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- Clear visual maps of critical information flows.
- Graphical analysis of information risks.
- Actionable risk mitigation plan.

Set up in 2006, InfoEthics UK offers information risk mapping and training. We work internationally in collaboration with experts and professional bodies in the knowledge management and information communities. InfoEthics UK is located in London, Oxford and Amsterdam.

We have a working knowledge of English, Russian, French, Dutch, German and Hungarian.

- +44 7985 968 512
- +31 626 298 398
- contact@infoethics.org.uk
- www.infoethics.org.uk
## Codifying Ethical Behaviour

### SCENARIO

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BEHAVIOUR

1. Respect diversity, equal opportunities & human rights
2. Reputation of the information profession
3. Access to information, ideas & works of the imagination
4. Provide optimum service within available resources
5. Balance needs of actual & potential users
6. Equitable treatment of all information users
7. Impartiality, avoiding inappropriate bias
8. Confidentiality & privacy
9. Conservation & preservation of information
10. Respect for intellectual property
11. Maintain personal professional knowledge
12. Respect for skills & competences of others
13. Highest personal standard of professional knowledge & competence
14. Competent professional practice (qualifications); updating own expertise
15. Only claim expertise where skills and knowledge are adequate
16. Users are aware of scope & remit of service provided
17. Clear process of providing information (standards & procedures)
18. Avoid inappropriate bias or value judgments
19. Protect confidentiality of information users
20. Deal fairly with competing needs of information users
21. Deal promptly & fairly with complaints
22. Ensure information systems & services are effective
23. Ensure materials provided are appropriate to needs of users
24. Defend legitimate needs of information users
25. Respect integrity of information sources; cite sources used
26. Preservation & conservation of materials, records management, archiving
27. Positive promotion of profession
28. Respect for other professionals: acknowledge their ideas
29. Treat colleagues in professional manner
30. Independent consultants: work in professional manner
31. Encourage enhancement of colleagues’ professional knowledge
32. Not speaking on behalf of professional body without authority
33. Report significant breaches of Code to professional body
34. Not acting to bring the profession into disrepute
35. Promote public good in professional duties
36. Promote equitable access for everyone to public domain information
37. Balance the needs of users, confidentiality, employment, public good
38. Encourage wider knowledge and compliance with Code
39. Have an understanding of their organization; promote aims of employer
40. Avoid engaging in unethical practices; report concerns about ethics

# CILIP’s Principles and Code of Professional Practice
SCENARIO 1 – Digital Preservation

Summary: A major collection of manuscripts and printed ephemera documenting the period known as the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923) is digitized, partly as a means of preserving the content for future generations, and partly in an attempt to make it more accessible to scholars and researchers. Scanning, done in 2004, successfully converts paper records into a proprietary format used by the library, although doubts are expressed by a team of archivists who question the future readability of the digital records created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Conflicting Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Dimensions

Possible Resolution(s)
SCENARIO 2 – Pharma Knowledge

Summary: Scientists at Global Pharmacorp use Wikipedia amongst their research sources to develop a new drug to treat macular degeneration. Clinical trials are supported by rigorous adoption of wiki technology to share results and discussions, although not all scientists have access to the wiki. Later, some scientists update their LinkedIn profiles to highlight their roles in the development of this important new drug. But within weeks, investment analysts express short-term doubts about the value of this company, and the share price quickly plummets. What are the information / knowledge decisions which could have bolstered the company’s external profile?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Conflicting Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Resolution(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCENARIO 3 – Submarine Fibre-optics**

**Summary:** Research into underwater fibre-optics is done by a small but renowned group of scientists in the EU, USA and India. There is only one specialized peer-reviewed journal in the field, and all the scientists know one another through collaboration and co-authoring. The Bangalore Institute of Submarine Fibre-optic Research (BISFoR) seeks commercial support and ways to increase its published output. To facilitate this, the BISFoR launches the open access *Journal of Submarine Fibre-optic Research*, claiming it brings the latest research outputs more quickly into the open, promoting more innovation. The Editor-in-Chief of the new journal is invited to chair the prestigious international conference on fibre-optics, despite qualitative questions about the BISFoR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Conflicting Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethical Dimensions**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Resolution(s)**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sector**: Corporate library

**Chemical librarian’s CSR**

**To what extent is the informed librarian responsible for blowing the whistle when discovering potentially lethal actions of the employer?**

**Summary**: The corporate librarian of a global pharmaceutical manufacturer provides specialist patent searches as well as news, industry research and scientific literature to his employer. As a chemist he feels qualified to make judgements about the information service which he mediates, and is recognised in this organisation for his constructive suggestions regarding chemical processes. However, he fails to report the dangers arising out of his employer's development of a chemical plant in a developing country, and feels guilty at the loss of lives following an explosion at the plant.

