

Bryce Bernstein

I will be analyzing scenario 2 and its ethical implications.

The main concern from an ethical perspective here is that Beerz and (by proxy) I have made an agreement with users about how their data is used. Such disclosure is a standard part of most End User License Agreements (EULAs), and up to this point Beerz has stuck to this promise. However, by looking at the archived web logs and reconstructing user's histories, we have now entered a land where we are no longer participating within the lines set out by the EULA. This is wrong from a legal perspective, but it is also ethically wrong as you are not using user's data in a way that they are aware of nor consenting to. Formally, the ethical question is then, "when I see something is wrong and has repercussions that would not directly affect me, should I speak up when it might affect me?" I think in a scenario like this, it is quite obvious that the most responsible course of action is to explain to higher-ups why you see a problem. It is worth mentioning that it would be possible to start collecting data, but only if users are notified. I also think it should be explained that you have made a legal agreement with users and violations of such an agreement open the company to concerns of lawsuit and other losses.

From the CEOs perspective, I can understand the appeal of taking old data and using it to increase revenue. Increasing profits is, after all, a massive part of the CEO's job, but the CEO would be being careless if they continued on the path of collecting more user data beyond what was told to customers. After all, it would result in a loss of money if sued. Moreover, they do not have the right to suddenly start collecting data that they weren't meant to collect. The CTO is correct to be concerned about this practice. Maximizing profits is not the primary concern to the CTO; their concern is developing new, interesting features. They should have the right to speak up and express concern. My perspective as someone who clearly cares deeply about the company's mission to value customer privacy is that this is not in the best interest of Beerz,' so I

do think I would be responsible for speaking up rather than rolling with the plan. In a perfect world, I would have the right to criticize Beerz without risking being fired, but it might not be the case in this scenario. Finally, there are the rights of the customers themselves. Privacy is a basic right that is being denied in this scenario as the people have no control of what is done with their data, so their rights are not acknowledged.

There is definitely relevant information for the scenario that has not been included in this hypothetical. For example, is there a EULA that users have signed? Did that EULA say data could be kept if the company decides to start keeping it? That would not change the issue from an ethical perspective, but it would change it legally; it would become a legally viable move to collect data that you hadn't intended to keep. That being said there are still concerns of false advertising and the like if we ever claimed to not keep data. I also think there could be ethical ways to perform this. For example, you could tell users that you want to add this new feature and they could willingly provide their information for the feature. Then, they have the direct opportunity to either give or take back consent regarding the issues.

Considering the situation, I think the most appropriate action would be to talk with the CEO (probably through conversations with the CTO), and explain the legal and ethical implications behind this decision. I would raise concerns that privacy is a right, and, by taking data that was not freely given, we have gotten dangerously close to violating that right. Ideally, this conversation would not result in any severe consequences, and it is possible that the CEO will be convinced and back off on his actions, especially if you raise the legal issues of the decision. I may just be idealistic, but I believe that you should be able to give criticism without being fired from a job. It is, nonetheless, possible that you are fired anyway. You could also ask that the CEO take actions to delete the unintended collected data. Another option, which is not a

good one, is to do nothing and let the features be implemented. The consequences are doing harm to ethical data collection by ignoring its tenets.

For the Code of Ethics, I will approach this on a point by point basis. The biggest pitfall is 1.3, being honest and trustworthy. Retroactively adding a feature that uses data that you promised not to collect is inherently dishonest. Jumping forward to 1.6, it requests that you respect privacy. Specifically, the following clause is clearly violated “computing professionals should establish transparent policies and procedures that allow individuals to understand what data is being collected and how it is being used.” Clearly there has been a big shift within Beerz to have this outcome, and privacy is not respected if people didn’t know this was going to happen. Sections 2 and 3 are less relevant because they are not dealing with the literal project itself. However, there is still some information to be gleaned. For example, they say professionals should provide reviews, which is something we would be doing by telling the CEO our thoughts on this decision. This is a mechanism to suggest that this direction is bad for Beerz.

To answer the questions in part A, I believe that it is most important that you do say something. This is a culmination of several ideas, but the most prominent are the legal and ethical issues raised by using data in a way that was not authorized nor consented to. I believe that, unequivocally, the only right answer is to complain to someone higher up and explain that this action is not sustainable nor ethical. If there is no response or you are fired, the options get worse. Realistically, if you aren’t fired, you can either implement what they ask or quit. Certainly quitting would be more ethical, but someone’s individual situation will surely affect the feasibility of such dramatic action. Similarly, an unstable financial situation makes getting fired a bad option.