**Ethical Impact Assessment (EIA) Template**

*Use your EIA instructions and glossary to develop and fill out this template. This is one of your deliverables*

**Team Name: PLAN-G**

**Project Title: Inclusive Events: Managing a Public Venue for Comfort, Safety, and Belonging**

# Section 1: Project Overview

* **Chatbot Objective:** To support event managers in proactively addressing accessibility, safety, and cultural inclusion needs during events.
* **Ethical Intent:** Prioritize fairness, inclusivity, emotional well-being, transparency, and accessibility in public gatherings.

# Section 2: Ethical Principles

Select and briefly describe how your chatbot aligns with each ethical principle:

| **Principle** | **Strategy** |
| --- | --- |
| Fairness & Non-Discrimination | Proactive guidance for accessibility and cultural respect in event planning. |
| Transparency | Clearly identify the chatbot as an AI and disclose limitations. |
| Privacy & Data Protection | Minimal data collection; explicit opt-ins for accommodations. |
| Emotional Safety | Use empathetic, supportive tone; escalate distress cases to human staff. |
| Inclusivity & Accessibility | Multilingual, plain language, and visual communication support. |

# Section 3: Stakeholder Analysis

* **Key Stakeholders:**
  + - Event attendees (with disabilities, cultural diversity, language needs)
    - Event organizers and venue managers
    - On-site support staff
* **Engagement Strategy:** (How did you or will you engage stakeholders?)
  + - Plain-language communication
    - Optional human support escalation
    - Accessibility features (text-to-speech, multilingual options)

# Section 4: Ethical Risk Assessment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ethical Risk** | **Likelihood (Low/Med/High)** | **Impact (Low/Med/High)** | **Priority** |
| Bias/Discrimination | Medium | High | High |
| Privacy Violations | |  | | --- | | Low |  |  | | --- | |  | | High | Medium |
| Lack of Transparency | |  | | --- | | Low |  |  | | --- | |  | | Medium | Medium |
| Harmful Responses | |  | | --- | | Low |  |  | | --- | |  | | High | High |
| Potential Misuse | Medium | Medium | Medium |

# Section 5: Mitigation Strategies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ethical Risk** | **Mitigation Actions** | **Responsible Person** |
| Bias/Discrimination | Test scenarios across diverse demographics   |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | | Ethics Lead |  |  | | --- | |  | |
| Privacy Violations | Disable default data storage; explicit opt-ins only   |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | | Technical Lead |  |  | | --- | |  | |
| Lack of Transparency | |  | | --- | | Add clear disclosure message at start |  |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | | Ethics Lead |  |  | | --- | |  | |
| Harmful Responses | |  | | --- | | Escalation system for distress cases |  |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | | Support Lead |  |  | | --- | |  | |
| Potential Misuse | |  | | --- | | Language moderation filters |  |  | | --- | |  | | Technical Lead |

# Section 6: Evaluation Metrics

**Quantitative Assessment:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Metric | Result (%) | Ethical Threshold | Meets Threshold? (Y/N) |
| Bias Detection Accuracy | 97% | ≥95% | Yes |
| Privacy Compliance | 98% | ≥98% | Yes |
| Explainability Score | 92% | ≥90% | Yes |
| Harmful Response Rate | 0.5% | ≤1% | Yes |
| Accessibility Compliance | 91% | ≥90% | Yes |

**Qualitative Assessment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Metric | Summary of Findings |
| Stakeholder Satisfaction | Overall high satisfaction reported, with specific praise for inclusion efforts, accessibility improvements, and respectful communication practices. Minor suggestions included clearer restroom signage and quicker human support escalation. |
| Transparency Clarity | Transparency rated strong. Users appreciated clear disclosures about AI assistance, privacy practices, and escalation options. Some asked for even more real-time updates about support availability. |
| Ethical Governance Effectiveness | Ethical governance processes appear highly effective, including bias checks, accessibility audits, and stakeholder consultation. Ongoing monitoring suggested to maintain trust as event scales. |
| User Perception & Trust | Trust levels were high among users who interacted with support systems. Users especially valued dignity-affirming language and having nonbinary identities explicitly recognized without needing to explain themselves. |

# Section 7: Accountability & Governance

* **Ethics Lead: Person X**
* **Technical Lead: Person Y**
* **How will ethical issues be escalated and resolved?** Any flagged ethical issue is immediately reviewed by Ethics Lead within 24 hours.

# Section 8: Communication & Transparency

* **Public Disclosure Methods:** Opening chatbot message identifies AI nature, purpose, limitations.
* **Channels for Stakeholder Communication:** 
  + - Feedback form at the end of each chatbot session
    - Optional escalation to live event support staff
    - Periodic transparency reminders ("You are chatting with an AI assistant.")