

Assessment 2

Computer Science and Technology Degree Programme

Group Members:-

P.B.M.C.S.Basnayake :- UWU/CST/16/007

W.M.M.M.Kularathne :- UWU/CST/16/027

Maduwanthi A.A.H :- UWU/CST/16/029

H.C.S.Peiris :- UWU/CST/16/032

S.I.M.Mabarana :- UWU/CST/16/058

Case 1: Access to User Files, Child Pornography

Morgan accidentally comes across directories with files that have suspicious sounding names. But Morgan has not authorized to read other people's files. But he accesses to the files. It is not a moral work.

Looking over the list of fundamental principles, we find these to be most relevant to our scenario:

- Be impartial.
- Respect the rights of others.
- Treat others justly.
- Maintain your integrity.

We examine the list of clauses associated with these four fundamental principles and identify those that are most relevant:

- 1.3 - Because computer professionals must be honest and trustworthy also maintain high standards of professional competence, conduct, and ethical practice.
- 1.6 – Respect privacy.
- 1.7 – Honor confidentiality.
- 2.2 – maintain high standards of professional competence, conduct, and ethical practices.
 - Somebody has misused the company's PC by using it to store images of child pornography. By this principle Morgan has an obligation to report what he discovered.
- 2.3 – Also Morgan knows and respect existing rules pertaining to professional work. Because the company has not authorized Morgan to read other people's files.
 - Morgan discovered the child pornography by violating the company's policy against examining files on personal computers used by employees.
- 2.8 - Access computing and communication resources only when authorized or when compelled by the public good.
- 4.1 – Uphold, promote, and respect the principles of the code.
 - Simply because Chuck had these files on his computer does not necessarily mean he is guilty. Perhaps someone else broke into Chuck's computer and stored the images there.

Our analysis is more complicated because Morgan violated company policy to uncover the child pornography on Chuck's PC. Once he has this knowledge, however, the remaining principles guide Morgan to reveal what he has discovered to the relevant authorities within the corporation, even though management may punish Morgan for breaking the privacy policy. There is the possibility that Chuck is a victim. Someone else may be trying to frame Chuck or use his computer as a safe stash for their collection of images. Morgan should be discreet until a complete investigation is completed and Chuck has had the opportunity to defend himself.

Case 2: Anti-Worm

These fundamental principles are most relevant to the anti-worm scenario:

Continually improve your abilities.

Share your knowledge, expertise, and values.

Respect the rights of others.

Take responsibility for your actions and inactions.

Examining the list of clauses associated with each of these fundamental principles reveals those that are most relevant to our case study.

- Strive to achieve high quality in both the process and products of professional work.

Tim tried to prevent others from responsibility discovering that he was had the author of the anti-worm. He did not accept responsibility for what he had done.

- Be encouraged to volunteer professional skills to good causes and contribute to public education concerning the discipline.

The anti-worm did something good by patching security holes in PCs. Tim provided the anti-worm to the Internet community without charge. However system administrators spent a lot of time trying to halt the spread of the anti-worm, a harmful effect.

- Improve their knowledge of this code, its interpretations and its application to their work.

Tim followed the letter of the first two of these three clauses when he acquired a copy of the worm, figured out how it worked and created a reliable anti-worm in a short period of time. The experience improved his knowledge and skills.

According to some of these principles, Chris Smart did the right thing. According to others, Chris Smart was wrong to release the anti-worm. Using this logic we no longer consider the fact that Chris Smart improved his technical knowledge and skills by developing and releasing the anti-worm.

When we evaluate Chris Smart's action from the point of view we must determine whether his effort were directed to a good cause. Certainly, Tim's anti-worm benefited the PCs it infected by removing a security vulnerability. To summarize our analysis, Chris Smart's release of the anti-worm is clearly wrong from the point of view.

Case 3: Software Recommendation

Prof. Smith should be in trouble for not disclosing all the information he knew. It is unethical to sell someone a product that you partly own. So, the action is not a moral way to software recommendation. But it's not like Jones is recommended a bad product.

However, software professionals should,

- Be impartial.
- Disclose information that others ought to know.
- Share your knowledge, expertise and values.

Alex Jones was asking Prof. Smith for free advice, and she provided it. When he freely shared his knowledge about network security and recommended the best product, he was acting in the ACM Code of **1.1. Contribute to society and to human well-being, acknowledging that all people are stakeholders in computing** and **2.1. Strive to achieve high quality in both the processes and products of professional work.**

However, Prof. Smith appears to have violated the other codes, at least to some degree. Most important, he did not reveal his personal interest in Netcheks, which could read his to be biased. The fact that he did not mention the "best buy" package is evidence that he was neither evenhanded nor completely forthcoming when she answered Jones's question about software packages. Perhaps Jones should have heeded the maxim, "Free advice is worth what you pay for it." Nevertheless, the ignorance or foolishness of one person does not excuse the bad behavior of another. Prof. Smith should have revealed his conflict of interest. At that point Jones could have chosen to get another opinion if he so desired. Let's consider the following ACM codes.

1.3. Be honest and trustworthy

Prof. Smith ignored this moral code while not telling the name of the magazine that he got the rating.

1.5. Respect the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works and computing artifacts

Prof. Smith promoted the product that he has the shares without telling that to Jones. It violates the above code.

2.4. Accept and provide appropriate professional review

Prof. Smith provided not mentioned the free product and the magazine of rating the product. It was the violation the above code.

Case 4: Consulting Opportunity

According to this case 4 scenario the actions of Jean is not morally right. That is because there are several principles that we need to pointed out as

- be honest and trustworthy(1.3)
 - When talking about Jean's action, Computer professionals should be honest to their company and should inform about their decisions to the management and should be transparent
- Honor Confidentiality(1.7)
 - Jean should inform about the financial fee and steps taken to uplift the financial and current state of the company
- know and respect existing rules pertaining to professional work(2.3)
 - Jean should follow the moral guidelines following by the company
- Avoid Harm(1.2)
 - Jean should inform to the company that company is under the risk as some of them left the job and level of support is dropping down
- Articulate apply and support policies and processes that reflect the principles of the code(3.4)
 - There should be effect communication among the employees of the company, in this case Jean has violated it and he didn't inform to his peer group about the decision
- Treat violations of the code as inconsistent with membership in the ACM
 - As ACM members other employees should recognize a breach of code by Jean and should consider reporting the violations to the ACM

Sometimes we can argue that Jean is helping Acme Corporation that is because Government is dropping the gold level of support because it is quite too expensive, but phone support and online support aren't enough. If these agencies cannot find another source of on-site training, they may stop using Acme's software altogether. By providing East Dakota with affordable on-site training, Jean is helping to ensure that East Dakota would remain a customer of Acme Corporation, finding at the silver level. We can also argue that Jean's work for East Dakota will improve his knowledge of the software package and his ability to teach others how to use it, making him a more effective phone support person at Acme. However, management at Acme will convince by these arguments, because Jean did not disclose the offer from East Dakota before accepting it. Jean's decision is likely to cause management to question his loyalty to his company and his fellow employees. If the company learns about his consulting work, Jean may well be the next person laid off. According to our justification, Jean's actions are unwise and not loyal.