

To: Ed Mechler, CCP, 76105,3332  
From: Don Gotterbarn, INTERNET:gotterba@seasva.gwu.edu  
Date: 10/8/96, 3:19 PM  
Re: Re: FW: SE Ethics (fwd)

Sender: gotterba@seasva.gwu.edu  
Received: from franklin.seas.gwu.edu (franklin.seas.gwu.edu [128.164.9.2]) by hil-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id PAA08434; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 15:06:20 -0400  
Received: from seas.gwu.edu (root@felix.seas.gwu.edu [128.164.9.3]) by franklin.seas.gwu.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id PAA08810 for <76105.3332@compuserve.com>; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 15:06:15 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from buster.seas.gwu.edu (buster [128.164.25.50]) by seas.gwu.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) with ESMTP id OAA17108 for <76105.3332@CompuServe.COM>; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 14:15:55 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: (from gotterba@localhost) by buster.seas.gwu.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA14333; Tue, 8 Oct 1996 14:15:56 -0400  
Date: Tue, 8 Oct 1996 14:15:55 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Don Gotterbarn <gotterba@seasva.gwu.edu>  
X-Sender: gotterba@buster  
To: "Ed Mechler, CCP" <76105.3332@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Re: FW: SE Ethics (fwd)  
Message-ID: <Pine.HPP.3.90.961008140530.14121D-100000@buster>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Ed,

Here is some of the comments I have received. I have already sent an email to Dennis thanking him for his comments. Because it is at the level it is at, we need to respond at two levels; one involving modification or clarification of the code and; at a strategy level- how we plan to package this product? whose code..which professional society "owns-approves it" etc.

We need a plan on how to do this, before we bring it up to the steering committee again.

Hope to talk with you soon.

don

PS. I don't think I have said this yet.. You did a great job keeping this going. Thanks!

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 7 Oct 96 14:00:13 CDT  
From: Dennis Frailey 575-7702 <frailey@skopen.dseg.ti.com>  
To: gotterba@etsu.east-tenn-st.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: SE Ethics (fwd)

Don, I think the steering committee would like to hear some response to my comments and Mary's from those who formulated the draft code of ethics.

DJF

Forwarded message:

> From Mary\_Shaw@KEYSTONE.ARCH.CS.CMU.EDU Mon Oct 7 12:05:41 1996  
> From: Mary\_Shaw@cs.cmu.edu  
> Reply-To: Mary\_Shaw@cs.cmu.edu  
> To: Felipe Cabrera <cabrera@MICROSOFT.com>

> Cc: "boehm@pollux.usc.edu" <boehm@POLLUX.USC.EDU>,  
> "e.chikofsky@computer.org" <e.chikofsky@computer.org>,  
> "frailey@ARAFURA.DSEG.TI.COM" <frailey@arafura.dseg.ti.com>,  
> "ld@sei.cmu.edu" <ld@SEI.CMU.EDU>,  
> "lltripp@kgv1.bems.boeing.com" <lltripp@kgv1.bems.boeing.com>,  
> "mrb@sei.cmu.edu" <mrb@SEI.CMU.EDU>,  
> "sif@watson.ibm.com" <sif@WATSON.IBM.com>,  
> "zweben@cis.ohio-state.edu" <zweben@CIS.OHIO-STATE.EDU>  
> Subject: Re: FW: SE Ethics  
> In-Reply-To: Your message of Tue, 01 Oct 96 13:26:47 -0800.  
> <c=US%a=\_%p=msft%l=RED-74-MSG-961001202647Z-52912@mail3.microsoft.com>  
> Date: Mon, 07 Oct 96 13:04:25 -0400  
> Message-Id: <27413.844707865@KEYSTONE.ARCH.CS.CMU.EDU>  
> Sender: Mary\_Shaw@KEYSTONE.ARCH.CS.CMU.EDU

> Felipe,

> I share Dennis' general concern that this is fine in theory but hard to  
> apply. I realize that codes of ethics should be idealistic, but they  
> also must be credible -- that is, practitioners should be able to  
> see how the code shapes their work. Another way of saying this is  
> that this draft seems a little naive.

> The Code doesn't discriminate in intensity, even though some of the  
> points are pretty close to absolute and others are currently viewed  
> by many as good practice. I'd sign up to expecting an SE to refuse to  
> work on a project that is blatantly unsafe or fraudulent. However,  
> deviations from this committee's view of good process doesn't fall in  
> this category, and the Code doesn't distinguish. For example, for me  
> "thou-shalt-absolutely"s include 2.01, 2.03 (but see note), 2.07, 4.04,  
> 4.08, 4.09 whereas "you should make a good-faith attempt to" include  
> 1.01, 1.05, 4.06, 5.06, 5.11.

