



From Idea to Benefit

Human-Centered AI practice workbook

Use this workbook locally or print it. Do not upload responses to the website. Define the task before selecting a tool, and run a small trial with human review.

Seven questions before use

1 Task and person who needs it

2 Simplest available alternative

3 Cost and time ceiling and who bears it

4 Necessary data and what we remove

5 Offline alternative and access needs

6 Reviewer and authority to reject output

7 Benefit measure and stop condition

Proposed decision Run a small trial / Revise / Stop

Local trial card

1 Trial title and specific need

2 Reference idea and link and our contribution

3 Local differences and the non-technical alternative

4 Trial limits resources and cost ceiling

5 Reviewer and data we will not collect

6 Measure comparison and stop condition

Teaching example

Proposed 20-minute activity: students read the false claim that all stored water is safe to drink, identify what needs checking, then improve the statement with their teacher. No drinking experiment, student data or accounts are required.

Community listening example

Proposed 30-minute session: 5 minutes to explain purpose, 10 to choose a general task, 5 to group anonymous themes, 5 to review the summary and 5 to select a trial. Participation is voluntary; no default recordings or photos.

Benefit evaluation template

Define task reviewer and comparison conditions. Count total time including review. Do not automatically attribute a difference to technology.

Indicator	Usual method	Trial
Tasks completed out of total attempts		
Minutes including review		
Cost in a named currency		
Corrections and serious errors remaining		
Help needed and access barriers		
User feedback without their name		

Worked example with invented data

30 minutes using the usual method versus 18 with assistance saves 12 minutes, or 40%. The assisted draft needed 3 corrections versus 1. Neither retained a serious error after review. Decision: run another trial before expanding. These training values are not DJAIRI results or causal evidence.

Follow-up decision owner and review date

Water and vegetation scenario notebook

Separate observations assumptions and calculations. This is a teaching calculation, not an engineering specification or Deir Al-Kahf measurement. No excavation or alteration at a heritage site is authorized by this workbook.

1 Collection area in square metres and measurement source

2 Rainfall in metres source and period

3 Runoff coefficient range and other losses

4 Unit and calculation check and specialist reviewer

Invented example: $100 \text{ m}^2 \times 0.020 \text{ m} \times 0.6 = 1.2 \text{ m}^3 = 1,200 \text{ litres}$ before other losses. A coefficient of 0.3 gives 600 litres; 0.8 gives 1,600 litres. These values do not establish actual water availability.

For a later field trial a specialist reviews storage irrigation and plant species. Record rain and irrigation dates plant survival and fixed photo points. An AI tool does not choose species alone.

References and context

Detailed references and reuse boundaries are available on the website Sources & Approach page.

<https://humanitarianpivot.org/sources-and-approach-en/>

Original DJAIRI material. Version 1.0, 7 October 2026. References provide principles and context, not partnerships or endorsements. The site photograph is documentary; website diagrams are original.