to be defined by users of standard

Q: stakeholder persona covered in stakeholder ID

IV. Confirmation of next section to be reviewed.

Suggestion that Evaluation section is reviewed next and revisit data representation.

## 9. Issues Resolution

I. Review issues log for committee resolution

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1zSpa6CudF1XvC9\\_p5wozM3uBsiUIEJD u/edit?usp=sharing&oid=103424764539432327806&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1zSpa6CudF1XvC9_p5wozM3uBsiUIEJD u/edit?usp=sharing&oid=103424764539432327806&rtpof=true&sd=true)

1. Do we need to make the point that should ensure that data is lawful? The requirement for Standards not to refer to legal statements also applies to IEEE so as not to confuse people that complying to standard means being compliant with the law – it is always additional to the standard. Resolved.
2. In principle narrowing the scope is fine as this is being done anyway at the moment. Resolved.
3. AIS to be used throughout. Resolved.
4. Resolved
5. Attribute is acceptable term, not feature or characteristic: “property or characteristic of an object that can be distinguished quantitatively or qualitatively by human or automated means” – value of an attribute (eg woman is a value of gender) – value may be confusing as to ‘human values’ vs ‘data value’ – in context will be clear what value is meant. Resolved.
6. Currently metadata – provenance may be part of the metadata, but may also potentially go beyond that. Suggestion that we say in requirements that it is expected to have the provenance and metadata. Include in order to highlight provenance as a point but keep the title as metadata. Resolved.
7. Do sensitive and protected have different definitions? Are they in different areas of law? Suggestion that protected attitudes is more of a natural choice

in reference to discrimination law. For non-lawyers sensitive may give the sense that it is attributes that people might have concerns about whether or not they are protected by law, whereas protected is more directly legal. Needs clarifying within our definitions.

## **10. Updated Outline Discussion**

### **i. Requirements**

Small group working on this, reviewed and simplified the content in terms of structure. Many of the subsections can be considered inputs or outputs, so the core of the section will focus around defining the acceptable bias profile. Work identifies what the current bias profile is – requirements says given the different relevant attributes here's the red line to assess the bias profile – and if it crosses the line it needs to be mitigated. Weekly call, open to join.

### **ii. Conceptualizing Algorithmic Bias**

Hope to kickstart this in this month ahead.

### **iii. Committee discussion on finalizing Informative Annex sections that are in draft:**

#### **- Legal Frameworks**

Needs to be revisited, would anyone be able to look at the section and suggest a way forward? Needs to be pared down to the core issue that people coming into the standard will have – how are legal considerations different from bias considerations for a standard and how do we identify what is needed for the standard?

#### **- Human Factors**

Do we need this section? If we need to bring up questions of this can we instead refer to existing published standard? At the moment it is quite academic, and review team asked to what extent this is just a particular way of looking at it rather than a general overview and accepted approach. Needs further review. Once we have gone through normative then we can come back and see what parts we might still need. Some might potentially go into cultural aspects.

#### **- Cultural Aspects**

Also needs to be reviewed again. Still some to add on disability. Important when reviewing standard that we make sure to mention cultural considerations from time to time. Check at end to make sure it supports the whole standard.

## **11. Any Other Business**

There will be a TEMPL workshop at the TransAI conference in late September. The inaugural Trustworthy and Ethical Machine Learning workshop was last year, very reasonable attendance. [www.transai.org](http://www.transai.org)

## **12. Dates/times for Future Meetings**

- Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> April @ 2000 UTC - Easter
- May and June – A doodle poll has been sent out to identify the most popular times to have meetings and to be most inclusive.  
<https://doodle.com/meeting/participate/id/bk2Ej3xa>

## **13. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 19:41 UTC

**Attendees:**

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Employer/Affiliation</b>	<b>Voting</b>
Aich	Anupam	Leica Biosystems	
Albalkhi	Rahaf	Independent	X
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Courtney	Patrick	tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Fajardo	Andrej	LAMIC Research Group	
James	Clare	Independent	X
Koene	Ansgar	EY and University of Nottingham	X
Kumar	Aditesh	Independent	
Leppali	Jussi	Valmet	
Loughran	Roisin	Dundalk Institute of Technology	X
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide	X
Rivas	Pablo	Baylor University	
Szczekocka	Ewelina	Independent	X
Weger	Gerlinde	Independent	X
Bahn	Christy	IEEE Staff	