

**IEEE P7003 Working Group  
Meeting Agenda  
6<sup>th</sup> April 2023 / 20:00 PM UTC – 22:00 PM UTC  
Teleconference**

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 20:04UTC

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

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

**3. Approval of April Agenda**

***Motion to approve the agenda for 6<sup>th</sup> April 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> March meeting minutes**

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

**8. Issues Resolution**

I. Review issues log for committee resolution

Issue 7 has been left open so we can look at definitions again later.

Issue 9, we will use that space to collect suggestions for standards on data quality that we want to consult

Issue 12, WG members changing content that has been voted on – going forward

Liz will make voted sections read only in iMeet so only admins can change them

Status of other issues has been updated on the spreadsheet

[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).

**9. Structural review of P7003 work**

I. Status of March vote

- Both votes were approved, no one voted against.
- II. Next section up for vote  
Data rep was open for WG wide review for the last month, so now we can do a line edit with a small editing team. Who would like to be on the team? Rahaf, Andrej, Julian, Firdaus, Roisin. Please confirm to Gerlinde your intent to do this. Then it can go through WG again and over to vote.
  - III. Review of Evaluation Section  
Design documentation is an input, need to discuss where this would come from. Suggest that it is an external document that needs to be supplied to the bias consideration process – can give guidance as to what it should include. Initial work on a design section early in the standard process was decided that it was not needed.  
Some of the pieces in this work are more appropriate in the requirements section. In this part can also put the requirements for a design document, but we don't want to lock people into one particular process with design.  
Open for everyone to look at in the Google drive, anything that needs changing please do suggested editing in the text and add a comment to say why that change has been made and is needed. Next month will go into small group line editing, then WG review then vote.
  - IV. Data Representation Section editing  
As II

## **10. Updated Outline Discussion**

- i. Requirements  
No official update but they have been making progress
- ii. Conceptualizing Algorithmic Bias  
Pablo has done a new outline based on the work already done – is anyone interested in joining the team to help out? This is a highly important section.
- iii. Committee discussion on finalizing Informative Annex sections that are in draft:
  - Legal Frameworks
  - Human Factors
  - Cultural Aspects

These are all in draft and are not necessarily specific to the information that people would need in using the standard and specific focus on bias. Legal frameworks to be added to issues list as it no longer has a leader. They all need revisiting to focus down onto the contents of the standard.

## **11. Any Other Business**

Use cases – a couple of months ago a use case was presented to Ansgar and Gerlinde on the importance of stakeholders in creating chatbots for rural healthcare. Should we include use cases in our standard to illustrate sections. Could invite Ray Bond to a future call to give an overview of it. There is some concern about the impact on the timeline, and how it would work, whether we would follow one through each section or have a specific section for use cases. It would be a good idea to take the standard through an example to see how practicable it is. Tabled for the moment but add to the issues list.

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

Based on a poll, 15:00-17:00 UTC is the best time for the next calls.

- Thursday May 4<sup>th</sup> 15:00 to 17:00 UTC
- Thursday June 1<sup>st</sup> 15:00 to 17:00 UTC

### 13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 21:28 UTC

#### Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Employer/Affiliation	Voting
Ahmad	Firdaus	Independent	
Albalkhi	Rahaf	Independent	X
Clifton	Chris	Purdue University	X
Courtney	Patrick	tec-connection	X
Dowthwaite	Liz	University of Nottingham	X
Dymond	Jesslyn	Independent	
Fajardo	Andrej	LAMIC Research Group	X
Hagar	Jon	Independent	X
Kumar	Aditesh	Independent	
Loughran	Roisin	Dundalk Institute of Technology	X
Meza	Jose	Independent	
Padget	Julian	University of Bath	X
Pena	Abel	Code Explorers Worldwide	X
Percivall	George	Spatial Web Foundation	
Weger	Gerlinde	Independent	X
Bahn	Christy	IEEE Staff	