

Dear Thomas,

The fact you gave a brief explanation as to why you chose the malware disruption case study made your post stand out more as you didn't go straight into the ethical, legal and social issues like many of the other students.

Providing a background on the ethical concerns the hackers who provided the worm that forcibly took Rouge Services offline in relation to the BCS code of conduct showed that you are capable of taking a step back and looking at the bigger picture as you provided a perspective from everyone involved not just Rouge services.

While referencing the computer misuse act demonstrated a good understanding of cyber laws it is only applicable to organisations based in the United Kingdom. In the case study it mentioned that the reason governmental agencies had such an issue shutting Rouge Services down was because in the region they operated the laws were not strong enough to force Rouge services cooperation. I was wondering if you have looked into the steps taken by other governments to combat cybercrime as some less economically developed countries have very lax regulations regarding cyber laws. Have you looked into cyber laws in other countries such as China's Cybersecurity law (The Cybersecurity Law of the People's Republic of China, 2017).

While you used paragraphs to separate the information you didn't make use of any section headers. I would strongly recommend using section headers in any academic writing to make the document easier to read.

I noticed a minor inconsistency in your references when I compared them against the example guidelines provided by the university as you used a letter after the year to distinguish between multiple works by the same author published in the same year whereas in the example documents on referencing provided by the university, they do not follow this convention.

After noticing the minor inconsistencies in your references I looked further into your references and noticed the year on the ACM code of ethics reference and the year on the malware disruption use case were incorrect as if you look at the meta tags on the malware disruption use case the publication date was the 27th of July 2018 and if you look at the date listed in the copyright notice for the ACM code of ethics it was also published in 2018 but you put 2024 for both. Additionally, I noticed your inline references were not always correct. For example, the inline reference for the computer misuse act was incorrect as you are supposed to list the law and the year it was made not the government who made it. I would suggest that when writing your references in the future double check them before any submissions to ensure they are correct and follow the guidelines provided by the university.

When you referenced section 4a of the BCS code of conduct you only mentioned that they are breaking that particular section of the BCS code of conduct I would have expected you explain why you considered their actions to be a breach of the BCS code of conduct E.G. how could their actions bring the profession into disrepute? At postgraduate level you are expected to dig deeper looking at why not just what.

I believe your post could have benefited from you providing your own experience on ethics E.G. Has there ever been any time you had to make a decision where you had ethical concerns if so, what were your concerns? What decision did you make? Who did you consult with prior to making your decision?

Finally, I felt your final paragraph was used effectively to summarise your overall thoughts on the legal, social and ethics issues relevant to IT.

Best Regards,

Sam

References

The Cybersecurity Law of the People's Republic of China 2017. China. Available from:

https://www.dataguidance.com/sites/default/files/en_cybersecurity_law_of_the_peoples_republic_of_china_1.pdf [Accessed 08 October 2024].