

ICLG Response to the Consultation Draft Code of Professional Ethics

Thank you for the chance to comment on the CILIP Draft code of Professional Ethics. Our main comments are the Corporate Information Professional might have difficulty complying with A7 and B6(2) as they currently stand.

Introductory paragraphs

The introductory paragraphs are useful in putting the reasoning behind the code into context, but we would prefer to see them with a heading e.g. ‘Reasoning’ or ‘Background’ or “Introduction” so that it is clear from the start as to why they are included.

A1 The phrase ‘good standing’ is a bit old fashioned, we would suggest the more simple ‘good reputation’

A2 We think there should be an additional point referring to the awareness of the need for current and accurate information to balance the “conservation and preservation”. Or **B2(5)** may be an alternative place for this comment.

A4 This needs to start “Subject to the restrictions in A10” as access to information may be affected by copyright issues, intellectual property rights etc.

A7 The reference to the equitable treatment of all information users is not something that all corporate firms apply, for instance in a law firm priorities are given first to the Partners of the firm, then to the associates and then to trainees. If someone such as a secretary wants help with her personal conveyancing matter priority is given to the Partner, this is certainly not equitable but is within the framework of the business.

B2(5) see comment re A2

B3(8). In Corporate Libraries informing users of charges is an in-house policy decision and should not be in a code-of-conduct. Sale of goods and services legislation already covers this issue and the public cannot incur costs unless previously informed and agreed. In a corporate environment there may be in-house policies such as only informing if a charge is above ‘£x’.

B4(8). The reference to ‘appropriate authorities’ needs to be clarified.

B6(2) - Some information professionals in corporate environments cannot allow access to their resources for licensing and/or security reasons, therefore this statement should be expanded.

Also some of the companies they work for actually sell information as their main revenue stream therefore it would not be possible to “promote equitable access for all members of society to information of all kinds and in all formats”

