

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

Meeting Minutes November 9, 2018

Meeting Location: join.me/P7011.josh

Start: 1:10 p.m. EST

End: 2:35 p.m. EST

Officers presiding:

Vice-Chair (VC), Secretary: Sean La Roque-Doherty

Minutes recorded by:

Secretary

Call to order

[The Join.me meeting place waited for the host. The audio portion of the meeting place was active. The video portion became active approximately 30 minutes into the meeting.]

VC called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. EST.

Roll call of individuals

Angela Gunn, BAE Systems but attending as an individual, VM

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, no affiliation, VM

Christina Ma, Carnegie Mellon U.

Dillon Bodenheimer, Penn State

Jonathan Feinstein, no affiliation, VM

Michael Martinez, IEEE Computer

Peter Reid, Reid Group, VM

Scott Yates, Content Coalition, VM

Vicky Hailey, VHG, VM

Approval of agenda

VC read the agenda.

Scott Yates motioned to approve.

Peter Reid seconded the motion.

With no objections, the agenda was approved.

Patent identification

VC made a call for patent claims.

[No response]

Scope of the Standard discussion

Scott Yates introduced the Scope of the Standard, draft 2, reported from the Scope of the Standard subgroup. The document was uploaded to the Documents folder of the Scope of the Standard subgroup.

<https://ieeesa-meetcentral.com/p/aQAAAAADt16s>

Introductory comments

The scope document does not address all the news. If the standard attempts to address all news, the WG will never produce a standard. This draft has a tight focus for the WG to reach out to other organizations and invite them to join our effort per the meeting of Oct. 26. The first line of the document, repeats the earlier draft: "Increase the notion that 'standards in news' is a good thing." Because, standards in news is not a widely accepted concept. The Scope of the Standard Subgroup agreed to proceed with the following "standards" to include in the scope:

- Transparency of ownership/control.
- Transparency of editorial controls.
- Use of metadata (e.g. schema.org, IPTC metadata for photos, ads.txt, etc.)

The standard's target audience for adoption: any URL owner that is publishing and wants to follow the standard.

If the standards are universal in nature, we will get good adoption among publishers. Then the platforms, researchers, academics, and anyone who wants to use the standard as a signal will follow.

Potential future measures that are outside the scope of this group now, but may be in the future:

- Truthfulness of any individual article.
- Headline and article agreement.
- Labeling of bias, opinion, entertainment or other aspects related to the question of what news is.
- Public-facing recommendations as to the veracity of any individual article.

Although it would be good to solve the problems listed directly above, it would take us off track and not lend the standard to wide adoption.

Discussion

Question: Would the standard apply to an individual post or to the owner of the URL where the post is published?

Response: The owner of the base URL.

Comment: Start with standardizing core elements, get adoption, and add to the core elements over time.

Comment: That was the design of the scope. The standards elements comprise the core criteria and what we don't cover in this standard, we may consider later.

Comment: Regarding potential targets and users of the standard, I would like to see us deal with the standard in a broader way, instead of narrower, over time.

Comment: Each PAR (Project Approval Request) has only one standard, one document output, and one working group. If you look at multiple standards within this WG, then you need one PAR for each separate standard.

[Action Item: The Scope of the Draft version 2, change "standards" in "the standards that fall within the Scope of the Working Group" to "chapters" or other language (e.g., measures) to stay within one PAR, one standard.]

Comment: Once we get the core criteria of the standard, the next questions are what groups are doing this? What can this WG add to what's been done? What groups should we reach out to and liaison with?

Comment: Either we decide what terminology we need to decide the scope and what terminology we need to go forward or open another subgroup and have them focus on terminology.

[Action Item: The Secretary will create a new subgroup Terminology and solicit members for participation.]

Question: Is the subgroup still open to changing entities that will use the standard – now limited to URL owners? What about the individuals that will be originating or touching [editing] what is published online?

Discussion: Who will use the standard: URL owners, news purveyors, domain owner, and what to do with apps?

[Action Item: The subgroup Scope of the Standard will further discuss who is going to use the standard.]

Subgroup participation and leaders

VC announced that a list of subgroups and member participation was sent out prior to the meeting. The subgroups will accomplish much of the work toward the standard. The subgroup Scope of the Standard, Related Projects and Organizations, and Terminology have work to do based on this meeting and the previous meeting of October 26. Subgroups should meet or discuss on iMeet to select a leader.

[Members attending this meeting expressed their interest in subgroups via email. The Secretary recorded the interests.]

Comment: We need a call to participation to other groups and establish liaison status to formally and officially exchange information to make sure this WG is not overlapping or to share and coordinate information to reach a common goal.

[Action Item: Charge the subgroup Related Projects and Organizations to determine what groups or organizations the WG should liaison with and work with IEEE to structure and offer the formal relationship, which requires a contract dealing with patent claims, copyright, etc.]

[Action Item: Secretary to update the subgroup lists and members and resend via the list via email Reflector (listserv) in .xls or .csv to allow all members to view it. The Secretary will repeat the call for participation and leaders.]

Regular meeting times going forward.

VC suggested alternating meeting times at 9 a.m. and 9 p.m. Eastern time for all future meetings.

Discussion: Fridays are good days, but the 9 a.m. or 9 p.m. EST make it inconvenient. The 1 p.m. Eastern time is good for the US east and west coasts and Europe. Although it's 5 a.m. on the Australian east coast, it's Saturday, when there are fewer conflicts than other weekdays.

Comment: Take an inventory of the countries participating members are in and establish UTC times for meetings, when it is not the middle of the night for any member, for the WG to vote on.

[Action item: The Secretary will research mutually convenient UTC times for meetings based on member locations and report back to the WG at the next meeting.]

New business

VC called for new business.

[No response]

Next meeting?

December 7, 1 p.m. EST.

Adjourn

VC adjourned the meeting at 2:35 p.m. EST.