INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD
ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47]
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value : 86.87
Volume - 11, Issue - 08, August - 2025

DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF/202508007 --:-- Research Paper / Article / Review

Carebots and the Elderly: Navigating the Ethical and Legal Frontiers of Robotic Elder Care

Dr. Subholaxmi Mukherjee
Assistant Professor of Law, ICFAI University Tripura
subholaxmimukherjee@iutripura.edu.in

Abstract: *As populations age globally, the integration of artificial intelligence and robotics in elder care—specifically through carebots—has garnered increasing attention. These robotic systems are designed to assist older individuals with daily tasks, monitor health, and provide companionship. However, the deployment of carebots raises significant ethical and legal concerns. This article critically examines these challenges, including issues of autonomy, privacy, consent, data protection, liability, and the human dignity of elderly users. Through a multidisciplinary lens that draws from law, ethics, gerontology, and technology studies, this paper aims to develop a normative framework for the responsible governance of carebots in elder care.*

Keywords: *Carebots, Elderly Care, Robotics, Artificial Intelligence, Ethical Issues, Legal Framework, Autonomy, Privacy, Dignity, Informed Consent, Data Protection, Surveillance, Liability, Human–Robot Interaction, Gerontechnology, Health Technology Law, Ageing Population, Companion Robots, Robot Ethics, AI Regulation.*

1. INTRODUCTION: The Rise of Robotic Elder Care

The 21st century is witnessing an unprecedented demographic transformation. The global population is aging at a historically rapid pace. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), by 2050, the number of individuals aged 60 years and older will exceed 2 billion, outnumbering adolescents and youth aged 15–24. This shift, while a testament to medical and social progress, presents formidable challenges to healthcare systems, social services, and caregiving structures worldwide. Traditional models of elder care—dependent on familial support, human caregivers, and institutional care—are becoming increasingly unsustainable due to declining birth rates, increasing longevity, and a shrinking caregiving workforce. In this context, robotic technologies are being viewed as potential enablers of sustainable elder care.

Robotic systems specifically designed to assist the elderly, popularly referred to as "carebots," are rapidly emerging as a disruptive force in the elder care landscape. These machines are equipped with artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, sensor networks, and speech recognition capabilities. Their functionalities range from assisting in daily activities such as bathing, eating, and medication management to providing social companionship, emotional support, and even cognitive stimulation. Countries such as Japan, South Korea, Germany, and the United States have embraced these technologies to varying degrees, often as part of their national ageing strategies.

The integration of robotics into elder care has been welcomed by some as an innovative solution to labour shortages and the rising costs of care. Carebots can work continuously without fatigue, reduce the physical burden on human caregivers, and offer personalized care through adaptive algorithms. Additionally, socially assistive robots (SARs) such as PARO (a robotic seal) and humanoid robots like Pepper have shown promise in alleviating loneliness and enhancing the psychological well-being of elderly individuals, particularly those with dementia.

However, despite these advantages, the rapid deployment of carebots introduces complex ethical and legal dilemmas that remain inadequately addressed. Ethically, the use of robots in intimate caregiving settings challenges deeply held notions of human dignity, empathy, and relational care. Legal frameworks have yet to catch up with the rapid technological advances, leaving critical gaps in areas such as data protection, liability, informed consent, and accessibility.

Moreover, the broader social implications of robotic care must not be underestimated. Will the automation of elder care reinforce social isolation by reducing human contact? Can emotional attachments to robots be considered

ethically sound or psychologically safe? Are we at risk of commodifying care, reducing it to a transactional service devoid of human presence? These questions become even more urgent when considered in light of vulnerable populations, including individuals with cognitive impairments or limited digital literacy.

This article seeks to systematically examine these issues by adopting a multidisciplinary lens that encompasses law, ethics, gerontology, and technology studies. It critically evaluates the ethical concerns and legal uncertainties surrounding carebots and proposes a normative framework for their responsible and equitable governance. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure that the rise of robotic elder care does not compromise the fundamental values of autonomy, dignity, and justice that should define care for older persons.

2. Literature Review:

The scholarly discourse on robotic elder care has matured over the past two decades, beginning with foundational critiques by Sparrow and Sparrow (2006), who argued that robotic assistance risks undermining the human dimension of caregiving. Sharkey and Sharkey (2012) expanded on this concern, highlighting the ethical tensions inherent in substituting human caregivers with machines. Vallor (2011) introduced care ethics into the robotics debate, stressing the importance of relational dignity and moral responsiveness. Borenstein and Pearson (2013), in contrast, explored the emancipatory potential of carebots, framing them as tools for enhancing elder autonomy. Calo (2015) contributed legal insight by drawing parallels between robotics and cyberlaw, urging proactive regulatory frameworks. Mittelstadt et al. (2016) deepened the ethical discussion by mapping algorithmic risks, particularly regarding fairness, accountability, and opacity in decision-making systems. Institutional reports such as the IEEE's *Ethically Aligned Design* (2019), the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2020), and UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendation (2021) have recently shifted the discourse toward global principles of ethical AI governance. These developments form the intellectual foundation for this paper's normative framework.

