Peer Response

by Jane Aldridge - Sunday, 8 October 2023, 2:34 PM

Hi Kwok,

I agree that it is so important that Abi is completely transparent and presents both the positive and negative aspects of the analysis. Section 3e of the BCS code (2022) also references this point, that professionals should not 'withhold information on the performance of products'. Section 1.3 of the ACM (2023), also makes this clear. I also agree that presenting written documentation to the manufacturer on the issues, limitations, methods used and risks is also imperative. This will help to enforce the point that the positive view of the analysis is not necessarily correct, and this is also required to protect Abi. What can so often happen is that employees leave an organisation, such as the manufacturer and when new management join they may start questioning Abi's analysis.

Another point which I wanted to raise is that Abi is a programmer and he should raise his concerns with his management, both verbally and documented in an email. The risk here is not just Abi's but also the organisation he works for, and so he needs to ensure that management understand the situation and the risks involved. He should also discuss this with his Compliance officer at the firm he works for and also document his concerns in an email. This isn't just Abi's issue to resolve, it is also his organisations.

References

Association for Computing Machinery (N.D.). ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Available from: https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics

[Accessed 1st October 2023]

British Computer Society (2022). BCS Code of Conduct. Available from: https://www.bcs.org/membership-and-registrations/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/

[Accessed 1st October 2023]

Peer Response

by Jane Aldridge - Sunday, 8 October 2023, 3:18 PM

Hi Astrid.

The case study mentions that Abi is a researcher at an institute, and as such he does have the responsibility to ensure that the institute is aware of the risks involved in this particular project, because it isn't just his risk alone, he needs to share the risk of this project. The way I would suggest that he does this, is firstly to ensure that his work is validated by at least one, if not two of his peers. He should then approach his manager and walk his manager through his analysis and results, and also ensure

that his manager understands the risks involved, in presenting the 'positive' view. He should email his manager either a document or a powerpoint presentation prior to the meeting, so he has an audit trail. Sometimes managers are busy, and any potential issues need to be highlighted to them. In the meeting Abi can also discuss the fact that he has concerns about the analysis and the future risk it poses for the institute and suggest that the risk is discussed with the company's compliance officer or risk officer. This approach would ensure that Abi shares the risk of this project, and will also make the organisation aware of the risk. The risk to the institute is that any future investigation into the manufacturers claims could result in reputational damage to the institute.

Peer Response

by Jane Aldridge - Sunday, 8 October 2023, 4:32 PM

Hi lason,

You make a very valid point that Abi could recommend an independent peer review. Due to the importance of this project, and its' potential impact, I would also suggest that at the beginning of the project Abi documents how he is going to validate his analysis, and present this to both the manufacturer and his manager for signoff. There should also be an independent internal review of his results and the models he has used at the end of the project, prior to sharing his analysis with the manufacturer. It is common within banks for any new statistical models to have to undergo a formal review process. Also consultancies, such as PWC (2014) are asked to externally validate statistical models across different industries.

References

PWC (2014). The Role of Model Review, Model Risk Management and Continuous Model Monitoring in the Financial Services Industry. Available from:

https://www.pwc.ch/de/publications/2016/pwc_model_review_and_model_risk_mana gement_e.pdf

[Accessed 8th October 2023]