> There are some other points that require each software engineer to  
> control things over which he/she has no control. Naturally the SE  
> should try to achieve all this, by working within the company if not  
> directly. But holding individual SEs responsible for things outside  
> their control is another place where the degree of responsibility  
> and consequence isn't clear: 1.01, 1.06, 1.07, 1.09, 1.12, 3.04, 4.02,  
> 6.06, 6.10

> There are some points at which mechanism creeps in. The Code should,  
> I think, state the objective and leave implementation to the best  
> judgement of the engineer. (This is the usual rule about specifications.)  
> Examples: 1.01 (the new one about written specs, added between Aug 8  
> and Sep 30), 2.02 (the "well-documented" part), 2.03 (the "affix  
> signature" part), 5.13, 6.02 (the only way I can understand this one  
> is as an implementation of something I haven't figured out yet).

> A particular problem area is international business. Even if the  
> Code is intended for US practice, many US firms operate internationally.  
> 3.02 and 3.03 (on bribes, kickbacks, etc) don't really address the  
> very gray situation in some countries. For example, I understand that  
> in some countries customs officials are not supposed to take payments  
> (by whatever name), but the computation that yields their salaries  
> assumes they \*are\* receiving such payments.

> There are also omissions in the handling of intellectual property.

- > Piracy appears in 4.04, confidentiality and public domain IP are used
- > inconsistently in 4.05, copyright but not patent appears as part of a
- > list in 4.07, trade secret and nondisclosure are mentioned nowhere at
- > all (though 4.05 was probably intended to address them), there's also
- > nothing about export restriction, and what's there about privacy is
- > politically loaded.
- >
- > On the whole, I think the document would be more likely to be read if
- > it were shorter, crisper, and more realistic. A supplementary document
- > could work through examples in a little more detail than the 2-liners
- > that constitute most of this document.
- >
- > Specific comments:
- >
- > Introduction:
- > - "to assure ... used for good" makes me uneasy (who gets to decide
- > what's "good"?)
- > - The last sentence about the second-order bullets being incomplete
- > sets of examples is pretty obscure.
- >
- > Rule 1
- > - 1.04: Who on earth gets to decide whether goals are "proper"?
- > - 1.10: software/documentation seems mismatched to privacy. Privacy
- > probably belongs under Rule 2 anyhow. Further, there's a big
- > difference in the privacy arena between what's legal in the US
- > and what many people think is "proper".
- > - 1.13: What if the client wants quality of product (==> not minimum
- > price) and quality of life for SEs and programmers (==> not
- > maximum productivity)?
- > - 1.14: It is not the case that "fad" is the same thing as "departure
- > from standard practice". In fact, there's a good case that
- > some standard practices ARE fads.
- >
- > Rule 2
- > - 2.03 Presumably this means engineering documents about the product,
- > not other documents the SE may sign at various times?
- > - 2.07 Wouldn't it be nice to have a level of practice that allowed this?
- >
- > Rule 3
- > - 3.02, 3.03 See note above about the realities of international business.
- > - 3.05, 3.06 Are these acts always and without exception unethical? I've
- > been a member of a number of groups in which potential conflicts
- > were managed other than by complete exclusion. Indeed, 3.07
- > offers an alternative, thereby creating disagreement among
- > 3.05, 3.06, and 3.07.
- >
- > Rule 4
- > - 4.01 I agree with Dennis.
- > - 4.05 Good sentiment, but imprecise statement. There are many
- > degrees of confidentiality to observe. In particular, copyright
- > material is widely available in books but not public domain.
- > Do you really mean an SE should say "I found the algorithm in
- > a standard textbook but must keep it confidential?" That's what
- > this point says.
- > - 4.07 Why just \*copyright\* laws? Why not \*all\* laws?
- >
- > Rule 5
- > - 5.08 How does this differ from 2.05?

>

> Rule 6

> - 6.02 Is it the intention of the Code to eliminate anonymous

> refereeing? That wouldn't be consistent with 5.13. More

> seriously, engineers review engineering artifacts regularly.

> As far as I know, reviewers of public artifacts don't check

> in first. This would preclude product reviews undertaken without

> prior warning to the developer; it would impede product selection

> in the same way. What is this really trying to say?

>

>

> Mary Shaw

>

>

>

>

>