**NOTE**: This Case Study is fictitious. It is informed by experience in the information world, but it does not claim to represent a scenario of actual events or relate to individual people or organisations.

**Case Study**: The corporate librarian of a global chemical manufacturer provides specialist patent searches as well as news, industry research and scientific literature to his employer. As a chemist he feels qualified to make judgements about the information service which he mediates, and is recognised in this organisation for his constructive suggestions regarding chemical processes.

On one occasion, however, the librarian realises that his company is engaged in the development of a hazardous process near an urban centre in a developing country. Knowing regulations in this country to be lax, he questions the social responsibilities of his employer but finds he is unable to raise his expert objections as a chemist for fear of losing his job. When an explosion happens in the overseas plant, releasing thousands of tonnes of deadly chemicals into the watercourse which results in the death of many local residents, the librarian believes that his failure to alert competent authorities was partly responsible for the huge number of deaths.

**The editors comment...**

The librarian in a corporate setting - as indeed in any other - may be a qualified information professional as well as holding qualifications or having expertise in another discipline. In this case we find a librarian who is also a chemist. He knows, through knowledge and experience, that the actions of his employer may be questionable, yet he decides to do nothing about this.

Contrast this with another librarian who, although having some experience in a particular discipline such chemistry, is not qualified to practise as a specialist in that discipline. The extent to which librarians and other information professionals are competent to practise in another's professional area of
expertise is a common question, and one which we have discussed in other cases (see, for example, Case 0017 'The infopro know best' concerning the role of an information professional providing economic advice).

We comment here on the responsibilities of the librarian as a member of the library and information profession. We suspect that the librarian in this case may require support from his professional association such as CILIP if he believes that he should raise the dangers with a disinterested employer, as well as more general support from his employer in providing adequate guidance on whistle-blowing.

In the present case, it is the librarian's fear of losing his job that persuades him not to alert competent authorities to the potential dangers posed by the employer's actions. We do not know whether his professional colleagues are able to share his concern, but he might have raised this issue with them (unless doing so would cause him to be seen generally as a trouble-maker). It is regrettable that the employer does not have a whistle-blowing policy enabling such incidents (as the potential danger to the urban community in the developing country) to be reported and action taken. However, it is equally possible that the employer has such a policy but that the librarian is either unaware of it, or the employer does not promote it to employees.

We pose a variation on the present scenario to discuss this case in more detail: How would the librarian behave in the same situation if members of his family lived in the area subsequently affected by the explosion? One cannot necessarily assume that he would immediately seek to criticise or question his employer; he might, for example, consider his scientific knowledge of the potential danger to be less than complete and that his scientist counterparts and their managers in the company are better placed to make rational judgements. Nevertheless, he still has a concern about a potentially life-threatening event, yet he believes that his employer does not welcome the advice of a librarian, albeit one qualified as a chemist.

The librarian's responsibilities to society (including himself and his family) as well as to his employer and colleagues provide an ethical challenge which he finds impossible to resolve. It is only after the event (the explosion) that a degree of guilt suggests that he ought to have considered behaving differently. It is too simple a solution to recommend a particular decision after the event. In this case the librarian is genuinely unable to help himself and needs the support of managers (to equip him with tools, resources and the capability to make rational decisions) and the library and information profession.
Sector: Public library

Don’t you know who I am?!

To what extent is a retired member of the information profession responsible for upholding ethical principles of the profession?

Summary: A retired archivist is instrumental in facilitating the sale of a valuable manuscript at auction, undermining the authority of the library’s managers. However, he feels justified in taking this action when it is subsequently discovered that the manuscript is actually more valuable than at first believed.

NOTE: This Case Study is fictitious. It is informed by experience in the information world, but it does not claim to represent a scenario of actual events or relate to individual people or organisations.

Case Study: The archives of a major British city, built up over many years, are acknowledged nationally and internationally for their rare and valuable contents. Many of these historic books and manuscripts are stored in closed vaults for safety. It was established practice to allow only senior archivists access to this valuable collection, and visiting scholars needed written permission before viewing. They were never allowed in unaccompanied.

Two years before this case a reorganisation of the Libraries, Heritage and Arts Department resulted in the early retirement of the Chief Archivist - an internationally renowned mediaeval historian. During August (when many senior staff were on holiday), he visited the City Archives, unexpectedly and without notice, accompanied by an art dealer from a US auction house. Although neither person had permission to access the vault, the former Chief Archivist insisted they be granted access. He told the receptionist, bluntly, that he had been responsible for building up the collection over his 25 years' service and that this gave him every 'right' to access the collection. The receptionist relented (she had only just returned to work after a long period of sick leave, and was feeling vulnerable), enabling the former Chief Archivist to take the art dealer to view a particular manuscript in the closed collection. The receptionist's initial reluctance was perceived by the retired Chief Archivist as antagonistic and he later reported the incident to the new management team. As a result, the receptionist received an initial warning letter as part of an initial disciplinary action, causing her significant stress and personal worry.