3. Objectives

This article is guided by the following core objectives:

1. **To conceptualize carebots within the framework of gerontechnology and examine their typologies, functionalities, and deployment contexts**—clarifying the technological landscape shaping modern elder care.
2. **To identify and analyze the ethical dilemmas** associated with robotic elder care, particularly in relation to autonomy, privacy, dignity, emotional manipulation, and equitable access for vulnerable elderly populations.
3. **To critically evaluate the existing legal and regulatory frameworks** governing carebots across jurisdictions, with special emphasis on data protection, liability, safety standards, and elder rights.
4. **To conduct a comparative analysis** of international approaches to carebot governance, highlighting best practices and regulatory gaps in the European Union, United States, Japan, South Korea, and India.
5. **To propose a normative governance framework** that integrates ethical design, legislative reform, institutional oversight, and international cooperation for the responsible, inclusive, and rights-based deployment of carebots in elder care.

4. Methodology

This study employs a normative, interdisciplinary methodology that integrates legal doctrinal analysis, ethical reasoning, gerontological inquiry, and technology assessment. The research framework is grounded in qualitative analysis of legal texts, international policy instruments, and regulatory standards relevant to AI and elder care. Key legal materials include the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act, India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023), and ISO 13482 safety guidelines. Ethical analysis is conducted using principles from care ethics, bioethics, and human rights discourse. The study also critically examines comparative legal approaches across jurisdictions such as the EU, Japan, the United States, South Korea, and India. Supplementing legal inquiry, the paper evaluates empirical findings from robotics research and incorporates stakeholder concerns, including those of caregivers, elderly users, policymakers, and designers. This multidimensional methodology enables the construction of a normative governance framework that is both context-sensitive and globally relevant.

5. Discussion:

5.1 Conceptualising Carebots and Their Applications in Elder Care

The deployment of carebots in elder care is not merely a technological innovation—it represents a paradigm shift in how societies perceive, administer, and experience care. To critically evaluate their ethical and legal implications, it is necessary to first establish a comprehensive understanding of what carebots are, how they are designed, the functions

they perform, and the settings in which they operate. This section provides a structured conceptual framework to analyze carebots within the broader context of gerontechnology and care ethics.

Defining Carebots

Carebots, or care-assistive robots, are a subset of service robots specifically designed to support older adults in maintaining independence, health, safety, and social engagement. These robots may be autonomous or semi-autonomous, using artificial intelligence, machine learning algorithms, computer vision, natural language processing, and sensor-based feedback to interact with users and adapt to their needs. Unlike industrial robots programmed for repetitive tasks, carebots must operate in complex, dynamic, and intimate environments—such as private homes, hospitals, or assisted living facilities—requiring high levels of responsiveness and ethical sensitivity.

According to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO 8373:2021), a service robot is "a robot that performs useful tasks for humans or equipment excluding industrial automation applications." Carebots fit within this classification but occupy a unique position due to the emotional, relational, and health-related nature of the services they provide. As such, they intersect not only with engineering and healthcare domains but also with legal, philosophical, and psychological considerations.

Typology of Carebots

Carebots encompass a diverse range of robotic systems, each tailored to address specific dimensions of elder care. A typological classification helps to delineate the spectrum of current and emerging applications:

A. Assistive Carebots

These robots provide physical support for mobility and daily activities. Examples include robotic wheelchairs, exoskeletons that aid walking, robotic arms for feeding, and robots that assist in lifting or transferring bedridden patients. The Japanese robot "Robear" is a well-known example, designed to gently lift patients from beds to wheelchairs.

B. Monitoring and Health Management Bots

These carebots are integrated with sensors and internet-of-things (IoT) connectivity to track an elder person's vital signs (heart rate, oxygen levels, temperature), detect falls, and issue emergency alerts to caregivers or medical personnel. They can be programmed to monitor medication schedules, detect irregular behavior, or even predict health risks through AI-enabled analytics.

C. Socially Assistive Robots (SARs)

SARs are designed to engage elderly users in verbal or non-verbal interactions aimed at reducing social isolation, providing cognitive stimulation, and encouraging adherence to therapy. Unlike assistive robots that perform physical tasks, SARs focus on emotional and psychological well-being. PARO, the robotic baby seal, has been shown in multiple studies to reduce agitation and improve mood in patients with dementia. Robots like ElliQ or Pepper can initiate conversations, play music, remind users of daily routines, and respond empathetically.

D. Companion Robots

Companion robots represent a fusion of SARs and affective computing. They simulate companionship by mimicking empathy, offering comfort, and serving as virtual friends. These robots often utilize machine learning to personalize interactions based on user behavior and preferences. Though non-sentient, their design aims to foster emotional bonds, which may be therapeutic for some users but ethically contentious for others.

Human–Robot Interaction in Elder Care

Effective integration of carebots requires careful consideration of Human–Robot Interaction (HRI), a multidisciplinary field that studies how humans and robots communicate, collaborate, and co-exist. In elder care, HRI must account for age-related sensory, cognitive, and emotional changes. Key challenges include:

- **Usability**: Interfaces must be intuitive for users who may lack technological proficiency or have impaired vision or hearing.
- **Trust**: Users must feel comfortable and confident in the robot's capabilities, particularly in critical tasks like medication delivery or fall detection.
- **Adaptability**: Robots must be capable of learning and adjusting to the evolving needs of users, particularly in the context of degenerative diseases like Alzheimer's.
- **Safety and Reliability**: Malfunction or miscommunication can lead to physical or psychological harm, making robust safety protocols essential.

