**Case 1: *AI filtering in HR (benefit)***

Laura is a full-stack developer with over 20 years of experience working on a broad spectrum of technologies, and she has consistently sought to be a positive disruptor in all her past projects. She was also fortunate to have worked for some of the biggest companies in Dublin, which had some of the toughest interview processes before the advent of the AI society. Dublin is so small that unprofessional behaviour in past projects can lead to job offers being withdrawn simply through networking.  In the case of Laura, collectively, nothing bad can be said about her as a professional.

Unfortunately, due to the economic downturn, Laura was laid off by her last employer, and she is finding it extremely challenging to navigate the current AI-driven HR filtering process. At the same time, AI has indeed helped the HR department to offload some of its repetitive tasks, which humans would have had to perform. The "entity" of the HR department has evolved from regional offices managing employees individually to a centralized system or even outsourcing to external vendors. Diminishing the personal connection between employees and HR often reduces communication to a generic email inbox with little understanding of the unique human story behind each person.

Unfortunately, due to the large number of professionals who find themselves in Laura's possession. AI has been placed at the centre stage to handle large volumes of applications or requests.

In a way, Laura is left with a conflicting question on her mind. Does she cheat the AI system by using another AI system for the technical exam so that she can proceed to the next stage of the interview process, or does she let the AI filter her out just by being herself and letting the moral compass of the system judge her character?

**Case 1: Goal**

I want to put the reader to the test and see if they bite for the fact that the main character is a female developer and get them thinking, with current AI filters, do you cheat to get the job (something we do in the analogue world) or you are honest and let the system tell you if you are qualified. How far do we push the envelope in the analogue world to get a job? Would we do the same with an intelligent AI filter?

**Case 2: AI in law (risk)**

Donna is a Generative AI platform designed by Ross, a legal secretary. He is currently working for a senior partner, Harvey, who is highly disappointed with the latest generation of junior solicitors who come out of college and directly expect to receive big salary offers without putting in the hard work and are constantly using ChatGPT to generate legal documents or witness reports. While spell checking a housing proposal, he heard on the BBC news that a lawyer in the UK had avoided contempt charges after presenting a false citation but may still face disciplinary action from the regulatory body. The news brought him back to his days as a junior solicitor when he would put in 80 hours per week to ensure all legal documents were in order and cross-check all his citations. While talking to Ross about his upcoming appointments. He received an email from the secretary of the Judge, with whom he had a case the following morning for a major client, expressing disapproval that one of his junior solicitors used ChatGPT to generate billing for a client with the same Judge.

Fearing he may lose his reputation before the eyes of the Judge; Harvey immediately suspended all the junior solicitors from any active cases. Seeing the pressure he was under, Ross suggested that Harvey use Donna, who could only communicate via email. Due to the workload and a personal recommendation from Ross, Harvey sent Donna a challenging research law question, expecting her to complete it within one week; he was surprised by the accuracy and speed of the reply.

Over time, Harvey became so satisfied with Donna's good work that they developed a virtual friendship and began discussing non-work-related issues at a romantic level.

Do we punish Ross for having created a productive tool? Under what arguments should Harvey continue using Donna for law related work if he is ever told. Should he report Donna to a regulatory body if he ever finds out that she is a machine and not a human?

**Case 2: Goal**

I wanted the readers to ask themselves how far they would trust something they don’t understand or judge it based on news alerts linked to the issue. Yes, generative AI is risky if left unchecked.

**Review of Case 1 (Healthcare AI - Aishling Collins.):**

* **Identify the key stakeholders**

 John CEO,

 Private funding source,

Patients (unemployed/retired people / internal database)

AI algorithm,

US Tech

* **Identify and assess what values or motivations are involved relating to the stakeholders**

**John:**needs the trial to be a success, as he will only be able to secure more funding if he can deliver on the trial's objectives.

**Private funding source:**They want to recoup their investment and make a profit on the loan. Although the details are not disclosed, the trial's success is likely linked to this**.**

**Patients**: They are simply looking to earn some extra money on the side. Since it is a local company, they trust it, and they will not suffer any harm.

**AI algorithm:** The more data it gets for a given user, the better it will be able to predict the skin cancer diagnoses

**US Tech:**wants to buy the data of the trail and keep the deal secret.

* **Investigate the relational phenomenon of the case in terms of risk and ethics (using the simplistic guide from Beauchamp and Childress)**

**1. Respect for autonomy**

 So, just because John had the patience to sign a consent form and pay them, he can still be held liable. As he adopted a “paternalistic approach”. He did not disclose to his patients the possibility of selling their data to third parties. The trial data should be available automatically, but by requiring an opt-in, he is adding more layers of controlled constraints. He is hoping the confidential agreement he signed with the US company will add another layer of protection for him from the patient.

**2. Beneficence**

The fact that the company is based in West Cork and the patients are neighbours who have lived in the area their entire lives implies that John’s company should take extra care in dealing with them and empower them to understand the entire process. Care should also have been taken to remove any technological barriers so that patients can view their data; patients are the owners of their data. While there are always risks associated with medical procedures, he should have taken extra care to explain these risks to patients and not just silently hope that nothing would go wrong.

**3. Non-maleficence**

The fact that unemployed and retired individuals are being targeted as potential trial users indicates that there is hope that if things go badly, the users will not be able to pursue the company. Since they are the less well-off members of society, their willingness to fight for justice is often restricted by their financial status. John’s company is deliberately engaging in this type of behaviour, and the confidentiality agreement put in place is a clear indication of wrongdoing.

**4. Justice**

John should not have sold the data to a third party without consulting the patient; he should have applied the consequentialist approach and explained the benefits to the patient. The sale helps the research to continue, as he has private funding. Additionally, there should be a framework in place that provides a clear explanation of what is being sold and what rights people have once the data is sold.