

IEEE P7011 Working Group Standard for the Process of Identifying and Rating the Trustworthiness of News Sources

Meeting Minutes

October 26, 2018

Start: 10:00 (EDT)

End: 11:30 (EDT)

Location: <http://join.me/P7011.josh>

Working Group Officers presiding:

Josh Hyman, Chair

Sean La Roque-Doherty, Secretary

Minutes recorded by the Secretary

1. Call to order (10:05 EDT)

WG Chair called the meeting to order.

Remarks: New members email your contact information to the chair.

2. Roll call of individuals and Declaration of Affiliation

Jonathan Feinstein, no affiliation, Voting Member (VM)

Alessandro Flammini, Indiana University

Angela Gunn, BAE Systems, VM

Vicky Hailey, VHG (Victoria Hailey Group), VM

Sandro Hawke, W3C, VM

John Johnson, Aligned Security, VM

Christina Ma, Carnegie Mellon University

Jilliene McKinstry, Gonzaga University

Andres Rodrigues, ITBA, VM

Scott Yates, Content Coalition, VM

3. Approval of agenda

La Roque: Moved to approve agenda.

Gunn: Seconded.

There were no objections.

The agenda was approved.

4. Patent identification

Chair made a call for patents. If there are any patent concerns, reach out to the Chair.

[No responses.]

5. Other initiatives/groups working on news trustworthiness

Discussion on other projects and groups dealing with the trustworthiness of news per the document:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vWE3iOn6yxUsRJyS_mks83m0Gwv_7cK0WtVt-SNsYzY/edit?usp=sharing

"https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vWE3iOn6yxUsRJyS_mks83m0Gwv_7cK0WtVt-SNsYzY/edit?usp=sharing"

Introductory remarks: The spreadsheet is a joint effort that first came together at a face-to-face meeting of the W3C group. Scroll down under the list of projects and organizations to view the list mapped in quadrants according to whether their strategy to determine news trustworthiness is theoretical or practical and whether the strategy is content or a delivery mechanism.

Comment: A good thing to add to the analysis is whether the project is a technology or a human driven solution.

Comment: I would like to see some description of open vs. closed.

Summary: The WG needs to gauge the willingness of these organizations to participate in developing the IEEE standard. Before the WG does that, it needs to be clearer on the scope of the project to ask other groups to participate in the process. A Draft Scope is in the WG subgroup Scope of the Standard. The subgroup should meet as soon as possible to further develop the draft to a document the full WG can review.

Action Items:

- 1. Create a new subgroup Related Projects and Organizations.**
- 2. Add members who volunteered at this meeting to the subgroup.**
- 3. Add the list of other projects and organizations to iMeet in the new subgroup folder for documents.**
- 4. The subgroup is charged to identify organizations to invite to the P7011 WG.**

6. Scope discussion

a. Draft a scope

The Chair shared a draft of a scope document at the meeting for discussion. The draft is stored in iMeet subgroup Scope/Documents: <https://ieee-sa.imeetcentral.com/p/aQAAAAADtchB.>

Comment: The Scope Draft is from the initial paper on this project: "[Addressing Fake News: Open Standards & Easy Identification](#)."

Introductory remarks on the draft: One item we've never decided on, but we've had a lot of discussion on: Who is covered under the standard? We talked about news purveyors being generally any kind of journalism on the internet to blog posts. This is something we need to decide.

Discussion: Who is covered by the standard and the scope of the standard, including who is a news purveyor.

Question: Whether the scope should be narrow, covering news purveyors vis-à-vis all news?

Question: Whether the standard is intended to be a conformity-based, certification-based, or advisory?

Comment: Identify stakeholders, such as news purveyors (e.g, CNN, BBC, ABC), technologists, user groups, etc. to become part of the process.

Comment: The Journalism Trust Initiative (JTI) and the Trust Project, are to organizations that have done much work towards identifying a standard.

Comment: It's possible to produce something Google can use; provide standardized data elements that describe a particular piece of news that make it easy to do things like verifying the source and producing a standardized, verifiable list of clean signals. But still leave the algorithmic choice of how those materials or the data is going to be used up to people who have algorithmic tools.

Comment: It might be an idea to start out simple. What is the terminology we can get consensus on. Standardization is the basis of terminology agreement. Every single standard has a basic definition in terms of the words it uses as the very foundation of it.

Comment: The document that Josh has proffered focuses on the scope subgroup, and terminology would go to another subgroup. It sounds like we have two or three action items from this discussion.

Action item: Call to members for participation in subgroups, and a call to subgroups to select a leader.

b. Focus on next steps

The Secretary volunteered to send out notices to the WG for subgroup participation and leadership volunteers and confirm the existing membership in subgroups.

7. Technical gurus / leaders needed

Not discussed.

8. Vacant officer positions

a. Vice Chair

Hailey nominated La Roque-Doherty.

Yates: Second.

There were no objections.

La Roque-Doherty is elected vice-chair.

9. New business

[No new business.]

10. Next meeting

Consensus for 1 pm, November 9.

11. Adjourn

The Chairman adjourned the meeting

JOIN.ME CHAT

Comment/Question 1:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vWE3iOn6yxUsRjyS_mks83m0Gwv_7cK0WtVt-SNsYzY/edit?usp=sharing

Comment/Question 2: Is this list on voluntary projects only?

Comment Question 3: <https://credweb.org/>

Comment/Question 4: And the report is at <https://credweb.org/report> :-)

Comment/Question 5: <https://botswatch.de/portfolio-item/landtagswahl-bayern-2018-wahlwoche/> to add on the list.

Comment/Question 6: <https://www.business-punk.com/2018/03/botswatch-analyse-fake-news/>

Comment/Question 7: wonder if it's worth mentioning all the Journalism-Code-of-Ethics projects? like http://ethicnet.uta.fi/codes_by_country

Comment/Question 8: If this is going to be a standard that news purveyors are maybe conforming to, they need to be at the table, buying in to the creation of the standard

Comment/Question 9: I like creating a standard. It can be as simple as income-generating vs not. Blogs, itunes, Facebook generate income. That is an area that traditional news organizations' ethics fail.

Comment/Question 10: I like that. Income generation tends to create a trail, too, which puts a parameter on the thing -- one-offs are a different category of thing.