Cultural and social attitudes toward robots also influence HRI. In Japan, where Shinto beliefs attribute animism to non-human entities, there is greater public acceptance of robotic companionship. In contrast, Western societies may express more ambivalence due to concerns about dehumanization or ethical transgression.

Care Settings and Deployment Models

Carebots are currently being deployed across a range of settings, each presenting unique regulatory and operational challenges:

A. Home-Based Care

Home environments pose both opportunities and challenges. On one hand, carebots can facilitate independent living, reducing the need for institutionalization. On the other hand, privacy concerns are more acute in private residences, and the burden of oversight often falls on informal caregivers.

B. Hospitals and Nursing Homes

In institutional settings, carebots can support nurses and staff in repetitive tasks, reduce workload, and enhance patient monitoring. However, questions of liability, supervision, and user consent become more complicated in shared spaces.

C. Telepresence and Remote Monitoring

Some carebots enable remote presence through video and audio communication, allowing distant family members or doctors to monitor the user. These features are particularly useful during pandemics or in rural areas but require strong data protection mechanisms.

Carebots in Policy and Practice

Several nations have recognized the potential of carebots in their policy frameworks. Japan's Robot Strategy and Korea's Aging Society Policies explicitly promote the use of robots in elder care. In the EU, research funding through the Horizon 2020 programme supports socially assistive robotics. Despite these advancements, regulatory oversight remains uneven. Most jurisdictions lack specific legislation for robotic caregivers, relying instead on a patchwork of medical device laws, data protection regulations, and consumer safety standards.

The private sector also plays a critical role, with major corporations and startups developing carebots for mass deployment. This commercialization, while expanding access, also raises concerns about commodification of care, profit-driven motives, and unequal distribution of technology.

In sum, carebots are not monolithic technologies but a heterogeneous and rapidly evolving field with the potential to transform the landscape of elder care. Their utility spans physical assistance, emotional engagement, cognitive stimulation, and healthcare management. However, their integration into caregiving environments demands an interdisciplinary approach that is attentive to user diversity, cultural contexts, and social justice concerns. Understanding the taxonomy, interaction dynamics, and deployment contexts of carebots is a necessary foundation for evaluating the ethical and legal implications that follow in subsequent sections of this article.

5.2. Ethical Issues in Robotic Elder Care

The introduction of carebots into elder care is more than a technological intervention—it is an ethical transformation of care itself. Elder care is inherently relational, imbued with emotional, psychological, and moral dimensions that extend beyond the delivery of services. As carebots begin to occupy this space, they raise profound ethical questions concerning autonomy, dignity, privacy, vulnerability, and human values. These concerns become especially acute when care is provided to populations who may be cognitively impaired, physically dependent, or socially marginalized. This section critically examines the central ethical issues implicated in the design, deployment, and interaction of carebots in elder care contexts.

Autonomy and Informed Consent

Respect for individual autonomy is a foundational principle in bioethics and care ethics. In the context of elder care, autonomy refers to the right of older adults to make decisions regarding their own bodies, environments, and relationships. The use of carebots challenges this principle in several ways.

First, the complexity of robotic systems and their embedded AI algorithms may render them opaque to elderly users. Many carebots operate through machine learning systems that adapt in real-time, making their behavior unpredictable or unintelligible even to their developers. Informed consent under such conditions becomes problematic. Elderly individuals—particularly those with dementia, cognitive decline, or sensory impairments—may not fully understand what the robot is doing, what data it is collecting, or what risks are involved.

Second, the presence of carebots in shared or institutional settings often involves default installation or implicit consent. For example, a nursing home may install robotic monitors or surveillance tools without individual residents being aware or capable of objecting. This raises concerns about substituted decision-making and paternalism, where choices are made on behalf of the elderly "for their own good" but without their genuine participation.

Ethically responsible deployment requires that carebots incorporate transparent interfaces, meaningful user control, and consent mechanisms that are cognitively accessible. Adaptive consent models—where users can give, withdraw, or modify consent over time—should be embedded as design norms.

Privacy and Surveillance

One of the most contentious ethical issues surrounding carebots is their capacity for continuous monitoring and surveillance. These robots often rely on embedded sensors, microphones, and cameras to collect data that inform their responses and enable emergency interventions. While these capabilities may enhance safety—such as detecting falls or non-responsiveness—they simultaneously generate detailed records of the user's behaviors, routines, and even emotional states.

The ethical dilemma lies in balancing safety with the right to privacy. Older adults, particularly those living alone or in vulnerable health conditions, may have their most intimate activities—bathing, dressing, sleeping—recorded or analyzed by AI systems. Even if such data are anonymized or encrypted, the potential for misuse, unauthorized access, or profiling remains significant.

Moreover, privacy is not merely a technical issue of data protection—it is a matter of dignity and self-determination. For many elderly individuals, the perception of being constantly watched can lead to self-censorship, anxiety, and erosion of trust in caregivers. From a Kantian perspective, treating individuals as ends in themselves, rather than as means to a technological goal, requires that privacy be protected not just functionally but ethically.

Ethical carebot design should therefore integrate privacy-by-design principles, minimize data collection, and include clear opt-in/opt-out settings. Institutional settings must ensure informed authorization and establish independent oversight to prevent surveillance overreach.