Some months later the US auction house won a contract to sell at auction a proportion of the archives and other items belonging to the city council. The particular manuscript which the former Chief Archivist was keen to show the visiting art dealer realised a much higher price than the council had expected. It turned out that research by the retired Chief Archivist, presented at an international colloquium, had revealed the manuscript to have been the missing part of an historic collection. He had informed the US auction house which was then able to promote this in order to command a higher sale price. Reflecting on
the earlier criticism levelled at him when he had unexpectedly visited the City Archives with the US dealer, the retired Chief Archivist felt justified in his action which had now saved the council from a significant loss of opportunity.

**The editors comment...**

One’s initial reaction is to consider the role of the former Chief Archivist as overstepping boundaries. Indeed, it is clearly reported that he entered the closed archive without any proper authority, that he introduced a relative stranger whose credentials had not been verified by the relevant Department, and that he behaved unreasonably towards the receptionist, both to gain access to the archives and later in reporting her defensive attitude.

Whether we assume that the former Chief Archivist, through retirement, no longer has any formal employment relationship with the Department, or even whether he is still employed in the library and information profession, is irrelevant. Even as someone who may no longer have any formal employment relationship, it would be difficult to argue that a prominent archivist of over 25 years’ experience no longer has any influence in the profession and that he would not be aware of responsibilities to the current profession and those working in it. Indeed, he behaves in this case as if he is still gainfully employed by the Department, and his overstepping boundaries and reasonable behaviours do not concur with the section of CILIP’s Code of Professional Practice which relates to responsibilities to colleagues and the information community. Even as a retired member of the information community he is still part of it.

We have no insight into the motives of the retired archivist in bringing the art dealer to see the manuscript in the first place. Perhaps he already realised the rarity of the object and its likely value, but we do not know why he didn’t seek to explain this to the relevant managers at the city council. If he did, and if the new Chief Archivist had been privy to discussions, then one would have to conclude that the senior managers and current Chief Archivist were remiss in allowing such a course of events to happen without proper procedures being followed. We believe also that the relevant managers could not but take a lenient view of the receptionist’s reticence.

By whatever procedure or lack of procedure this incident occurred, and irrespective of the fact that the manuscript eventually turned out to be more valuable than had been suspected, we believe that serious lessons in archives management should be learned by this city council. We also hope that the inappropriate actions of the retired Chief Archivist be used to illustrate the extent to which we remain members, or representatives, of the library and information profession outside our normal places of work.
Stakeholders in Information Ethics
Information Ethics Themes

2020-
- Longevity
- Breakthrough
- Population
- Terrorism
- Climate change
- Generational shifts
- Bioethics

- Regulation
- Responsibility to artificial intelligent agents
- Global imperatives

2013-
- Responsibility to information creators
- Copyright
- Privacy
- Globalisation
- Community
- Responsibility to self
- Positive intent
- Responsibility to dependants
- Information rich
- Diversity
- Equitability
- Multiculturalism
- Preservation

