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1. Robin Radonich – deep learning customer behaviour  
     
   Robin Radonich would continue to develop a deep learning algorithm to collect and interpret data on consumer driving behaviour. As a young professional, she will be eager to flaunt her abilities. In order to adhere to section 4.2.1 of the IITP code of practice, there is nothing illegal with collecting data for the use of the company, but potential misuse of data could come from a breach of privacy on clients (drivers in this case). Ideally, the employers should outline how they intend to use the information, and this will allow Robin to hone in on what information is specifically being looked for. Robin should proceed while making sure not to collect data that could influence discrimination to ethnicity or gender; by this I mean keeping information anonymous and the brackets for client behaviour somewhat vague yet informative.
2. Pavle Pesa – altering bank loan algorithm  
     
   Pavle Pesa may be slightly bias towards softening the regulations for clients receiving a loan, as his financial situation will make him sympathise to those that may also be financially compromised. This would be a breach of the IITP code of ethics section 5.4, Pavle must inform his employer of a potential conflict of interest. This is especially true as Pavle may also find himself in the situation where he is also a client of the bank – due to his financial situation he could find himself requesting a loan from the bank and softening regulations would be a very easy way to ensure he qualifies for the loan. Pavle may wish to notify the employer of his situation in compliance with code of ethics rule 7, notifying the employer that he may have a potential influence taking place. As to the legitimacy of altering algorithms that may tighten regulation of loans, I believe this to be fair and reasonable, as it is a company’s privilege to choose whom that do business with, even more so in a risk involved service such as financial loans.
3. Sanja Salopek – IoT recording crimes  
     
   According to IITP Code of Practice Article 2.8 – Respect the interests of your Clients: “Safeguard the confidentiality of all information concerning your clients”. It would be illegal and a breach of client privacy to use internet enabled toys to record and send specific cases of what a client has said to police. I would interpret this as legal to collect a database of words said in the toys vicinity, but to use it as evidence in a trial or as pretences for an arrest/raid would be mass surveillance of the public. Also, the toys may present a security issue being internet enabled, as it could make an easy target for hackers to determine if the toy was at home or not, possibly indicating the house was empty. If there was full disclosure that the toys would record and process information said, then this may pass. It is important that the algorithm is secure and does not use the recorded information for anything but statistics, else this would be a breach of privacy.
4. Myself – tracking employees  
     
   I would personally find this acceptable. Employers want assurances that their staff are competent, and it is no further than internal security cameras. If the data collected is strictly used for detecting slackers, i.e. the algorithm does not disclose what activity the employee was doing, this could effectively *enhance* employee privacy and still work effectively. I personally do not see any breach of the IITCP code of ethics nor code of practice. The only concern that could happen would be that the algorithm is purposely written to not monitor internet traffic from company computers, whereby manipulating and compromising the employer’s ability to monitor IT staff; this would be against the Code of Practice section 2.9 – Promote good practices within the Organisation: the algorithm would not be created to the best of my ability.