Human Dignity and the Risk of Dehumanization

Care, in its traditional conception, involves human presence, empathy, and moral responsibility. The replacement or supplementation of human caregivers with robotic systems raises serious concerns about dehumanization. Critics argue that carebots, by simulating care without experiencing moral responsibility or emotional concern, may reduce the recipient of care to an object of efficiency rather than a person deserving respect and compassion.

This risk is particularly acute in end-of-life care or palliative settings, where emotional resonance and existential comfort are as important as physical support. While robots can be programmed to speak soothing words or mimic human facial expressions, such responses are ultimately mechanical, lacking the authenticity that characterizes human interaction.

Some ethicists, drawing on theories of relational ethics (e.g., Nel Noddings), argue that genuine care cannot be replicated by machines because it arises from emotional engagement and moral responsiveness. Others contend that if robots can effectively relieve suffering, reduce loneliness, and provide security, their artificiality may be ethically permissible—so long as their role is transparent and supplementary.

Nevertheless, dignity is compromised when individuals are denied real human contact or when care is commodified and automated without consideration of the recipient's personhood. Ethical frameworks must prioritize the preservation of human dignity as a non-negotiable baseline.

Emotional Attachment and Anthropomorphism

Elderly users often anthropomorphize carebots—assigning them names, attributing feelings, and developing emotional attachments. This tendency is encouraged by design elements such as facial expressions, speech patterns, and responsiveness to user emotions. While such interactions can reduce loneliness and anxiety, especially among individuals with cognitive impairments or depression, they also raise ethically sensitive questions.

Is it morally acceptable to deceive users into believing they are forming relationships with sentient beings? Are we exploiting emotional vulnerability to increase user compliance and reduce care costs? Philosophers like Sherry Turkle have warned against the "relational illusion," where users experience intimacy with machines that are incapable of empathy, reciprocity, or moral understanding.

There is also concern about psychological dependency, especially when the robot is withdrawn due to malfunction or replacement. For cognitively impaired individuals, distinguishing between real and simulated relationships can become difficult, potentially leading to confusion, disorientation, or emotional harm.

Designers and policymakers must therefore adopt caution in how carebots are framed and marketed. Ethical guidelines should include transparency about the robot's capabilities, limitations, and non-sentience. Designers should consider whether the use of anthropomorphic features is ethically necessary or manipulative.

Equity, Inclusion, and Access

Technology, while often positioned as a democratizing force, can also exacerbate social inequalities. Carebots, particularly those with advanced features, are expensive and may only be accessible to wealthy individuals or well-funded institutions. This raises distributive justice concerns: Will carebots become a luxury for the few while the majority of the elderly remain under-served?

Digital literacy is another barrier. Many older adults lack familiarity with smart technologies, especially in low-income, rural, or developing country contexts. Without inclusive design, linguistic localization, and user training, carebots risk reinforcing technological exclusion.

From an ethics of care perspective, justice must involve not only equal distribution of resources but also attentiveness to individual needs, cultural values, and situational contexts. Ethically responsible innovation should prioritize affordability, scalability, and inclusive design that adapts to diverse elder populations.

Governments and developers must therefore ensure that carebot deployment does not deepen existing inequities or marginalize already vulnerable groups. Public funding, open-source development, and community participation can help bridge the digital divide and foster ethical inclusivity.

The ethical deployment of carebots in elder care demands more than technological sophistication. It requires a commitment to preserving the moral dimensions of care—autonomy, dignity, empathy, and justice. Ethical evaluation must be embedded at every stage of the robotic care lifecycle: from design and programming to implementation and oversight. As robotic systems become more sophisticated and pervasive, the ethical choices we make today will determine whether carebots empower the elderly—or merely manage them.

5.3 Legal Challenges and Regulatory Vacuums

While the ethical implications of robotic elder care raise profound normative questions, their deployment also confronts a fragmented and underdeveloped legal landscape. Carebots operate in a grey zone between health technology, consumer products, and AI systems, making them difficult to regulate under existing legal frameworks. Most jurisdictions have yet to enact comprehensive laws specifically tailored to the unique challenges posed by robotics and artificial intelligence in caregiving contexts. This section analyzes the most critical legal dimensions involved in the use of carebots for the elderly, including data protection, liability, safety standards, user contracts, and labour implications.

Data Protection and Cybersecurity

Carebots collect, process, and transmit a wide range of personal data, including biometric indicators, health status, location tracking, daily routines, and even emotional responses. Such data are often stored on cloud platforms or transmitted to caregivers and third-party service providers. The legal risks associated with this data flow are substantial, implicating both privacy rights and cybersecurity obligations.

In jurisdictions like the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provides a robust framework governing data minimization, purpose limitation, user consent, and rights of access, correction, and erasure. Under Article 9 of the GDPR, health-related data are classified as “special category data” and are subject to heightened protections. If a carebot collects data on heart rate or fall incidents, its developers and service providers may be considered “data controllers” or “processors,” requiring them to implement technical and organizational safeguards.

However, many jurisdictions, particularly in the Global South, lack comprehensive data protection laws, leaving elderly users vulnerable to unauthorized access, surveillance, or data commodification. Even in countries with laws on the books, enforcement mechanisms remain weak. The transnational nature of AI and IoT further complicates matters, as carebots often rely on foreign cloud services and cross-border data flows that may not be adequately covered by domestic legislation.

