

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 the CEO why you see a problem in the scenario. 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. A shareholder, who we may assume is only interested in maximizing profits, would view the situation in an identical manner due to the similarity between the shareholder's and CEO's goals. The CTO, however, 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. That is why they are excited by my presentation. We are proposing new features and, even though we temporarily collect data for

them, the data is not preserved, and we are explaining how we plan to ensure data is kept private. On the other hand, our annoying colleague is giving no respect to privacy. In fact, they are brazenly defying the principles on which the company stands. From the colleague's perspective, however, they are trying to please the CEO. I don't want to judge the colleague too harshly. It is true that his comment was not morally right, but that is why you discuss ideas in front of other people. You can't always hit the nail right on the head, so I choose to believe this was a slipup from the colleague, more so than it being deliberate sabotage of the company's values. Finally, 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.

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 (assuming you are high enough in Beerz to start such a conversation), 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. I find it unlikely that such a conversation would 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. Moreover, you could ask that the CEO takes actions to delete the unintended collected data.

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, the options get worse. Realistically, 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.