

Agenda and Meeting Record

Who	W3C Credible Web CG
When	10 December 2019 1pm ET
Video	https://zoom.us/j/706868147 Please try to be on camera
Telephone	+1 669 900 6833 or any dialin , code 706 868 147
Chair	Sandro Hawke
Scribe	Jesse Kranzler
Present	Listed in “Introductions” below
At Risk	
Regrets	

1. Introductions

Please put your name (affiliation) here. Extra information and links welcome.

1. Sandro Hawke (W3C/MIT, HawkeWorks).
2. Jesse Kranzler (Trust Metrics)
3. Scott Yates (CCC, JTI)
4. Connie Moon Sehat (CredCo, NewsQ)
5. Owen Ambur (ConnectedCommunity.net) joined late
6. Sam Klein (KFG) joined late

2. Select scribe

3. Announcements

Review [Section 8 for next week](#)

Review [Aviv's Doc for next week](#)

Then we're off until 2020.

JTI is on target to publish documents (questionnaire, annex) next Wednesday (18 Dec)

4. Discussion: NewsQ Signals

Continued from [Last Week](https://credweb.org/signals-beta/#newsq-highlight). <https://credweb.org/signals-beta/#newsq-highlight>

See [Group Editing Experiment: Signal Assessment](#)

Walking through Group Editing Experiment as a group to see if there is consensus among the group present. Went through two specific NewsQ signals but found the time more useful walking through and refining the 8 categories of signal assessment.

PASTE from group editing experiment:

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is relatively Easy to understand, if definition rephrased
The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is not relatively Easy for humans to measure, because it needs machine processing

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is not relatively Easy for machines to measure, because it needs humans.

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is relatively Commercially available, with slightly different output (numerical rather than categorical).

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is relatively Composite.

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is relatively Hard to Game, because it's secret formula and multifactor.

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is not relatively Interoperable, because of secret formula.

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is (not) relatively Promising.

The NewsQ "Advertiser Safety" signal is relatively Linked to Accuracy, according to Trust Metrics maybe, because they focus on per-advertiser.

[Article Attribution](https://credweb.org/signals-beta/#article-attribution): <https://credweb.org/signals-beta/#article-attribution>

Definition: Describes the ratio of articles that contain proper attribution to the number of total articles analyzed. "Attribution" in this signal is defined by articles that contain an author's full name rather than an anonymous admin (or publisher name or writer's first name). Expected

Output: Ratio of (number of properly attributed articles) / (number of total articles analyzed, removing exclusions mentioned above). Sites that do not contain any articles are given a NULL (Insufficient Data) output.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is relatively Easy to understand, with a little rephrasing.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is relatively Easy for humans to measure, relative to the number of articles sampled.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is (not) relatively Easy for machines to measure, but only for sites with suitable structured markup, maybe.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is not relatively Commercially available, although Trust Metrics has it internally.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is not relatively Composite.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is not relatively Hard to Game.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is relatively Interoperable, if defined a little more clearly, like around how you find/sample the articles of the site, and current vs archival articles.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is not relatively Promising, because it's easy to game.

The NewsQ "Article Attribution" signal is (not) relatively Linked to Accuracy.

- Evaluated in peer-reviewed published study, "Scientifically evaluated", "Evaluated by Third Party", "Evaluated in published study".
- Commercially available - filled out by provider
- Not applicable vs don't answer -- means something.
- Interoperability == COULD BE commercially available from multiple independent sources
- Generated by Humans / Machines / Hybrid --- Can it be done without ongoing human effort per sample. Less than a penny vs more than a dollar. Price now vs projected. Expected to be scalable / cheap.

Easy to understand. NAH.

Easy for humans to measure. NAH

Easy for machines to measure. => Expected to be scalable

Commercially available => Currently Available (DownloadLink / FeedLink / Term; maybe - Availability Announced NAH)

Composite.

Hard to Game.

Interoperable.

Promising. NOT USEFUL YET

Linked to Accuracy. => Evaluated in study

5. Adjourn

6. Post-Meeting Discussion Notes

So, revising Suitability categories to:

- Currently Available
- Interoperable
- Expected to be scalable
- Composite
- Hard to game

- Evaluated in published study