Description of package content. (MD- please keep clusters paper clipped together otherwise it will be hard to figure out what is going on. - don)

Cleaning out my office I came across- (this is the order they are in the envelope)

1. Notes from my review of the Kanko student comments - paper written in red ink- I have typed up a transcription in case you cannot read my handwriting. I also included an explanation of what the marks on the paper mean.

2. "SE Profession" Email from Laurie Werth through the SE newsletter called FASE Which contains the 15 April 1993 version of Fletcher Buckley's motion. Notice that in the cover letter it says "The following motion or some slightly altered version..." There had been other versions from Buckley before this one.

3. "Don G notes of meeting" This file created May 28 1994 has some temporal proximity to the steering committee meeting so they reflect my thoughts close to the time of the meeting. From the notes- Elliot had a lot of input. Notice the expression `code of ethics' is not used. My notes record the origin of the concentric circle model. It also records a claim made by Elliot about focusing on Core practices -the areas of professional practice, (like a code of practice rather than a Code of Ethics). This was supported by Dennis. Question marks indicate I was going to pursue this further.

4. Report to the IEEE CS Board of Governors November 10, 1993. Several important things to note. First this document is written prior to the ACM involvement. I am not sure of the date I have a reference on it I I-12 Dec

ACM involvement- my notes indicate that Gwen Bell- then ACM president did not want to chair the committee but that a Co-chair needed to be selected. Appendix 2 which contains an ACM resolution to establish a commission on Software Engineering is concerned with questioning the status of SE as a discipline rather than professionalizing SE

The original definition of profession in the document does not include `service'. The recommendation for ethical standards 3.3 does not specify the type of deliverable. The examples of `unethical' involve violation of the law.

It also contains the enabling memo and a list of the original IEEE committee.

5. "March 4 1994 IEEE BOG minutes" - Now the ethics task force is to `define a Code of Ethic" -ACM does not seem to be a full participant yet.

6. "ACM and IEE minute 5/28/94 Pittsburgh- I was there-you have referenced this already in the book. Only Action item for SEEP seems to be to get a press release to the ACM and CS leaders.

7. A collection of things related to Stuart Feldman. In order to get anything published we were told that it needed a disclaimer and Feldman was assigned by the Steering Committee to be the author April 14 letter from Feldman. April 24 contains, Feldman's original paragraph' revision of paragraph by Keith and Simon's addition in upper case about policy makers.

Email to Tom Jewett- editor of SIGCAS setting up the publication of version 2.1 some modifications were made at the last minute to 2.1 based on comments by Peter Prinzivali- email also attached.

8. Set of Documents indicating changes made in the movement to version 2. 2a,2.1 -letter from Miller -modifications by Ben Fairweather in Bold, responding to Prinzavali's concerns in next email -email Duncan Langford - Letter to task force containing reports and plan and soliciting comments -MD- there is a line I wrote then about structure of the code being similar to British computer society and NSPE Codes. If I remember correctly in chap 4 you claim this as your original **contribution.** You may wan t to check these. .

9 Moving to version 3. Ben's Comments . The first suggestion that the ordering of Principles is wrong. "Principle 2 is more important than Principle 1" Our review is indicated by -check marks means -incorporate it, question marks mean `discuss it'

10. Making version 2 a collection of the changes and arguments for them to version 1. Shows some of how we worked. Simon and I would work over stuff, send it to Keith for comment and modify. We would also include others reviews. Then we would launch it to the task force. - Keith email -Keith email which is a response to my earlier email. 2 things here- 1) why the reports had to be written by early February and 2) a description of some of my concerns with version 1. -email about restructuring the clauses within the principles Email listing the changes to principles t and 2 in version 2.

11. Evidence about Email stuff the answer about the SE-ethics list at CMIJ. It was just for the working groups leaders who then had responsibility to communicate with their groups

Email from Vivian about your email address. Note that list shows you already on list as specified to me.

12 Weckert's comments

13 5.1 to 5.2 1998- After the Code passed the IEEE Technical review. Someone at IEEE asked that it undergo a review by a lawyer. This document is that review. It was judged by those at IEEE-CS that it had passed the review. He spotted a typo in the Code. Fixing that turned the Code into version 5.2 .

Life should have b een easy from that point. BUT.....