Cybersecurity presents another formidable challenge. Carebots, like all networked devices, are susceptible to hacking, data breaches, and malicious code injection. A cyberattack that disables a robot’s alert system or manipulates its decision-making algorithms could result in physical harm or death. Therefore, the legal framework must incorporate mandatory encryption, real-time monitoring, breach notification protocols, and liability for cybersecurity failures.

Liability and Accountability

Perhaps the most complex legal challenge posed by carebots is the question of **liability** when things go wrong. Suppose a carebot fails to detect a fall, delivers the wrong medication, or causes emotional distress due to inappropriate interaction—who is legally responsible?

Traditional legal doctrines such as **product liability**, **medical malpractice**, or **negligence** are ill-suited to handle cases involving autonomous systems that "learn" and evolve over time. These frameworks presuppose a linear chain of causation and clearly identifiable human fault—conditions often absent in AI-based robotics.

Legal scholars have proposed several models to address this challenge:

- **Strict liability for manufacturers**: Under this model, carebot producers would be held liable for any harm caused by their product, regardless of fault. While this protects consumers, it may stifle innovation.
- **Shared liability models**: Responsibility is distributed among developers, manufacturers, software providers, and even end-users, depending on the nature of the failure.
- **AI-specific liability legislation**: The European Union's proposed Artificial Intelligence Act (AIA) and AI Liability Directive are pioneering efforts to introduce harmonized rules for high-risk AI applications, including those used in healthcare and elder care.

In India, while general tort principles could theoretically be applied to carebot-related injuries, there is no specific legal provision addressing liability for autonomous robotic systems. Given the increasing use of AI in consumer healthcare products, Indian law would benefit from statutory reforms that establish clear standards of care, fault attribution, and compensation mechanisms for robotic failures.

Licensing, Certification, and Safety Standards

Unlike pharmaceuticals or medical devices, carebots often escape rigorous regulatory scrutiny before being introduced into elder care settings. This regulatory gap is concerning given the vulnerability of the target population and the potential for harm.

Regulatory bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), or India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) have limited mandates when it comes to non-therapeutic or socially assistive robots. As a result, robots that significantly influence elder behaviour, medication adherence, or mental well-being may be used without prior clinical validation or human-subject testing.

To address this, legal frameworks must:

- **Mandate pre-market certification**: Carebots should undergo independent testing for safety, reliability, and accessibility before being introduced to care environments.
- **Establish performance standards**: These could include response times for emergency detection, speech recognition accuracy, or the precision of physical assistance mechanisms.
- **Create post-market surveillance**: A legal obligation for manufacturers and institutions to report adverse events or malfunctions to a centralized authority.

International standards such as **ISO 13482** (Safety requirements for personal care robots) provide a starting point but lack enforceability unless incorporated into domestic law. India, for instance, has no statutory or administrative framework to license robotic elder care devices, leading to unregulated deployment and uneven safety compliance.

Contractual Rights and Elder Abuse Prevention

In many cases, elderly users "agree" to use carebots by accepting End User License Agreements (EULAs) that are drafted in dense, technical language. These contracts often include waivers of liability, data-sharing provisions, and arbitration clauses that elderly individuals may neither understand nor have the bargaining power to contest.

This situation raises significant concerns under **consumer protection** and **elder law** regimes. The asymmetry of information and power between robot developers and elderly users—especially those with diminished capacity—may amount to exploitation.

Moreover, carebots can potentially facilitate **new forms of elder abuse**: emotional manipulation, surveillance coercion, or unauthorized financial transactions. If a carebot includes voice-command features linked to banking or home automation systems, misuse by third parties becomes a realistic risk. In such scenarios, the law must provide robust mechanisms for redress and institutional safeguards.

Legislators must therefore:

- Mandate **plain language disclosure** of terms and conditions.
- Prohibit unfair contract terms that waive fundamental rights or obscure liabilities.
- Develop a **statutory framework** for elder technology protection, akin to existing elder abuse laws.
- Appoint **digital guardians** or ombudsmen to monitor the rights of elderly tech users.

Labour Law and Workforce Implications

The introduction of carebots also has implications for the **human caregiving workforce**. While robots may reduce the burden on overstretched human caregivers, they may also displace low-skilled care workers, many of whom are women, migrants, or informal laborers.

Labour law must therefore balance the imperatives of automation with the protection of employment rights and just transitions. Key concerns include:

- **Job displacement and reskilling**: Governments must invest in retraining programs to help displaced care workers transition into supervisory, technical, or human-centered roles.
- **De-professionalization**: There is a risk that increased reliance on robots may reduce the perceived value of caregiving as a profession, leading to further underinvestment in the care economy.
- **Worker surveillance**: In settings where carebots record staff performance, new concerns arise about employer overreach and digital surveillance of workers.

Policymakers must ensure that the economic benefits of robotic elder care do not come at the cost of labour exploitation or the erosion of caregiving as a dignified profession. Labour regulations must incorporate new definitions of human–robot collaboration and establish ethical boundaries for AI oversight of human workers.

The legal landscape for carebots in elder care remains underdeveloped, inconsistent, and fragmented. As these technologies grow in complexity and scope, so too must the legal frameworks that govern them. The multidimensional risks posed by carebots—ranging from privacy breaches and unsafe operation to liability confusion and labour disruption—demand a proactive, rights-based regulatory approach.

