Peer Response

by Jane Aldridge - Sunday, 8 October 2023, 2:34 PM

Hi Kwok,

I agree that it is so important that Abi is completely transparent and presents both the positive and negative aspects of the analysis. Section 3e of the BCS code (2022) also references this point, that professionals should not 'withhold information on the performance of products'. Section 1.3 of the ACM (2023), also makes this clear. I also agree that presenting written documentation to the manufacturer on the issues, limitations, methods used and risks is also imperative. This will help to enforce the point that the positive view of the analysis is not necessarily correct, and this is also required to protect Abi. What can so often happen is that employees leave an organisation, such as the manufacturer and when new management join they may start questioning Abi's analysis.

Another point which I wanted to raise is that Abi is a programmer and he should raise his concerns with his management, both verbally and documented in an email. The risk here is not just Abi's but also the organisation he works for, and so he needs to ensure that management understand the situation and the risks involved. He should also discuss this with his Compliance officer at the firm he works for and also document his concerns in an email. This isn't just Abi's issue to resolve, it is also his organisations.

References

Association for Computing Machinery (N.D.). ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Available from: **https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics**

[Accessed 1st October 2023]

British Computer Society (2022). BCS Code of Conduct. Available from: **https://www.bcs.org/membership-and-registrations/become-a-member/bcs-code-of-conduct/**

[Accessed 1st October 2023]