

ERCIM



NEWS

www.ercim.eu



Special theme:

Transparency in Algorithmic Decision Making

*Research and Society:
Ethics in Research*

KEYNOTE

- 3 High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence**
by Sabine Theresia Köszegi (TU Wien)

RESEARCH AND SOCIETY

This section about “Ethics in research has been coordinated by Claude Kirchner (Inria) and James Larrus (EPFL)

- 4 Ethics in Research**
by Claude Kirchner (Inria) and James Larrus (EPFL)
- 5 How to Include Ethics in Machine Learning Research**
by Michele Loi and Markus Christen (University of Zurich)
- 6 Fostering Reproducible Research**
by Arnaud Legrand (Univ. Grenoble Alpes/CNRS/Inria)
- 7 Research Ethics and Integrity Training for Doctoral Candidates: Face-to-Face is Better!**
by Catherine Tessier (Université de Toulouse)
- 8 Efficient Accumulation of Scientific Knowledge, Research Waste and Accumulation Bias**
by Judith ter Schure (CWI)

SPECIAL THEME

The special theme “Transparency in Algorithmic Decision Making” has been coordinated by Andreas Rauber (TU Wien and SBA), Roberto Trasarti and Fosca Giannotti (ISTI-CNR).

Introduction to the special theme

- 10 Transparency in Algorithmic Decision Making**
by Andreas Rauber (TU Wien and SBA), Roberto Trasarti, Fosca Giannotti (ISTI-CNR)
- 12 The AI Black Box Explanation Problem**
by Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale and Dino Pedreschi (KDDLab, ISTI-CNR Pisa and University of Pisa)
- 14 About Deep Learning, Intuition and Thinking**
by Fabrizio Falchi, (ISTI-CNR)
- 15 Public Opinion and Algorithmic Bias**
by Alina Sirbu (University of Pisa), Fosca Giannotti (ISTI-CNR), Dino Pedreschi (University of Pisa) and János Kertész (Central European University)

- 16 Detecting Adversarial Inputs by Looking in the Black Box**
by Fabio Carrara, Fabrizio Falchi, Giuseppe Amato (ISTI-CNR), Rudy Becarelli and Roberto Caldelli (CNIT Research Unit at MICC – University of Florence)

- 18 Inspecting the Behaviour of Deep Learning Neural Networks**
by Alexander Dür, Peter Filzmoser (TU Wien) and Andreas Rauber (TU Wien and Secure Business Austria)

- 19 Personalisable Clinical Decision Support System**
by Tamara Müller and Pietro Lió (University of Cambridge)

- 20 Putting Trust First in the Translation of AI for Healthcare**
by Anirban Mukhopadhyay, David Kügler (TU Darmstadt), Andreas Bucher (University Hospital Frankfurt), Dieter Fellner (Fraunhofer IGD and TU Darmstadt) and Thomas Vogl (University Hospital Frankfurt)

- 22 Ethical and Legal Implications of AI Recruiting Software**
by Carmen Fernández and Alberto Fernández (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos)

- 23 Towards Increased Transparency in Digital Insurance**
by Ulrik Franke (RISE SICS)

- 25 INDICÆTING – Automatically Detecting, Extracting, and Correlating Cyber Threat Intelligence from Raw Computer Log Data**
by Max Landauer and Florian Skopik (Austrian Institute of Technology)

- 26 Why are Work Orders Scheduled too late? – A Practical Approach to Understand a Production Scheduler**
by Markus Berg (proALPHA) and Sebastian Velten (Fraunhofer ITWM)

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

This section features news about research activities and innovative developments from European research institutes

- 28 Using Augmented Reality for Radiological Incident Training**
by Santiago Maraggi, Joan Baixauli and Roderick McCall (LIST)
- 30 Building upon Modularity in Artificial Neural Networks**
by Zoltán Fazekas, Gábor Balázs, and Péter Gáspár (MTA SZTAKI)