1990s-
- Whistle-blowing
- Politics
- Impartiality
- Competence
- Censorship
- Harm
- Access
- Proper standard of information provision
- Queue jumping
- Conflicts of interest
- Integrity
- Misuse of information
- Limitation of advice
- Promptness and diligence
- Equal treatment
- Good repute of the profession
- Confidentiality
- Transparency
- Responsibility to society
- Responsibility to an employer
- Responsibility to clients
# Grey Literature & InfoEthics: areas of shared interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grey Literature areas of interest</th>
<th>Information Ethics areas of interest</th>
<th>Shared concerns</th>
<th>2020 guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to new technologies</td>
<td>Digital preservation</td>
<td>Are digitally preserved materials truly preserved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New tools – younger scientists seek single point of access to information</td>
<td>New tools: Driving a change in information behaviours</td>
<td>Are we witnessing a paradigm shift in information tools? Is there a ‘Google generation’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access – pioneers not mandated but driven by needs of community</td>
<td>Standards in Open Access</td>
<td>Are we equipped to challenge or even understand the questions of open access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication tools bypass commercial publishing</td>
<td>Who validates published information? Who is the publisher?</td>
<td>How do we manage the increased risk of suboptimal standards or validation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document types, peer review</td>
<td>Document types – preprints (traditional) v new (e.g. datasets) – opportunity for anyone to edit</td>
<td>Is a new way of working emerging? No formal peer review via publishers? Who validates in a closed community?</td>
<td>How do we resolve the inherent weaknesses in informal (e.g. open) peer review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of data – citations? At which point is an author cited – validity of this.</td>
<td>Usage of data – citations?</td>
<td>Do we question the objectivity of citations?</td>
<td>Can we avoid the influence of self-interest in citations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access / preservation / data sensitivity</td>
<td>Open access / preservation / data sensitivity</td>
<td>Who controls datasets? Is patient privacy compromised?</td>
<td>How do we protect the rights of individuals at the same time as enabling valuable open access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New media for storage</td>
<td>New media for storage</td>
<td>Do new media create additional risks for preservation?</td>
<td>Are new technologies always a better thing if risk of loss is increased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New collections – audio recordings</td>
<td>Aren't new players in the information landscape really untrained infopros?</td>
<td>Is our professionalism through use of surveys, ethnographers, etc. compromised?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers – collecting data in the field</td>
<td>Increasing complexity of the information services role.</td>
<td>Blurred distinction between the user &amp; provider of information services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists as GL consumers and producers – a dual role.</td>
<td>How do we address the many professional issues involving right/wrong or subjective decision-making?</td>
<td>Can we collectively resolve these common concerns?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going concerns – language, copyright, plagiarism, preservation</td>
<td>Pricing structure in document delivery: Is it equitable or fair?</td>
<td>Can or should dissemination of information be improved (access, cost, equitability)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination – ILLs, exchange programmes, document delivery</td>
<td>Can standards construction and the application of metadata be truly objective?</td>
<td>How do we ensure the validity (objectivity) of metadata standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access – metadata standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access – full-text repositories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access – work flow – student involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs &amp; Tweets – citation of ephemerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs &amp; Tweets – preservation / archiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs &amp; Tweets – mix of personal &amp; professional content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs &amp; Tweets – web 2.0 – informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs &amp; Tweets – findability – appropriate search strings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open archives – current issues – copyright / peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open archives – libraries / GL specialists - Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open archives – life-cycle – preprints / post-prints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open archives – scholarly communication – continuum from a limited to wider audience – informal to formal (culminates in publication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open archives – open access (timeliness, free vs paid, quality, green agenda)</td>
<td>free v. paid = equality of access; developing world ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – tracking methods – citation data – doc lifecycle</td>
<td>death of &quot;biblionmetrics' role for academic publishing &amp; researchers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – central repository – to accommodate diverse doc types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – peer review – acknowledge level of review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – target audiences – not only WoS but Google, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – wider audiences – via easily understood summaries</td>
<td>risk of end user using unvalidated data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – relationships between diff government organization types – e.g. NGOs / FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and influence – specialist CoPs /</td>
<td>communities of influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Data / datasets – push v pull | decreasing role of trained InfoPro? |
| Data / datasets – policy – top down v bottom up |
| Data / datasets – repurposing – changing perspectives of use/creation – validation, fuel new research, synthesis |
| ROI – expectations / generating no net income, indirect costs | Risk of not doing so – losing the content. |
| ROI – cost measures / cost analysis – many diff methods of measuring |
| ROI – usage assessment – funding linked to performance and results / quality (proof of value) |
| LIS education – awareness – students / professionals / practitioners | How do we respond to the lack of Information Ethics in the LIS curriculum? |
| Both GL and IE are marginalised in LIS curricula. |
| LIS education – knowledge transfer – coursework, research, workplace – formal / informal |
| LIS education – recommendations / BPs – instructors v librarians | Do educators or practitioners provide the best case studies from which to learn? |
| LIS education – assessment – curricula (little or no findings), student survey – can they accurately identify and recognise GL? |
Action Plan
Ethical Principles and Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals

http://www.cilip.org.uk/get-involved/policy/ethics/Pages/default.aspx

The conduct of members should be characterised by the following general principles and values, presented here in no particular order of priority:

1. Concern for the public good in all professional matters, including respect for diversity within society, and the promoting of equal opportunities and human rights.
2. Concern for the good reputation of the information profession.
3. Commitment to the defence, and the advancement, of access to information, ideas and works of the imagination.
4. Provision of the best possible service within available resources.
5. Concern for balancing the needs of actual and potential users and the reasonable demands of employers.
6. Equitable treatment of all information users.
7. Impartiality, and avoidance of inappropriate bias, in acquiring and evaluating information and in mediating it to other information users.
8. Respect for confidentiality and privacy in dealing with information users.
9. Concern for the conservation and preservation of our information heritage in all formats.
10. Respect for, and understanding of, the integrity of information items and for the intellectual effort of those who created them.
11. Commitment to maintaining and improving personal professional knowledge, skills and competences.
12. Respect for the skills and competences of all others, whether information professionals or information users, employers or colleagues.

Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals

This Code applies the ethical principles to the different groups and interests to which CILIP members must relate. The Code also makes some additional points with regard to professional behaviour. The principles and values will differ in their relative importance according to context.

The Code set out below is current - October 2012

A: Personal responsibilities

People who work in the information profession have personal responsibilities which go beyond those immediately implied by their contract with their employers or clients. Members should therefore:

1. Strive to attain and continue to develop the highest personal standard of professional knowledge and competence.
2. Ensure they are competent in those branches of professional practice in which qualifications and/or experience entitle them to engage by keeping abreast of developments in their areas of expertise.
3. Claim expertise in areas of library and information work or in other disciplines only where their skills and knowledge are adequate.

4. Refrain from any behaviour in the course of their work which might bring the information profession into disrepute.

B: Responsibilities to information and its users

The behaviour of professionals who work with information should be guided by a regard for the interests and needs of information users. People working in the information profession also need to be conscious that they have responsibility for a growing heritage of information and data, irrespective of format. This includes works of the imagination as well as factual data. Members should therefore:

1. Ensure that information users are aware of the scope and remit of the service being provided.
2. Make the process of providing information, and the standards and procedures governing that process, as clear and open as possible.
3. Avoid inappropriate bias or value judgements in the provision of services.
4. Protect the confidentiality of all matters relating to information users, including their enquiries, any services to be provided, and any aspects of the users' personal circumstances or business.
5. Carry out and use research involving users (e.g. surveys of needs) in a responsible manner, ensuring that best practice is followed as set out in law or in codes of conduct recommended by research organisations (e.g. universities) or professional bodies.
6. Deal fairly with the competing needs of information users, and resolve conflicting priorities with due regard for the urgency and importance of the matters being considered.
7. Deal promptly and fairly with any complaints from information users, and keep them informed about progress in the handling of their complaints.
8. Ensure that the information systems and services for which they are responsible are the most effective, within the resources available, in meeting the needs of users.
9. Ensure that the materials to which they provide access are those which are most appropriate to the needs of legitimate users of the service.
10. Defend the legitimate needs and interests of information users, while upholding the moral and legal rights of the creators and distributors of intellectual property.
11. Respect the integrity of information sources, and cite sources used, as appropriate.
12. Show an appropriate concern for the future information needs of society through the long term preservation and conservation of materials as required, as well as an understanding of proper records management.

C: Responsibilities to Colleagues and the Information Community

The personal conduct of information professionals at work should promote the profession in the best possible manner at all times. Members should therefore:

1. Act in ways that promote the profession positively, both to their colleagues and to the public at large.
2. Afford respect and understanding to other colleagues, including those in other professions and acknowledge their ideas, contributions and work, wherever and whenever appropriate.
3. Refer to colleagues in a professional manner and not discredit or criticise their work unreasonably or inappropriately.
4. When working in an independent capacity, conduct their business in a professional manner that respects the legitimate rights and interests of others.
5. Encourage colleagues, especially those for whom they have a line-management responsibility, to maintain and enhance their professional knowledge and competence.
6. Ensure that any member of staff to whom a task is delegated has the knowledge and skills necessary to undertake that task effectively and efficiently.
7. Share, where possible, results of research and development projects they have been involved in to help encourage best practice across the profession and enable colleagues to improve the services they provide.
8. Refrain from ascribing views to, or speaking on behalf of, CILIP, unless specifically authorised to do so.
9. Report significant breaches of this Code to the appropriate authorities.(1)
10. Refrain from any behaviour in the course of their work which might bring the information profession into disrepute.

D: Responsibilities to society

One of the distinguishing features of professions is that their knowledge and skills are at the service of society at large, and do not simply serve the interests of the immediate customer. Members should therefore:

1. Consider the public good, both in general and as it refers to particular vulnerable groups, as well as the immediate claims arising from their employment and their professional duties.
2. Promote equitable access for all members of society to public domain information of all kinds and in all formats.
3. Promote the necessary skills and knowledge amongst users to become effective independent learners and researchers.
4. Strive to achieve an appropriate balance within the law between demands from information users, the need to respect confidentiality, the terms of their employment, the public good and the responsibilities outlined in this Code.
5. Encourage and promote wider knowledge and acceptance of, and wider compliance with, this Code, both among colleagues in the information professions and more widely among those whom we serve.