Lawmakers must adopt a dual strategy: (1) updating existing laws on health, elder rights, consumer protection, and data governance to cover carebot-specific scenarios, and (2) developing new legal instruments that reflect the unique challenges of robotics and AI in care environments. Ultimately, the goal must be to ensure that robotic elder care serves to **enhance**, not replace, the human values at the heart of caregiving.

5.4. Comparative Legal Approaches to Regulating Carebots

The global proliferation of carebots necessitates a comparative understanding of how different jurisdictions are approaching the regulation of these technologies. While the core ethical and legal concerns—privacy, safety, liability, autonomy, and equity—are largely universal, states have responded with varying degrees of comprehensiveness, normative emphasis, and enforcement capabilities. This section surveys notable regulatory models and initiatives in the **European Union**, **United States**, **Japan**, **South Korea**, and **India**, assessing their respective strengths and limitations in governing robotic eldercare.

European Union: Rights-Centric and Risk-Based Regulation

The European Union (EU) is at the forefront of legal thinking on artificial intelligence, including its application in eldercare robots. The EU's **Artificial Intelligence Act (AIA)**, currently in final stages of adoption, classifies AI systems into tiers of risk—minimal, limited, high, and unacceptable. Carebots that monitor physiological conditions, assist with medication, or interact socially with vulnerable elderly persons are likely to fall under the "high-risk" category, subjecting them to rigorous oversight.

Key features of the EU's approach include:

- **Transparency obligations**: Users must be clearly informed that they are interacting with an AI system.
- **Human oversight requirements**: Critical decisions must remain subject to human intervention.
- **Robust data governance**: The **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** and **Data Act** ensure that carebots adhere to high standards of consent, minimization, and anonymization.
- **Liability reforms**: The proposed **AI Liability Directive** aims to harmonize tort laws across member states by shifting some burden of proof onto developers and mandating disclosure of algorithmic design details in civil litigation.

In addition, **ISO 13482** (Personal Care Robot Safety Standards) is often adopted in practice to ensure technical conformity. However, a challenge remains in the implementation at the national level, as member states exhibit differences in funding models, enforcement capacity, and healthcare integration of AI tools.

United States: Market-Driven Regulation with Sectoral Gaps

The U.S. regulatory framework is highly fragmented, relying primarily on sector-specific agencies and common law doctrines rather than comprehensive legislation. While the **Food and Drug Administration (FDA)** regulates software as a medical device (SaMD), many socially assistive robots used in eldercare escape its purview unless they claim therapeutic or diagnostic functions.

Key elements of the U.S. approach include:

- **Federal Trade Commission (FTC)**: Oversees deceptive business practices, which may be relevant to carebot advertising or data handling.

- **HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act)**: Provides some data protections, though only for covered entities (not typically robot manufacturers).
- **State tort law**: Applies general negligence and product liability principles to carebot injuries, but lacks uniform standards.

The absence of a federal AI law leads to inconsistent regulation, particularly around privacy, algorithmic bias, and accessibility. A growing number of states—such as California and Illinois—have begun enacting AI-specific laws, but these are still piecemeal and often not tailored to the eldercare context.
In 2022, the **Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights** issued by the White House emphasized safe and effective systems, algorithmic discrimination protections, and data privacy—principles that could guide future regulation of carebots.

Japan: Innovation-Focused with Cultural Integration
Japan stands as a global leader in the development and deployment of care robots, driven by its rapidly aging population and cultural receptiveness to robotic companionship. Rather than heavily regulating or restricting carebot use, Japan promotes responsible innovation through soft law instruments and public–private partnerships.
Salient aspects of Japan's regulatory strategy include:

- **METI Guidelines on Care Robotics (2019)**: These promote user safety, reliability testing, and human-centric design, but they are non-binding.
- **Robot Care Equipment Safety Guidelines** issued by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare: Offer practical safety checklists and usage protocols.
- **Privacy protection under APPI (Act on the Protection of Personal Information)**: Similar to the GDPR in principle, though less stringent in enforcement.
- Strong emphasis on **co-design** with users and caregivers, integrating carebots into community-based long-term care plans.

However, critics argue that Japan's light-touch regulatory approach could leave vulnerable users exposed to risks, especially as private sector actors dominate development with minimal oversight. Moreover, labor displacement issues have not been adequately addressed in regulatory terms.

South Korea: Tech-Savvy Yet Emerging Framework
South Korea, another technologically advanced and aging society, is rapidly expanding its use of carebots in eldercare institutions and smart home settings. The government actively supports carebot adoption through its **Robot Industry Promotion Act (2021)** and National R&D programs.
Legal and regulatory features include:

- **Framework Act on Intelligent Robots (2008)**: One of the earliest robotic legislation worldwide, though largely symbolic and promotional in nature.
- **Personal Information Protection Act (PIPA)**: A strong data privacy law applied to carebot service providers.
- **Digital Healthcare Regulations**: Allow experimental deployments through regulatory sandboxes, but lack permanent norms on liability and redress.

South Korea's Ministry of Science and ICT is currently drafting revisions to expand AI safety and ethical compliance, but concrete laws governing elder-specific robotic care remain under development.