- 32 BBTalk: An Online Service for Collaborative and Transparent Thesaurus Curation**
by Christos Georgis, George Bruseker and Eleni Tsouloucha (ICS-FORTH)

- 33 Understandable Deep Neural Networks for Predictive Maintenance in the Manufacturing Industry**
by Anahid N.Jalali, Alexander Schindler and Bernhard Haslhofer (Austrian Institute of Technology)

- 35 Is My Definition the Same as Yours?**
by Gerhard Chroust (Johannes Kepler University Linz) and Georg Neubauer (Austrian Institute of Technology)

- 36 Science2Society Project Unveils the Effective Use of Big Research Data Transfer**
by Ricard Munné Caldés (ATOS)

- 37 Informed Machine Learning for Industry**
by Christian Bauckhage, Daniel Schulz and Dirk Hecker (Fraunhofer IAIS)

ANNOUNCEMENTS, IN BRIEF

- 38 ERCIM Membership**
- 39 FM 2019: 23rd International Symposium on Formal Methods**
- 39 Dagstuhl Seminars and Perspectives Workshops**
- 40 ERCIM “Alain Bensoussan” Fellowship Programme**
- 41 POEMA - 15 Doctoral Student Positions Available**
- 42 HORIZON 2020 Project Management**
- 42 Cinderella’s Stick – A Fairy Tale for Digital Preservation**
- 42 Editorial Information**
- 43 CWI, EIT Digital, Spirit, and UPM launch Innovation Activity “G-Moji”**
- 43 New EU Project Data Market Services**
- 43 New W3C Web Experts Videos**
- 43 Celebrate the Web@30**

own, while it will have a low probability of interaction with opinions far from their own.

Simulations of the algorithmic bias model show several results that suggest that online platforms can have important effect on opinion formation and consensus in society. First, the number of opinion clusters grows when algorithmic bias grows (see illustration). This means that online platforms can favour fragmentation of opinions. Second, this leads also to polarisation, where the distance between the opinions of the people is larger compared to the situation without algorithmic bias. Third, the changes in opinion are much slower when the bias is in operation. Even when consensus is obtained, the

time to reach it becomes very long. In practice, this means that it could take years for people to agree on an issue, being in a highly fragmented state while this occurs.

These results bring important evidence that algorithmic bias may affect outcomes of public debates and consensus in society. Thus, we believe measures are required to at least stop its effects, if not reverse them. Researchers are investigating means of promoting consensus to counteract for the algorithmic bias effects. In the meantime, users could be informed of the way platforms feed information and the fact that this could affect their opinions, and maybe the mechanisms implemented by the platforms could be slowly withdrawn.

Reference:

- [1] Alina Sirbu, et al.: “Algorithmic bias amplifies opinion polarization: A bounded confidence model”, arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02111, 2018.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.02111>

Please contact:

Alina Sirbu,
University of Pisa, Italy
alina.sirbu@unipi.it

Detecting Adversarial Inputs by Looking in the Black Box

by Fabio Carrara, Fabrizio Falchi, Giuseppe Amato (ISTI-CNR), Rudy Becarelli and Roberto Caldelli (CNIT Research Unit at MICC – University of Florence)

The astonishing and cryptic effectiveness of Deep Neural Networks comes with the critical vulnerability to adversarial inputs — samples maliciously crafted to confuse and hinder machine learning models. Insights into the internal representations learned by deep models can help to explain their decisions and estimate their confidence, which can enable us to trace, characterise, and filter out adversarial attacks.

Machine learning and deep learning are pervading the application space in many directions. The ability of Deep Neural Network (DNN) to learn an optimised hierarchy of representations of the input has been proven in many sophisticated tasks, such as computer vision, natural language processing and automatic speech recognition. As a consequence, deep learning methodologies are increasingly tested in security- (e.g. malware detection, content moderation, biometric access control) and safety-aware (e.g. autonomous driving vehicles, medical diagnostics) applications in which their performance plays a critical role.