E: Responsibilities as Employees

Members who are employed have duties that go beyond the immediate terms of their employment contract. On occasion these may conflict with the immediate demands of their employer but be in the broader interest of the public and possibly the employer themselves.(2) Members should therefore:

1. Develop a knowledge and understanding of the organisation in which they work and use their skills and expertise to promote the legitimate aims and objectives of their employer.
2. Avoid engaging in unethical practices during their work and bring to the attention of their employer any concerns they may have concerning the ethics or legality of specific decisions, actions or behaviour at work.

Footnotes

1. The appropriate authority will vary depending on the context of the case. It may be CILIP, the employer, a regulatory body or an officer managing the ‘whistle-blowing’ procedure or some other body. It is not possible to be prescriptive.

2. It is recognised that sometimes Members, acting as a representative of employers, have to make decisions that may impact adversely on levels of service or the employment of staff. This is not in itself unethical behaviour but there might be circumstances in which it could be – the lawfulness of the action or the way it is managed, for instance.

SCIP Code of Ethics for CI Professionals

http://www.scip.org/About/content.cfm?ItemNumber=578

• To continually strive to increase the recognition and respect of the profession.
• To comply with all applicable laws, domestic and international.
• To accurately disclose all relevant information, including one's identity and organization, prior to all interviews.
• To avoid conflicts of interest in fulfilling one's duties.
• To provide honest and realistic recommendations and conclusions in the execution of one's duties.
• To promote this code of ethics within one's company, with third-party contractors and within the entire profession.
• To faithfully adhere to and abide by one's company policies, objectives and guidelines.

IFLA Core Values

http://www.ifla.org/III/intro00.htm#CoreValues

In pursuing these aims IFLA embraces the following core values:

1. the endorsement of the principles of freedom of access to information, ideas and works of imagination and freedom of expression embodied in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
2. the belief that people, communities and organizations need universal and equitable access to information, ideas and works of imagination for their social, educational, cultural, democratic and economic well-being
3. the conviction that delivery of high quality library and information services helps guarantee that access
4. the commitment to enable all Members of the Federation to engage in, and
benefit from, its activities without regard to citizenship, disability, ethnic origin,
gender, geographical location, language, political philosophy, race or religion.

**IFLA Code of Ethics for Librarians and other Information Workers (short version)**


**Background**

Librarians all over the world are well aware of their profession's ethical implications. In
more than 60 countries library associations have developed and approved a national
code of ethics for librarians. But a similar document on an international level adopted by
IFLA didn't exist until 2012.

During 2010 and 2012 a working group from FAIFE drafted and consulted extensively on
a draft international code of ethics for librarians and other information workers.

Hundreds of comments from IFLA Members and Non-Members were received to the
draft, and a final version was prepared for the endorsement by the IFLA Governing
Board. The "IFLA Code of Ethics for Librarians and Other Information Workers" was
approved endorsed in August 2012.

**Preamble**

This Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct is offered as a series of ethical propositions
for the guidance of individual librarians as well as other information workers, and for the
consideration of Library and Information Associations when creating or revising their own
codes.

The function of codes of ethics can be described as

- encouraging reflection on principles on which librarians and other information
  workers can form policies and handle dilemmas
- improving professional self-awareness
- providing transparency to users and society in general.

This code is not intended to replace existing codes or to remove the obligation on
professional associations to develop their own codes through a process of re-search,
consultation and cooperative drafting. Full compliance with this code is not expected.
The clauses of this code of ethics build on the core principles outlined in this pre-amble
to provide a set of suggestions on the conduct of professionals. IFLA recognises that
whilst these core principles should remain at the heart of any such code, the specifics of
codes will necessarily vary according to the particular society, community of practice or
virtual community. Code making is an essential function of a professional association,
just as ethical reflection is a necessity for all professionals. IFLA recommends the Code
of Ethics for IFLA to all its member associations and institutions and to individual librarians and information workers for these purposes.

IFLA undertakes to revise this code whenever appropriate.

1. Access to information

The core mission of librarians and other information workers is to ensure access to information for all for personal development, education, cultural enrichment, leisure, economic activity and informed participation in and enhancement of democracy.

To this end, librarians and other information workers reject censorship in all its forms, support provision of services free of cost to the user, promote collections and services to potential users, and seek the highest standards of accessibility to both physical and virtual services.

2. Responsibilities towards individuals and society

In order to promote inclusion and eradicate discrimination, librarians and other information workers ensure that the right of accessing information is not denied and that equitable services are provided for everyone whatever their age, citizenship, political belief, physical or mental ability, gender identity, heritage, education, income, immigration and asylum-seeking status, marital status, origin, race, religion or sexual orientation.

