Summary Post

In this discussion, I explored various real-world ethical dilemmas in computing, guided by established codes of ethics such as the ACM Code of Ethics and the BCS Code of Conduct. Through peer contributions and case analyses, a central theme emerged: ethical responsibility in computing is not only individual but also collective.

Jaafar El Komati presented a compelling case involving Rogue Services, an ISP complicit in malware distribution. He highlighted clear violations of ACM Principles 1.1, 1.2, and 2.8, and the BCS's emphasis on public interest. The ethical tension lay in the countermeasure: a worm deployed to disable Rogue's services, which, despite good intentions, caused collateral damage. Peer responses from Dhia, Martyna, and Craig emphasized the complexity of ethical interventions, accountability in distributed systems, and the risks of unintended consequences.

Koulthoum Flamerzi's case centered on a software engineer who launched an app without adequate testing, resulting in a data breach. This scenario demonstrated breaches of ACM Principles 1.6 and 2.5 and underscored issues related to GDPR compliance. The responses from Craig, Mohamed, and Shaikah emphasized how ethical failures often stem from broader organizational culture, not just individual mistakes, highlighting the need for systemic ethical practices.

In my own case, I examined a startup using generative AI trained on student data without consent. This scenario raised concerns about privacy, transparency, and responsible AI development, especially in sensitive sectors like education. Reflecting

on both ACM and BCS codes, I realized the importance of embedding ethical foresight into technological innovation.

Overall, this discussion deepened my understanding of ethical computing as a dynamic and collaborative practice. We must look beyond individual compliance to foster ethical cultures that prioritize user trust, minimize harm, and uphold professional integrity in the digital age.