However, one of the main roadblocks to their adoption in these stringent contexts is the diffuse difficulty to ground the decision the model is taking. The phenomenon of adversarial inputs is a striking example of this problem. Adversarial inputs are carefully crafted samples (generated by an adversary —

thus the name) that look authentic to human inspection, but cause the targeted model to misbehave (see Figure 1). Although they resemble legitimate inputs, the high non-linearity of DNNs permits maliciously added perturbations to steer at will the decisions the model takes without being noticed. Moreover, the generation of these malicious samples does not require a complete knowledge of the attacked system and is often efficient. This exposes systems with machine learning technologies to potential security threats.

Many techniques for increasing the model’s robustness or removing the adversarial perturbations have been developed, but unfortunately, only a few provide effective countermeasures for specific attacks, while no or marginal mitigations exist for stronger attack models. Improving the explainability of models and getting deeper insights into their internals are fundamental steps toward effective defensive

mechanisms for adversarial inputs and machine learning security in general.

To this end, in a joint effort between the AIMIR Research Group of ISTI-CNR and the CNIT Research Unit at MICC (University of Florence), we analysed the internal representations learned by deep neural networks and their evolution throughout the network when adversarial attacks are performed. Opening the “black box” permitted us to characterise the trace left in the activations throughout the layers of the network and discern adversarial inputs among authentic ones.

We recently proposed solutions for the detection of adversarial inputs in the context of large-scale image recognition with deep neural networks. The rationale of our approaches is to attach to each prediction of the model an authenticity score estimating how much the internal representations differ from expected ones (represented by the




Figure 1: Example of a common adversarial attack on image classifiers. The adversarial perturbation added (magnified for visualization purposes) fools the network to predict a wrong class with high confidence.

model’s training set). In [1], such a score is obtained by analysing the neighbourhood of the input with a nearest-neighbour search in the activation space of a particular layer. Our experiments on adversarial detection permitted us to identify the internal activations which are influenced the most by common adversarial attacks and to filter out most of the spurious predictions in the basic zero-knowledge attack model (see [L1]).

Building on this idea, in [2] we improved our detection scheme considering the entire evolution of activations throughout the network. An evolution map is built by tracing the positions an

input occupies in the feature spaces of each layer with respect to most common reference points (identified by looking to training set inputs). Experiments showed that adversarial inputs usually tend to deviate from reference points in the network with respect to authentic inputs (see Figure 2). Thus, conditioning our detector on such information permitted us to obtain remarkable detection performance under commonly used attacks.

We plan to extend our analysis in order to fully characterise the effect of adversarial attacks on internal activations even in stricter attack models, i.e. when

the attacker is aware of defensive systems and tries to circumvent it.

Despite our experimentation on adversarial input detection, both the presented approaches actually aim to cope with a broader problem, which is assigning a confidence to a model’s decision by explaining it in terms of the observed training data. We believe this is a promising direction for reliable and dependable AI.

Links:

[L1]
<http://deepfeatures.org/adversarials/>

References:

- [1] Carrara et al.: “Adversarial image detection in deep neural networks”, *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 1-21, 2018
- [2] Carrara et al.: “Adversarial examples detection in features distance spaces”, *ECCV 2018 Workshops*, 2018.

Please contact:

Fabio Carrara, ISTI-CNR, Italy
fabio.carrara@isti.cnr.it

Roberto Caldelli, CNIT Research Unit at MICC – University of Florence, Italy
roberto.caldelli@unifi.it




Figure 2: Conceptualisation of the evolution of features while traversing the network. Each plane represents a feature space defined by the activations of a particular layer of the deep neural network. Circles on the features space represent clusters of features belonging to a specific class. Blue trajectories represent authentic inputs belonging to three different classes, and the red trajectory represent an adversarial input. We rely on the distances in the feature space (red dashed lines) between the input and some reference points representatives of the classes to encode the evolution of the activations.