To enhance access for all, librarians and other information workers support people in their information searching, assist them to develop their reading skills and information literacy, and encourage them in the ethical use of information (with particular attention to the welfare of young people).

3. Privacy, secrecy and transparency

Librarians and other information workers respect personal privacy, and the protection of personal data, necessarily shared between individuals and institutions. At the same time they support the fullest possible transparency for information relating to public bodies, private sector companies and all other institutions whose activities effect the lives of individuals and society as a whole.

4. Open access and intellectual property

Librarians and other information workers' interest is to provide the best possible access for library users to information and ideas in any media or format, whilst recognising that they are partners of authors, publishers and other creators of copyright protected works. Librarians and other information workers seek to ensure that both users’ rights and creators’ rights are respected. They promote the principles of open access, open source, and open licenses. They seek appropriate and necessary limitations and exceptions for libraries and, in particular, seek to limit the expansion of copyright terms.

5. Neutrality, personal integrity and professional skills

Librarians and other information workers are strictly committed to neutrality and an unbiased stance regarding collection, access and service. They seek to acquire balanced collections, apply fair service policies, avoid allowing personal convictions to hinder the
carrying out of their professional duties, combat corruption and seek the highest standards of professional excellence.

6. Colleague and employer/employee relationship

Librarians and other information workers treat each other with fairness and respect. To this end they oppose discrimination in any aspect of employment because of age, citizenship, political belief, physical or mental ability, gender, marital status, origin, race, religion or sexual orientation. They support equal payment for equal work between men and women, share their professional experience, and contribute towards the work of their professional associations.

Prepared by Loida Garcia-Febo, Anne Hustad, Hermann Rösch, Paul Sturges and Amelie Vallotton (*FAIFE working group*). Endorsed by the IFLA Governing Board, August 2012

**SLA Professional Ethics Guidelines**

http://www.sla.org/content/SLA/ethics_guidelines.cfm

**Preamble:**

SLA promotes the professional welfare of its members and the organizations and people they serve and fosters the global progress of the knowledge society. In an environment where concepts and practices of ethics and service continue to extend and expand, SLA members strive to implement and promote guidelines for the ethical and appropriate use of information and knowledge. Fundamental to these guidelines is the recognition that there are different kinds of information and knowledge, such as personally identifiable, proprietary, or classified information or public information pertaining to the actions of government. Also fundamental is a respect for a diversity of viewpoints, for cultural differences and for civil discourse.

SLA recognizes that ethical reflection is required in the application of these guidelines. In certain situations, ethical values may be in conflict or may demand that one ethical value take priority over another, especially given the diversity of SLA membership. For example, accountability to society or to the organization may trump the right to privacy or confidentiality.

SLA's guidelines for professional conduct are positioned within various interacting value systems: basic human rights; organizational missions, goals, objectives and ethical codes; legal, cultural, societal and governmental norms; and personal ethical beliefs. The guidelines are intended to help SLA members frame ethical deliberation whenever professionally-related ethical problems arise.

SLA members foster the profession's reputation for integrity, competence, diligence, honesty, discretion and confidentiality through creating and sustaining an environment that facilitates mutual trust among employers, clients or other individuals served, and the profession. They encourage the profession by sharing best practices, experiences and research.
SLA professionals:

Act with honesty, fairness and in good faith in serving and providing value to their employers, clients, and vendors.

Provide their employer, organization, or clients with the highest level of service, by delivering the best sources and services possible within organizational constraints and by improving the quality of and adding value to the information and knowledge they provide.

Enhance employer success by contributing to the mission, goals, policies and strategies of the organization.

Respect the intellectual property of their employers, clients and competitors, and within the legal and ethical constraints of the organization, inform their clients or employers of potential legal and ethical violations in the provision of sources or services.

Honor the privacy, rights, and reputation of individuals and organizations in the proper use of information content regardless of format or medium, adhering to the best practices of ensuring confidentiality.

Strive for excellence by seeking and maintaining professional knowledge and competencies in intellectual and information technologies in themselves, their colleagues, their organization and other professionals, including education for information literacy.

Represent themselves accurately concerning their education, competencies and experience to their employers, clients, colleagues and other professionals.

Avoid conflicts of interest while in the performance of their work.

