

Checklist - AI Bot Ethical Profiles

Purpose. This checklist is an aid to understanding, not a definitive guide. It offers an informal assessment of the overall ethical profile of the most popular AI bots for the most common ethical issues; energy and sustainability, Intellectual Property (IP, such as copyright) and creators' rights, bias and safety governance, and misinformation and disinformation.

- Section 1 – overall narrative summary for each.
- Section 2 – ethical profiles by bot for each of the 4 ethical issues above.
- Section 3 – methodology; how we created this checklist.

Caveat. We believe we have struck a good balance between being accessible for non-technical people and being useful, but we recognise our work has limitations and it hasn't been independently verified. Care must be taken to ensure you do not treat these ratings as more authoritative than the evidence supports. They are not definitive and AI and companies use of it is continuously evolving.

In case you might wish to test our work or build on it for your own use or make your own ethical assessments, we have included in the course resource download, a range of credible websites that organisations can use for their own ethical analysis. There is also a downloadable checklist of actions that individuals and organisation could take that would improve their ethical use of AI, in each of the areas we have assessed.

Section 1 - Overall Bot and Company Ethical Profile

Copilot (Microsoft). Using our methodology, Microsoft appears to show the strongest overall ethical posture. It seems to have clear sustainability actions, strong governance structures, and transparent commitments to reducing energy and water use. It has strong licensing agreements and opt-out mechanisms for creators, and robust safeguards against misinformation. Overall, it is the most consistently strong performer.

Claude (Anthropic). Anthropic is a safety-first organisation, known for its “Constitutional AI” approach. It performs extremely well on bias, safety, and misinformation controls. Its sustainability and IP transparency are improving but less detailed than Microsoft’s. Overall, it is one of the most ethically aligned platforms, especially on safety.

Gemini (Google). Google has long-standing leadership in sustainability and strong research credentials in AI safety. It performs well on energy and governance, but its transparency around IP and training data appears to be more limited. Misinformation controls are solid but not appear to be consistently strong across all use cases. Overall, a strong but slightly uneven ethical profile.

ChatGPT (OpenAI). Based on our methodology, OpenAI seems to perform moderately across most categories. It participates in major governance bodies and invests in safety research, but its transparency around sustainability, IP, and misinformation appears to be mixed. It is improving but still faces legal and public scrutiny. Overall, our methodology places it in the middle of the ethical spectrum.

Llama (Meta). Meta's sustainability commitments appear moderate, but the platform demonstrates weaker performance in key areas such as intellectual property (IP), creators' rights, and misinformation controls. Our methodology suggests that Meta's open-source approach likely increases the risk of misuse, while transparency appears limited. Governance participation is varied, reflecting a mixed picture. Overall, Llama's ethical profile is among the weakest in this evaluation. However, we acknowledge a counterargument: open-source models can promote transparency, enable independent audits, and foster community-driven safety enhancements—advantages that proprietary, closed systems may lack. As such, the ethical assessment may evolve as the open-source approach develops and matures.

Section 2 – Bot and Company Profile Tables by Ethical Area

1. Energy, Sustainability and Water Use.

AI Bot	Sustainability	Energy	Water	Transparency	Overall
Copilot	Strong	Strong	Strong	High	Green
Claude	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Moderate	Green Leaning
Gemini	Strong	Strong	Moderate	High	Green Leaning
ChatGPT	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Amber-Green
Llama	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Low	Amber-Red

2. Bias and Safety Governance.

AI Bot	Bias Mitigation	Safety	Transparency	Overall Standing
Copilot	Strong	Strong	High	Green
Claude	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Green
Gemini	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Green Leaning
ChatGPT	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Amber-Green
Llama (Meta)	Mixed	Mixed	Low–Moderate	Amber-Red

3. IP & Creators' Right.

AI Bot	Data	IP	Legal Exposure	Overall
Copilot	High	Strong	Moderate	Green
Claude	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Green leaning
Gemini	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Amber green
ChatGPT	Moderate	Mixed	High	Amber
Llama	Low	Weak	High	Red

4. Misinformation and Disinformation

AI Bot	Misinformation	Transparency	Safety	Overall Standing
Copilot	Strong	High	Strong	Green
Claude	Very strong	Moderate	Strong	Green
Gemini	Moderate–Strong	Moderate	Strong	Amber - Green
ChatGPT	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Amber - Green
Llama	Weak–Moderate	Low–Moderate	Mixed	Amber-Red

Section 3 – Methodology

Problem. There are clear ethical issues around AI, but legal and regulatory guidance is limited, and best practice is still emerging, while public debate is at risk of being influenced by loud but often weakly evidenced claims (virtue warriors).

Our Approach. In response to concerns from our community, we have sought to distil a complex and fast-moving area into information that is accessible and useful to non-technical audiences.

Methodology. Our ethical AI comparison was carried out using AI under human supervision and is based solely on publicly available information, with a simple strong/moderate/weak scoring system focused on documented policies and actions rather than technical audits or moral judgements; the work was tested using each of the AI tools assessed to identify weaknesses and increase robustness. We asked the bots themselves to review our assessment of them and the overall response was very positive. A wide range of suggestions were offered by them, which were added and built into our work.

Strengths. The strength of this approach lies in its transparency, alignment with UK government, civil-society and industry frameworks, focus on issues that matter most to the public, and use of indicative ratings to make complex information understandable while avoiding false precision.

Limitations. We also recognise its limitations, including reliance on company-level evidence, a bias towards organisations with greater reporting capacity, the use of proxy data for some impacts, and the need to navigate contested areas such as open-source AI. We also recognise that ensuring our work is easily accessible to a wide and often non-technical audience necessarily involves simplification, selectivity and making assumptions. It has not been independently verified, and we recognise that the technology and how companies use it is evolving rapidly.

Conclusion. Taken together, we are confident this work provides a useful, proportionate and repeatable tool for raising awareness and supporting charities and other organisations to think more clearly and critically about AI ethics, offering a reasonable level of confidence for its intended purpose while encouraging further scrutiny rather than replacing it.

Contact learning@charityexcellence.co.uk if you'd like more information on the methodology we used.

Iteration:

21 Dec 25 – initial methodology and version 1 created.

22 Dec 25 – stress testing by Copilot Researcher, Llama, Gemini, ChatGPT and Claude.

24 Dec 25 – additional useful feedback from bots incorporated by Ian.



Help us to help everyone by sharing this with your network. [Charity Excellence Learning](#): certificated, **online AI courses** that anyone can undertake.

Visit our [Charity Excellence AI Ready web page](#) to download **dozens of free AI resources** and to **assess your organisation's AI readiness**.