India: Nascent and Fragmented Legal Landscape
In India, the regulatory environment for carebots remains in its infancy. Although there is significant interest in digital health and AI innovation, legal frameworks specific to eldercare robotics are absent.
Key constraints include:

- **No AI-specific law**: India currently lacks comprehensive legislation to regulate AI, robotics, or autonomous systems. The **Digital India Act** and **Data Protection Act (2023)** offer limited coverage.
- **Lack of elder-specific safeguards**: Although the **Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act (2007)** imposes caregiving duties on children and institutions, it does not contemplate robotic care.
- **Consumer law and tort law**: May provide some recourse in the case of faulty carebots, but there are no standards for testing, approval, or monitoring.
- **Data privacy**: The new **Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023)** provides a framework for consent and data processing, but its enforcement mechanisms remain under development.

Given India's socio-economic diversity and eldercare challenges, a robust legal architecture is essential to avoid deepening digital divides or enabling technological abuse among vulnerable populations. Public consultations on a **National Robotics Framework** have begun, but comprehensive action is awaited.

Emerging Global Norms and Regulatory Harmonization

Several international efforts aim to harmonize ethical and legal standards for carebots:

- **OECD Principles on AI (2019)**: Advocate inclusive growth, human-centered values, transparency, and accountability.
- **UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendation (2021)**: Urges member states to protect human dignity, rights, and sustainability in deploying AI.
- **Council of Europe's CAHAI Process**: Exploring legally binding instruments to govern AI in human rights frameworks.

These initiatives provide guiding principles, but enforcement remains domestic. An international treaty or model law on care robotics—similar to the **Hague Conference instruments** in private law—could facilitate regulatory convergence while preserving national specificities.

Comparative legal analysis reveals a spectrum of approaches to carebot regulation, from the EU's rights-based rigor to Japan's innovation-oriented pragmatism. While no jurisdiction has yet achieved a fully comprehensive legal framework, emerging models point toward certain best practices: mandatory safety testing, privacy-by-design mandates, algorithmic accountability, and elder-specific safeguards.

For countries like India, the task ahead involves adapting global principles to local realities—balancing innovation with protection, and economic growth with ethical integrity. Regulatory harmonization, especially through international cooperation, will be key in preventing regulatory arbitrage and ensuring that carebots enhance rather than undermine the dignity of elderly persons worldwide.

5.5. Toward a Normative Framework for Carebot Governance

As the integration of robotic systems in elder care accelerates, it becomes imperative to formulate a robust normative framework that balances technological advancement with ethical imperatives and legal accountability. This section proposes a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach to carebot governance, rooted in ethical design, legislative reform, professional oversight, and international cooperation.

Ethical Design Principles

The foundational layer of carebot governance lies in embedding ethics into the design architecture itself. The principles of **Privacy-by-Design** and **Dignity-by-Design** must be integrated into the development lifecycle—from prototype to deployment.

- **Privacy-by-Design (PbD):** Given the intimate nature of elder care, privacy must not be an afterthought. PbD requires that data minimization, user consent protocols, and encryption techniques be embedded into the hardware and software design of carebots. Passive surveillance mechanisms, such as motion sensors or facial recognition, should be accompanied by opt-in models and user override features.
- **Dignity-by-Design:** Beyond mere functionality, carebots must be designed to respect and promote human dignity. This entails avoiding infantilizing interfaces, enabling user autonomy in interactions, and respecting cultural preferences in speech, gesture, and touch modalities.
- **Transparency in AI Decision-Making:** Carebots often rely on AI-driven algorithms for decision-making, such as prioritizing tasks, interpreting user emotions, or issuing medical alerts. Such systems must be explainable, auditable, and open to scrutiny to prevent bias, manipulation, or automation opacity. Explainable AI (XAI) principles should be mandatory for care contexts.
- **User-Centered Interfaces:** Interfaces should accommodate a wide range of physical, cognitive, and digital literacy abilities. Use of large fonts, voice commands, tactile feedback, and multi-language options can promote inclusivity.

Legal Regulation

The legal vacuum in which carebots currently operate demands urgent attention. Existing laws regulating medical devices or consumer electronics are insufficient to address the unique risks and rights involved in robotic elder care. A proactive legislative agenda should include:

- **Carebot-Specific Legislation:** Comprehensive laws must be enacted to regulate the design, sale, and use of carebots. These laws should address elder-specific rights, such as protection from manipulation, consent in automated care interactions, and safeguards against dehumanization.
- **Integrated Data Protection and Liability Norms:** Carebots must adhere to data protection regimes (e.g., GDPR, Indian DPDP Act), while also adapting them to elder care settings. Legislation must also clearly define liability in cases of malfunction, harm, or rights violation—whether attributable to manufacturers, software developers, care institutions, or individual caregivers.

- **Certification and Independent Testing:** A formal system of certification should be established to assess the safety, usability, ethical compliance, and privacy features of carebots. Testing must be conducted by independent regulatory bodies, not merely by corporations with vested interests.
- **Ombudsman for Elder Tech:** A dedicated institutional mechanism for grievance redressal must be created to handle complaints relating to robotic care, especially those involving data misuse, emotional distress, or loss of autonomy.

Institutional and Professional Oversight

Governing carebots must go beyond laws and design—it requires dynamic, situated, and interdisciplinary oversight mechanisms.

