**IEEE P7011 Working Group**

**Standard for the Process of Identifying and Rating the Trustworthiness of News Sources**

**Meeting Minutes December 20, 2019**

1. **Call to order.**
2. **Roll call of individuals**.
3. **Agenda approved without objections**.
4. IEEE Patent policy identified. No attendees expressed concerns or conflicts with patents
5. The Secretary presented IEEE copyright policy. No attendees expressed concerns or conflicts with existing copyrights.
6. Update from P70xx Berlin Writing Sessions: The Chair reviewed the Berlin Writing sessions. Several P70xx working groups were present. The working groups were in various states of developing standards from early in the process to finalizing their standard. P7011 is in the middle of the pack, relative to all P70xx standards. Our working group got feedback from IEEE editors and other members of P70xx working groups. P7011 members also provided feedback to other working groups. The Chair proceeded to review the current working draft P7011\_d1.
	1. Chair acknowledged a takeaway from Berlin: What we are trying to accomplish is not impossible.
	2. The scope and purpose was refined.
	3. Glossary was updated.
	4. Section 4 was further developed in Berlin and reviewed.
	5. We’re not always looking at a purveyor in isolation but looking at them in the context of the environment they are operating in. So, it’s not a single news story or source; understanding trustworthiness within the context of the publication’s world and not in isolation. It will be the rare occasion that one reporter is the sole source for any piece of news. So, looking at reputation over a period of time and not a specific article. Look at the context of the publisher and adjacent peers in the environment.
	6. For article review, we focused on a proper sample set: 35 articles with a PE of less than .01. If anyone has a love of statistics, we would like someone to expound on the statistical assumptions.
	7. Classification of news items not under review; four major classes: paid content, opinion, satire, press releases (see section 5.1).
	8. Fact checking: look to existing tools out there, especially, the international fact checking network.

Comments

i) Members should read through the current draft stored on Google and comment.

ii) Members question the most current version: d1.

iii) We should share the draft with IPTC (International Press Telecommunications Council), which is trying to coordinate efforts among groups.

iv) The proper way to share with IPTC is to have a liaison attend our meeting and review and comment on the draft. It’s against IEEE policy to share a draft with the public.

1. P7011 documents to comment and edit are available on Google Docs. The executive team can edit and comment on the current draft d1 on Google, and all working group members can review and comment. Contact the Secretary (sean.laroque-doherty@ieee.org) to access the document on Google.
2. Allocating clauses (sections) of the draft standard to subgroups.
	1. The draft is now in a high-level outline and now it’s a matter of building the statements to the draft to inform an adopter what it **shall** do to be compliant with the standard.
	2. Are there any volunteers to coordinate the subgroups and content?
		1. Alastair: bias of language, section 4.5.
		2. Peter: news item selection, section 4.4.
		3. Nick: section 5.3 factual statements.
		4. Technical editor: the Secretary volunteered, along with the section on dispute resolution.
		5. Cordell: section 4.1, change the parenthetical bullet points to actual standard language.

Comments:

i) We can go through the subgroups and match or assign sections or we can start from scratch with the outline and have individuals tackle sections, but it may be best to have a small group.

ii) Focus on sections 4 and 5 and delay section 6.

iii) Section 4 is the meat of it. How does the standard work. Section 5 is how to take the information and make a score. And Section 6, how to display the score. So start with 4 and 5.

iv) Send out a call to the working group’s original mailing list, catch them up with what has happened, and ask for volunteers.

v) If individuals have an interest in any section, take charge of it and provide content for review. Don’t feel you have to do it in committee. Just let us (executive team) know.

**vi) Drafting language should tell adopters what they shall do to be on compliance not what they should or may do.**

viii) Do not get hung up on proper language. We will review and comment and the draft will go to IEEE editors for review.

1. Action items:
	1. Acknowledge the volunteers and their sections in the document.
	2. Make the document available to all members on the call.
2. New business.
	1. JTI update: The JTI is published and done ahead of schedule. The Plenary for publication generally went smoothly. The biggest change at the final Plenary: there was a requirement at 8.1 regarding disclosure of income by the media outlet (shall provide percentages of revenue by category); now it reads the outlet must state the categories of revenue and the order of their size (compare the order of ingredients on a food label) -- numbers or percentages are not required but allowed (should).
	2. Beware of using JTI compliant since it remains an application process as to what is compliant with the JTI.

Comments:

i) Perhaps use “JTI consistent” instead of “JTI compliant.”

1. The meeting was adjourned without objection.