Peer Response 1

Dear Jaafar,

Your post offers a strong explanation of the ethical issues in the Rogue Services case. You clearly showed how the company's actions go against the ACM and BCS codes of conduct, especially with references to principles like ACM 1.1, 1.2, and 2.8 (ACM, 2018; BCS, 2015). This shows a solid understanding of the frameworks we have been working with.

I found your discussion of the worm particularly interesting. You explained well how, even though it was meant to prevent harm, it ended up affecting innocent third parties. That highlights the ethical tension between good intentions and harmful consequences, and you clearly considered both sides (Moor, 2005; Tavani, 2016).

One area you could explore further is accountability in global or distributed systems. In this case, Rogue was able to operate by taking advantage of legal gaps across jurisdictions. This raises important questions about who is responsible when harm happens in these complex setups. Johnson and Miller (2008) point out that responsibility can become unclear in digital networks with many actors involved. Looking at this angle might add more depth to the ethical analysis, especially where legal systems struggle to respond effectively.

References:

ACM. (2018). *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*.
https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics

BCS. (2015). *BCS Code of Conduct*. British Computer Society.
https://www.bcs.org/membership/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/

Johnson, D.G. and Miller, K.W., (2008). Un-making artificial moral agents. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 10(2–3), pp.123–133. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-008-9174-6 (Accessed 13 May 2025)

Moor, J.H. (2005). Why we need better ethics for emerging technologies. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 7(3), 111–119.

Tavani, H.T. (2016). *Ethics and Technology: Controversies, Questions, and Strategies for Ethical Computing* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Peer Response 2

Hi Craig,

Thank you for your well-structured and clearly reasoned post. Your comparison of the ACM and BCS codes effectively highlights how both stress public interest, legal compliance, and professional integrity. You have clearly shown how Rogue Services' inaction breaches these principles.

I also support Khoulthoum's suggestion about anticipatory governance, as discussed by Floridi and Cowls (2019). It is a valuable perspective that reinforces the need to embed ethics early in technical processes. Building on that, another useful direction could be exploring accountability mechanisms that enforce ethical conduct when companies fail to self-regulate.

For instance, you might consider whether external pressures such as regulatory enforcement, public exposure, or reputational damage are enough to encourage companies like Rogue Services to behave more responsibly. External stakeholder pressure has been shown to significantly influence ethical behaviour (Tian, Liu and Fan,

2015), and strong governance mechanisms are key in ensuring companies are held accountable when internal ethics fail (Brennan and Solomon, 2008).

Your post already offers a strong ethical foundation. Adding this layer of analysis could enrich your discussion and align well with the themes of legal and institutional responsibility covered in this module.

References:

Brennan, N.M. and Solomon, J. (2008) *Corporate governance, accountability and mechanisms of accountability: an overview*, Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 21(7), pp. 885–906. Available at: https://researchrepository.ucd.ie/bitstreams/bb3434a7-e9a5-494f-8902-d7d700b50715/download (Accessed: 21 May 2025).

Floridi, L. and Cowls, J. (2019) *A unified framework of five principles for AI in society*, Harvard Data Science Review, 1(1). Available at: https://hdsr.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/l0jsh9d1 (Accessed 21 May 2025)

Tian, Q., Liu, Y. and Fan, J. (2015) *The effects of external stakeholder pressure and ethical leadership on corporate social responsibility in China*, Journal of Management & Organization, 21(4), pp. 388–410. doi: 10.1017/jmo.2015.14. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277931123_The_effects_of_external_stakeholder_pressure_and_ethical_leadership_on_corporate_social_responsibility_in_China (Accessed 21 May 2025).

Peer Response 3

Jasim, your analysis of the Blocker Plus case is both clear and compelling. You effectively connect technical design flaws to ethical and legal breaches, particularly in terms of discrimination and transparency.

Khoulthoum also raised important points around bias auditing and accountability.

Building on that, I think it would be valuable to consider how participatory design can help prevent these types of failures. As noted by Le Dantec and Fox (2015), systems used in public settings should involve diverse user groups early in the design process. Consulting librarians, educators, and affected communities might have helped identify risks linked to user-generated feedback.

Another aspect worth exploring is fairness at the data level. Binns (2018) suggests that fairness must be addressed not only through final decisions but also in how systems are trained and how inputs are filtered. Blocker Plus lacked safeguards to detect malicious input at the source, which contributed to biased learning.

Your post offers a solid ethical assessment. Expanding on how inclusive design and better data governance could have mitigated harm would further strengthen your contribution to this important discussion.

References:

Binns, R. (2018) Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy, arXiv preprint. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.03586 (Accessed 21 May 2025).

Le Dantec, C.A. and Fox, S. (2015) Strangers at the gate: Gaining access, building rapport, and co-constructing community-based research, Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing (CSCW '15), pp. 1348–1358. Available at: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2675133.2675147 (Accessed 21 May 2025).