Background

Prepared by the SLA Information Ethics Advisory Council Toni Carbo, Thomas Froehlich, Louis-Rene Dessureault, Jonathan Gordon-Till, Barbie Keiser, Barbara Wildemuth, Deb Hunt and Carolyn Sosnowski

Approved by the SLA Board of Directors, December 2010

AALL Ethical Principles

http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Leadership-Governance/policies/PublicPolicies/policy-ethics.html

Approved by the AALL membership, April 5, 1999

Preamble

When individuals have ready access to legal information, they can participate fully in the affairs of their government. By collecting, organizing, preserving, and retrieving legal information, the members of the American Association of Law Libraries enable people to make this ideal of democracy a reality.
Legal information professionals have an obligation to satisfy the needs, to promote the interests and to respect the values of their clientele. Law firms, corporations, academic and governmental institutions and the general public have legal information needs that are best addressed by professionals committed to the belief that serving these information needs is a noble calling and that fostering the equal participation of diverse people in library services underscores one of our basic tenets, open access to information for all individuals.

**Service**

We promote open and effective access to legal and related information. Further we recognize the need to establish methods of preserving, maintaining and retrieving legal information in many different forms.

We uphold a duty to our clientele to develop service policies that respect confidentiality and privacy.

We provide zealous service using the most appropriate resources and implementing programs consistent with our institution’s mission and goals.

We acknowledge the limits on service imposed by our institutions and by the duty to avoid the unauthorized practice of law.

**Business Relationships**

We promote fair and ethical trade practices.

We have a duty to avoid situations in which personal interests might be served or significant benefits gained at the expense of library users, colleagues, or our employing institutions.

We strive to obtain the maximum value for our institution’s fiscal resources, while at the same time making judicious, analytical and rational use of our institution’s information resources.

**Professional Responsibilities**

We relate to our colleagues with respect and in a spirit of cooperation.

We distinguish between our personal convictions and professional duties and do not allow our personal beliefs to interfere with the service we provide.

We recognize and respect the rights of the owner and the user of intellectual property.

We strive for excellence in the profession by maintaining and enhancing our own knowledge and skills, by encouraging the professional development of co-workers, and by fostering the aspirations of potential members of the profession.

**ETHICAL PRINCIPLES BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Special Committee on Ethics was appointed in 1997 by then - President Judy Meadows for the purpose of reviewing the Association's Code of Ethics and proposing any revisions necessary. The Code of Ethics incorporates by reference the ALA Code of Ethics which has been revised twice since the AALL Code was adopted. The Special
Committee followed a previous AALL taskforce and other groups in studying possible revisions to the AALL Code of Ethics.

The Special Committee studied the current Code of Ethics and determined that the Code should be replaced. The Committee examined in detail the codes of ethics of other professional associations, including sister library organizations, and wrote articles for AALL Spectrum throughout the past year which called attention to the Committee's efforts and mission.

The Committee met in Chicago in May 1998 and drafted much of the proposed Ethical Principles. Committee members added portions later, and the final draft was circulated and discussed extensively at the Annual Meeting in Anaheim. Registrants received copies in their packets, they could record their responses on a flipchart located by the entrance to the Exhibit Area, and they could voice their concerns at the second portion of the Open Forum. Further, members with e-mail addresses received a copy of the proposed Ethical Principles in a message broadcast from AALL Headquarters. The Committee received several responses and considered them carefully. As a result, the Committee revised some of what was circulated to the membership and brought these Ethical Principles to the Executive Board at its Fall 1998 meeting with the suggestion that they be submitted to the AALL membership for approval. The Ethical Principles were submitted to the membership in March 1999 and approved by an overwhelming majority vote.

Submitted by: J. Wesley Cochran, Chair, Ethics (Special Committee)

**AIIP Code of Ethical Business Practices**

http://www.aiip.org/content/code-ethical-business-practices

An Independent Information Professional is an entrepreneur who has demonstrated continuing expertise in the art of finding and organizing information. Each provides information services on a contractual basis to more than one client and serves as an objective intermediary between the client and the information world.

All members of the Association of Independent Information Professionals (AIIP) agree to and support the objectives of AIIP and accept the following Code of Ethical Business Practice:

- Uphold the profession's reputation for honesty, competence, and confidentiality.
- Give clients the most current and accurate information possible within the budget and time frames provided by the clients.
- Help clients understand the sources of information used and the degree of reliability which can be expected from those sources.
- Accept only those projects which are legal and are not detrimental to our profession.
- Respect client confidentiality. Recognize intellectual property rights. Respect licensing agreements and other contracts.
- Explain to clients what their obligations might be with regard to intellectual property rights and licensing agreements.
• Maintain a professional relationship with libraries and comply with all their rules of access.
• Assume responsibility for employees' compliance with this code.

Approved by the membership May 5, 1989, at the Third Annual Meeting, Lowell, Massachusetts, USA. Amended by the membership April 22, 1990, at the Fourth Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, USA. Amended by the membership April 18, 1997, at the Eleventh Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida, USA. Amended by the membership April 24, 1999, at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting, Berkeley, California, USA. Amended by the membership April 20, 2002, at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Long Beach, California, USA.