# IEEE P7000 Working Group Meeting
# Draft Agenda (Day One)
# 25 September 2017 / 9:00 A.M. – 5:00 P.M. UTC
# Location: Austrian Standards/ Meeting Room: Hall 1008

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 9:01 AM.

2. **Roll call and Disclosure of Affiliation**
   Members present introduced themselves and those present via phone-only, stated their name and affiliation. The list of attendees is attached. A quorum was not achieved and noted.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Due to lack of quorum, the agenda could not be approved. John reviewed what the group was going to work on and discuss on day one of the meeting.

4. **IEEE Patent Policy: Call for Patents**
   The call for patents was raised. There were no issues.

5. **Approval of 19 April 2017 Meeting Minutes**
   Due to lack of quorum, the April meeting minutes could not be approved.

6. **Introductory Discussion**
   a. **What have we done so far?**

   Sarah noted the group officially started in September. We collected requirements for (and expectations on) the P7000 standard for eight months through Working Group calls, sub-committee calls, iMeet, e-mails, Working Group member presentations, expert presentations, surveys, etc.

   A zero draft was created and improved. A draft D1 was circulated at the beginning of July 2017 and feedback was collected through iMeet.

**b. Small Workshop to understand the 3 processes in Draft vs1**
Present participants ran through an example for the 3 processes currently drafted in P7000 using the example of a GPS bracelet for kits. It became clear that the process identifies harms and benefits first with the help of the three philosophical approaches (Utilitarianism, Deontological Analysis and Virtue ethics). It then abstracts to identify relevant values for a value proposition and for risk analysis. It was agreed that figure 1 must be enhanced to be more comprehensible and include the 3 philosophical approaches. It will evolve as P7000 evolves..

**c. Joint Review of the PAR and its alignment with Draft vs 1**
It was felt that the current draft Version 1 (D1) is aligned with the PAR requirements. Carolyn Nguyen suggested that we call the standard a "governance framework". It was then discussed whether P7000 should only propose a process perspective as currently outlined in the PAR, or also include a number of baseline values (called "buckets" during the discussion) that any user should adhere to (for example, privacy, quality, sustainability, safety, any human rights standards, etc.). There was a strong need to have a subgroup leading this discussion moving forward.

**d. Grand Challenges Discussion**
Sarah asked the group to contribute towards listing areas that are grand challenges and the subgroups to work on the "grand challenges".

7. **Section 1 Review**

It was noted that we should note the difference between P7000 principles as opposed to corporate principles or values an organization already has in place.

- The WG needs a subgroup on value conflict resolution. Takashi brought up ITUT 3013 – Social economic assessment of future network by Tussle Analysis. The University of Zurich heads it. The document is public. He will share it with the group in iMeet.

- Carolyn outlined how we should be framing the need for context in ethical reasoning. It was problematized that careful wording is needed to delineate what we mean by context or some kind of "use case" needed to run through ethical analysis.

- Carolyn and others outlined that P7000 should use the word "ethical" all the time, but "value based" design; avoid "moral" language in the standard.

- Noah raised the issue to have "schemas". These are clear and transparent forms of documenting the processes lived through. A respective subgroup was decided on.

- It was noted that figure 2 should be improved and it should be pulled out more where P7000 fits into the larger system engineering landscape.

- The WG agreed that value qualities into which values can be broken down into are actually what engineers would call "System Level Requirements". The term "System Level Value Quality Requirements" was adopted to move forward. Ali brought this wording to the group and outlined how System Level Value Quality Requirements are used to determine "Value based System Design Specifications".

- The WG discussed whether ALL System Level Value Requirements would need to be run through a complete risk assessment and we agreed that this should not be the case to not overburden companies. The WG saw the need for a decision rule that determines what system level value requirements go to risk assessment and which do not and for those that do not we would need to find an alternative design process.

- The WG had a discussion how we can ensure that organizations don't build weapons with P7000 and we said that it must be explicit that this standard is used to guarantee the long-term well-being of people. On the 2nd day the WG came back to this discussion and the feeling was that P7000 could also be used by military companies and should not limit any organization from utilizing it overall.

- The WG discussed the need for some context and/or use-case to run through ethical analysis and there was consensus in the group that this context is needed, but wording needs to be improved in draft 1.

- The desire to put some guiding questions into the introduction was expressed.

- There was agreement that 1.1 Scope of the draft may need to be updated later in line with what will be developed.


8. **Section 2, 3 and 4**


9. **Sections 5.1-5.3 (including intro to Section 5)**


10. **Recess**

# IEEE P7000 Working Group Meeting
# Draft Agenda (Day Two)
# 26 September 2017 / 9:00 A.M. – 5:00 P.M. UTC
# Vienna University of Economics and Business, Welthandelsplatz 1;
# Building D2 / Second Floor, Meeting Room: TBD

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order at 9:25 AM

2. **Roll call and Disclosure of Affiliation**
   The list of attendees is attached

3. **Discussion of how to move forward, create process and transparency**
   The WG decided to have subgroups working in parallel and in sequence. A plan was developed on how this could work. More details on this will follow.

4. **Remainder Section 5 discussion**

   - The group reviewed the discussion points and grand issues from Day 1 of the meeting and continued the discussion on Section 5 of the draft.