- **Participatory Technology Assessment (pTA):** The deployment of carebots should be preceded by impact assessments involving diverse stakeholders—geriatricians, ethicists, caregivers, engineers, and elderly users themselves. Their voices are critical in understanding real-world implications.
- **Ethics Boards in Elder Care Facilities:** Analogous to hospital ethics committees, elder care institutions should form ethics review boards to evaluate and monitor the ethical use of robotic systems. These boards must be empowered to halt, modify, or suspend robotic care programs where necessary.
- **Training and Certification for Human Caregivers:** Caregivers must be trained in **Human–Robot Interaction (HRI)** to ensure that they can safely and effectively supervise, collaborate with, and assist carebots. Training should include emergency protocols, ethical use guidelines, and rights-based caregiving.
- **Monitoring of Algorithmic Performance:** Continuous evaluation of AI systems deployed in carebots is necessary to detect shifts in algorithmic behavior, especially as they learn and evolve in unpredictable environments.

Global Collaboration

The challenges posed by carebots are global in nature, yet their governance is highly fragmented. A transnational approach is essential to ensure equitable, ethical, and effective robotics governance.

- **International Harmonization:** Global institutions such as the World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations (UN), and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) should lead initiatives to harmonize standards for elder care robotics. Such standards must reflect both global norms and local socio-cultural sensitivities.
- **South–South Cooperation:** Developing countries must not merely import carebots from the Global North; rather, South–South cooperation can foster context-sensitive innovations tailored to local needs, languages, and resource constraints. India, Brazil, and South Africa can play a key role in developing carebots for community-based elder care models.
- **Inclusive Development Policies:** Policies supporting research, subsidies, and deployment of carebots must include equity-based metrics. Special emphasis should be placed on rural populations, underprivileged elderly persons, and female caregivers.

6. Conclusion: The Human in the Loop

As the global population ages, the integration of robotic systems into elder care appears both inevitable and necessary. Carebots offer tangible benefits: they can relieve overburdened human caregivers, provide round-the-clock monitoring, foster independence among elderly persons, and even offer companionship in socially isolated environments. Yet, the ethical and legal dilemmas they raise are profound.

Elder care is not merely a technical process—it is a relational, moral, and deeply human practice. The introduction of carebots must therefore not diminish the role of human empathy, attentiveness, and dignity. Robots must be tools for augmenting care, not for replacing the human essence of caregiving.

To ensure this, normative frameworks must embed **human rights, autonomy, and relational dignity** into every stage of the carebot lifecycle—from ideation and design to deployment and regulation. Ethical design principles, robust legal statutes, interdisciplinary oversight, and global collaboration are all essential to this mission. Above all, a human-in-the-loop model—where humans remain central in critical decision-making, emotional support, and ethical judgment—must be preserved.

In conclusion, the goal of carebot governance is not merely to mitigate harm or maximize utility, but to **affirm the ethical foundations of care** itself. In doing so, we ensure that robotics remains a servant of humanity, especially at its most vulnerable stage—the twilight of life.

REFERENCES:

1. Borenstein, J., & Pearson, Y. (2013). Robot caregivers: Harbingers of expanded freedom for all? *Ethics and Information Technology, 15*(3), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-013-9321-5
2. Calo, R. (2015). Robotics and the lessons of cyberlaw. *California Law Review, 103*(3), 513–563.
3. Sharkey, A., & Sharkey, N. (2012). Granny and the robots: Ethical issues in robot care for the elderly. *Ethics and Information Technology, 14*(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-010-9234-6
4. European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Brussels: European Commission.
5. World Health Organization. (2021). Decade of Healthy Ageing: Baseline report. Geneva: WHO.
6. Sparrow, R., & Sparrow, L. (2006). In the hands of machines? The future of aged care. *Minds and Machines, 16*(2), 141–161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-006-9030-6
7. Vallor, S. (2011). Carebots and caregivers: Sustaining the ethical ideal of care in the twenty-first century. *Philosophy & Technology, 24*(3), 251–268.
8. Niemeier, A., & Hauser, J. (2020). Robots in elder care: Challenges and future perspectives. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 46*(5), 9–13.
9. Lin, P., Abney, K., & Bekey, G. A. (2012). Robot ethics: The ethical and social implications of robotics. MIT Press.
10. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2), 1–21.
11. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2020). Getting the future right – Artificial intelligence and fundamental rights. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
12. India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2023). Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. New Delhi: Government of India.
13. Indian Parliament. (2007). The Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007.
14. IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. (2019). Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. IEEE.
15. European Parliament. (2017). Resolution with recommendations to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics. (2015/2103(INL)).
16. Coeckelbergh, M. (2010). Health care, capabilities, and AI assistance. *Studies in Ethics, Law and Technology, 4*(3). https://doi.org/10.2202/1941-6008.1127
17. Tzafestas, S. (2016). Social robotics: Roles, challenges, and future directions. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems, 86*, 35–45.
18. Decker, M., & Fischer, M. (2008). Service robotics: Do you know your new companion? *International Journal of Social Robotics, 1*(3), 253–265.
19. Coughlin, J. F. (2017). The longevity economy: Unlocking the world's fastest-growing, most misunderstood market. PublicAffairs.
20. Leenes, R., Palmerini, E., Koops, B. J., Bertolini, A., Salvini, P., & Lucivero, F. (2017). Regulatory challenges of robotics: Some guidelines for addressing legal and ethical issues. *Law, Innovation and Technology, 9*(1), 1–44.