

Tutorial 3 –EG2401 Engineering Professionalism

Tutorial 3.Q1

Case 1-Er. Ang Peng Siong is a principal engineer employed at a local M&E consulting firm, providing services in the design of electrical systems. Before being employed by the M&E consulting firm, Er. Ang owns 35 shares of stock in a company which produce electrical components and products which he specifies in his design for projects he is involved in. The share of stock he owns in the manufacturing company is considered small, representing only less than 0.05% percent of the total stock outstanding.

Case 2-Er. Badari bin Osman is a consulting engineer trained in the designing of mechanical engineering systems and similar to Er. Ang, he has invested his own money in mutual fund shares. The mutual fund, from time to time, invests in the stock of companies which produce the type of mechanical equipment which he may specify and recommend for his clients.

Case 3-Er. Chandini d/o Murthusamy is an officer of a public-list engineering consulting firm engaged mainly in civil engineering projects for clients. She had earlier on inherited a piece of land which currently being developed for mix used (i.e. housing and industrial use). The engineering consulting company she works for has been retained to make a feasible study and recommendation for a deep water sewerage system in the area where her land sits.

Questions:

Case 1- Was it ethical for Er. Ang to specify the products of the electrical company in which he holds stock?

Case 2- Was it ethical for Er. Badari to specify the products of companies in which the mutual fund holds shares?

Case 3- Was it ethical for Er. Chandini to design a sewer system in the area where her land sits?

Guide: Use the Code of Ethics of NSPE (recommended) as the reference to support your position with regards to the case above. The Code of Ethics may be obtained from Lecture Notes 5 of EG2401 IVLE by Kevin Kuang or directly from www.nspe.org

Tutorial 3.Q2

Professional engineer Er. Allan Ong is retained by the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) to conduct a technical feasibility study of a project to install a new power production facility. Er. Ong is tasked to evaluate the proposal and make recommendations on the ideal location to place the facility. The URA has pre-allocated two parcels of land which is located near the Jurong River where the facility should be located. Parcel 1 is currently undeveloped and is owned by a local businessman who has plans to develop it as a weekend retreat for himself. Parcel 2, happens to be owned by Er. Ong, is reasonably developed. Er. Ong discloses his ownership of Parcel 2 and recommends the building of the power production facility to be built on the undeveloped land of Parcel 1. He gave reasons which include: 1) Parcel 1 is a better location for the power plant from an engineering point of view, and (2) the lower cost of the land of Parcel 1. The URA did not raise any objections as to having Er. Ong conduct the feasibility study.

Question: Was it ethical for Er. Ong to conduct the feasibility study and make recommendations concerning the location of the power facility?

Guide: Use the Code of Ethics of NSPE (recommended) as the reference to support your position with regards to the case above.