   - Annette noted that defense companies are aware of design ethics and could use this standard. This standard could be applied to all people in different situations. We don't know how it will be applied.

   - Sarah mentioned the importance of having an editing team to address the comments received in iMeet. Noah and Sanja would like to be a part of the team.

   - John noted the "grand challenges", which are the subgroups are going to be mapped to the sections of the draft.

   - In section 5.2 Sarah noted refinement in this section is needed as well as section 5.6.

   - In the context of figure 2 it was discussed that we need a subgroup for operations and iterations instead of having stages 5 to 10. The 'values' mentioned in the section should go to the subgroup of baseline values/hygiene factors.

- When it came to sections 5.5 and 5.6 Annette & Ali pointed that this section should be overhauled with drawing a better line between the front part of the standard and the annex. We should not have 'educational' information in the front. Distinction between normative/formative content was mentioned.

## 5. Section 6&7

- The question came up of how principles would appear in a compliance document. The principle of well-being might be considered.

- Human rights were discussed and the question how human rights could enter the standard. As part of principles? As part of baseline values?

- A subgroup for roles, responsibilities and stakeholder management was formed.

## 6. Sections 8-12 and Annex

- Section 8:

  Carolyn argued that we should be speaking about "observability" that seems to be an alternative (or even better?) term for "controllability". A subgroup on controllability/observability was established.

- Section 9: The subgroup on value conflict resolution will need to overhaul this section.

- Section 9.3 will be addressed with the subgroup if there are any issues.

- Section 10: This section was not discussed however on the first day of the meeting, it was agreed that there must be criteria for deciding what system level value quality requirements must go to a full risk assessment.

- John noted that the WG needs to approve the subgroups and their scopes. Subgroups need to have deliverables.

## 7. Next Steps Discussion

- Plan for moving ahead: Noah and Sanja would create a new draft vs. 2 based on all comments received in time AND for comments that were agreed on during the meeting in Vienna. More detailed information will follow in a few weeks after the meeting.

## 8. New Business

## 9. Next Meeting
3 November, 2017 / 9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M. (EDT)

**10. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 P.M.

*Day One Attendance:*

| Last Name | First Name | Employer/Affiliation | Voting |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boddington | Paula | University of Oxford | x |
| Brodbeck | Noah | Self | x |
| Di Maio | Paula | Systemica | x |
| Egawa | Takashi | NEC Corporation | x |
| Gillespie | Tony | Robotics and Automation | x |
| Glamocanin | Vlastimir | Saints Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje | x |
| Gray | Lewis | Abelia Corporation | x |
| Hailey | Victoria | VHG-The Victoria Hailey Group Corporation | x |
| Hassami | Ali | Vega Systems-UK | x |
| Havens (Chair) | John | The Global Initiative for Ethical Considerations in the Design of Autonomous Systems | x |
| Jackson | Angela | Consultant | x |
| Nguyen | Carolyn | Microsoft | x |
| Raghavan | Sridhar | Independent | x |
| Reilly | Annette | Unaffiliated | x |
| Rizzo | Gabriele | Leonardo Company | |
| Salah | Dina | Sadat Academy for Management Science | x |
| Spiekermann (Vice-Chair) | Sarah | Vienna University of Economics and Business | x |
| Underwood | Mark | Krypton Brothers | x |
| Veleva | Sanja | Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technologies Ss.Cyril and Methodius University-Skopje | |
| Winkler | Till | Vienna University of Economics and Business | x |
| Zgrzebnicki | Pawel | University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland. | |
| Bahn | Christy | P7000 Secretariat /IEEE-SA (staff) | |

*Guests:*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brand | Hermann | IEEE Technology Centre GmbH |
| Karachalios | Konstantinos | IEEE-SA |
| Neppel | Clara | IEEE Technology Centre GmbH |

*Day Two Attendance:*

| Last Name | First Name | Employer/Affiliation | Voting |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abandoh-Sam | Joseph | Valleyview University | |
| Brodbeck | Noah | Self | x |
| Cath | Corinne | ARTICLE 19 & University of Oxford | x |
| Daine | Ashwin | Independent | x |
| Di Maio | Paula | Systemica | x |
| Egawa | Takashi | NEC Corporation | x |
| Gillespie | Tony | Robotics and Automation | x |
| Gray | Lewis | Abelia Corporation | x |
| Hailey | Victoria | VHG-The Victoria Hailey Group Corporation | x |
| Hassami | Ali | Vega Systems-UK | x |
| Havens (Chair) | John | The Global Initiative for Ethical Considerations in the Design of Autonomous Systems | x |
| Jackson | Angela | Consultant | x |
| Kienast | Edmund | Australian Digital Health Agency | |
| Nguyen | Carolyn | Microsoft | x |
| Reilly | Annette | Unaffiliated | x |
| Rizzo | Gabriele | Leonardo Company | |
| Salah | Dina | Sadat Academy for Management Science | x |
| Spiekermann (Vice-Chair) | Sarah | Vienna University of Economics and Business | x |
| Underwood | Mark | Krypton Brothers | x |
| Veleva | Sanja | Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technologies Ss.Cyril and Methodius University-Skopje | |
| Winkler | Till | Vienna University of Economics and Business | x |
| Zgrzebnicki | Pawel | University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland. | |
| Bahn | Christy | P7000 Secretariat /IEEE-SA (staff) | |