

*You are required to submit a written report, not exceeding one page, focusing on **one of the three** exercises given. You are free to select which exercise to tackle. Ensure **your answer is grounded in the concepts we've covered in class** to support your arguments. I have chosen Exercise 2.*

**Exercise 2:** When someone cuts a long line during the morning rush at our regular coffee shop, our objection to such behavior might rest on the belief that the store should operate on a principle of **first come, first served**—that no one should have special priority beyond their time of arrival. This particular principle of queuing is so deeply ingrained in certain societies that it can feel self-evident.

1. In the context of a coffee shop, what are some alternatives to first come, first served? How might each of these be justified? Why don't coffee shops tend to use these, despite those justifications?
2. What if we changed the scenario from queuing at the coffee shop to boarding an airplane? How would the answers to these questions change?
3. And now consider the different ways that we might prioritize the provision of vaccines. How would these answers change once again in this scenario?

Let us first discuss three alternatives regarding to the coffee shop first come, first served problem. One alternative can be giving **priority based on membership or loyalty programs**, this could be justified by the shop's desire to reward loyal customers and encourage them to choose the same shop again. While rewarding loyal customers is ethically sound, it may generate socio-economic disparities between customers; thus, coffee shops may not use this approach because it could lead to dissatisfaction among non-loyalty program members and potentially discourage new customers from trying the shop. Prioritizing customers with **time constraints**, such as those rushing to catch a train or getting to work, supports the coffee shop's goal of offering *efficient service*. However, subjective judgments of urgency may introduce biases and disadvantages for those unable to articulate their urgency, therefore this approach can potentially lead to disputes and dissatisfaction.

Another idea is implementing a **reservation** system, where customers can book time slots in advance, could enhance predictability and convenience. While ethically providing *fairness* and *predictability* for planners, concerns arise regarding *accessibility* for those unable to plan ahead or lacking access to reservation systems. Coffee shops may avoid this approach due to logistical complexities and the desire to maintain spontaneity for walk-in customers.

Let us change the scenario to boarding an airplane. There are already different strategies to avoid the first come-first served issue, such as **priority based on seat class or loyalty status**, that is, first-class and business-class passengers board before economy-class passengers due to higher ticket prices and premium services. With this, again, the airline aims to reward loyalty and encourage brand loyalty, helping airlines maximize profits and differentiate services. Prioritizing based on ticket price is ethically questionable as it privileges wealth over need and it may exacerbate inequalities and perpetuate class divisions.

Another idea, compatible with both the coffee shop and with boarding an airplane, is offering **fast track priority for vulnerable groups**: the coffee shop/airline could designate specific times of the day to prioritize vulnerable groups in the queue, such as seniors, pregnant women, or individuals with disabilities. This could be ethical by acknowledging and supporting the special needs of these groups, thus promoting *inclusion, equity and fairness* given that these individuals may face unique challenges or limitations that make waiting in long queues difficult or uncomfortable.

Finally, when considering how to distribute the provision of vaccines one approach involves prioritizing individuals with **higher risk factors** such as underlying health issues, elderly individuals, and frontline workers who face greater exposure. This aims to protect the most vulnerable and aligns with ethical principles of *beneficence and justice*, minimizing harm and prioritizing those in need. Another approach focuses on ensuring **equitable distribution of vaccines** across various regions and demographic groups, aiming to mitigate disparities in healthcare access. This method, guided by principles of social *justice and fairness*, emphasizes prioritizing marginalized communities and confronting systemic inequalities.

In all scenarios, ethical decision-making should prioritize fairness, equity, and the well-being of all individuals involved. Striking a balance between efficiency and inclusivity is crucial to maintain legitimacy and uphold ethical standards in various contexts.