



SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Meeting held on May 31, 2022).

THE CHAIR.— With a quorum present, the meeting is open.

(The time is 14:12).

—We welcome the delegation of the Colegio de Sociólogos del Uruguay, made up of its president, sociologist Eduardo Bottinelli, and a member of its Board of Directors, sociologist María Julia Acosta. I want to remind everyone that this association had told us of its interest in joining the work of the commission, which for us is very good news. As you know, we are only just getting started, so we are working by trial and error and, as a result, making mistakes and omissions. Consequently, the first thing I must do is thank you and apologize for not having invited you formally and in a timely manner.

MR. BOTTINELLI.— First of all, I want to thank you for receiving us, because for the Colegio de Sociólogos this is unprecedented; it has not had occasions like this before. Also, the initial receptiveness is very important to us.

The Colegio de Sociólogos del Uruguay submitted a note as a complaint—I clarify, in a good sense—and to point out the absence of sociology—especially the sociology of work—from a central matter such as the future of work.

First, I want to say who we are, those of us who are present here: the person speaking, Eduardo Bottinelli, who, besides presiding over the Colegio until the end of the year, is director of Factum and a lecturer and researcher in the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Universidad de la República, and María Julia Acosta, who is a member of the Board of Directors of the Colegio de Sociólogos and director of Social Studies at Equipos Consultores and a Grade 3 in Sociology of Work. That is to say, she also has a professional footing. It is important to stress that our participation here is on behalf of the Colegio and does not involve the other professional activities that each of us has.

One of the points we think it is relevant to make is that our note and our request are in no way questioning the professionals who make up the commission today.

Once we learned of the makeup of the Special Commission on Futures—through the press—especially on this specific point of the future of work and the work of the future, we began to receive some inquiries and comments from colleagues, who pointed out to us the absence I mentioned with respect to the sociological view of work.

So, very briefly, we want to present some elements that we believe should be considered in this commission and that have to do with the role that sociology in general, and the sociology of work in particular, has played, having taken part in various advisory capacities, both to unions—including the PIT-CNT itself—and, mainly, to the State itself, at the level of the Presidency, the OPP, the Ministry of Labor and Social Security, and also to international organizations. In other words, there is a significant link between the sociology of work and work as a whole.

In addition, there are international organizations and networks whose members are those who work in sociology, so there is international recognition there of the sociology of work in Uruguay. It is part of networks such as the Latin American Council of Social Sciences and the Latin American Association of Labor Studies; it even hosted the Congress of the Latin American Association of Labor Studies. As you will see, there is a significant accumulation of experience.

I want to tell you that the Colegio de Sociólogos is already twenty-five years old—it was founded in 1997—and it is an organization that brings together sociology graduates from all over the national territory. We are in the process of organizing the Fifth Uruguayan Congress of Sociology, in which there is a specific working group on the sociology of work. In addition, the Colegio de Sociólogos was part of the organization of the Congress of the Latin American Association of Sociology.

Among the objectives we have as a Colegio—established in the bylaws—are promoting the scientific development of sociology; encouraging intervention in, and planning of, social actions for the benefit of the community; disseminating national sociological output by fostering multidisciplinary exchange at the national and international levels; promoting training and professional development by energizing the connection of professionals with the academic community; and consolidating recognition of the profession, representing and supporting its members through the contribution of activities that bring prestige to sociology. It is within this framework that we requested this appearance.

We have also brought copies of some publications. The first is called *El oficio del sociológico en Uruguay en tiempos de cambio*—we will leave you a copy—which is the result of the Fourth Uruguayan Congress of Sociology and includes some of the work and linkages that have been made by sociology in Uruguay and the dialogue with Latin America. There is also the *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, which contains a specific article we wanted to present, called “Transformaciones en el mundo del trabajo en Uruguay: la gestión en el sector del software a medida,” written by María Julia Acosta. We also have the book *El Uruguay desde la*

sociología 18, which gives a rundown of the various working groups of the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences. There are two sociology of work groups there, one of which is the one María Julia Acosta belongs to, and to her I give the floor.

MS. ACOSTA.— I am going to give a summary so as not to take any more of your time.

The Sociology of Work Area of the Department of Sociology, which is made up of researchers who are also part of the Sistema Nacional de Investigadores, has a long history. Perhaps the main reference is Marcos Supervielle, although Francisco Pucci and Mariela Quiñones are also there, among others.

I want to highlight that lately we have done a lot of research funded by the Comisión Sectorial de Investigación Científica of the Universidad de la República, all of it aimed at understanding the culture of work, both from the workers' side and from the companies' side. There we got into topics linked to human resources management strategies, which are very important aspects when looking at the future and the future of work. In particular, it is about understanding what working entails and what solving problems is. We got into those topics because we believe they may be relevant.

Lastly, I want to point out that sociology has interpreted society through the category of work; in other words, it is a foundational category. The classics of sociology analyzed the great social transformations starting from work. It seemed relevant to us to reclaim a bit the historical knowledge of sociology on this occasion.

MR. BOTTINELLI.— The idea is to give a brief presentation to quickly introduce some elements with this work in mind, but also with other areas of sociology in mind. The book I mentioned to you summarizes the different places where sociology has been present in education, in health, in politics, and so on. There are a number of areas in which we believe the dialogue of sociology with the political system is something important and fundamental. We believe that sociology can contribute a view of things that often escape other kinds of studies.

I simply want to reinforce what Ms. María Julia Acosta said, namely that the earliest works of sociology strongly reflected how work is structuring and how it produces changes in societies, both in their organization and their hierarchies and in their values. From that perspective, we see that the involvement of sociology can contribute.

Thank you very much.

MS. NANE.— Good afternoon. Thank you very much for coming and for stepping forward when you saw that you were not included here, so that you could collaborate.

I want to ask two questions, one of them related to what Mr. Bottinelli just said.

The world of work underwent a revolutionary change starting with the pandemic, both in places that were prepared for remote work and in those that were not. Personally, I am very tied to the world of software, so staying home working was no trouble for me at all and I did not find it complicated in the slightest. Nevertheless, in other sectors there was a great transformation; so much so that nowadays people are still working from home.

Management and so on in software companies was mentioned here. One of the great concerns when you have dispersed teams is how to convey the corporate culture. Now, the topic we could begin to think about in the commission is how that sociology of work changes when work actually becomes an individual task. It is true that one has to be much more creative when it comes to thinking about all those tools that make it possible to collectivize knowledge, tasks, collaboration, and so on. This is a crucial point that we should raise in this setting.

The other leg that concerns me is that personnel selection systems are one of the categories in which they are advancing the most, in both data mining and artificial intelligence.

So, one of the crucial elements in the topic we are analyzing, the future of work, has to do not only with how someone who has a job is going to get through that future, how they will be challenged by that future and how the future will challenge work, but with who is going to gain access to the jobs of the future; that is, how the personnel selection funnel is going to work once it goes through automation. Automation will go by way of artificial intelligence; artificial intelligence is based on algorithms; algorithms have the same biases that, generally speaking, the data feeding the algorithm have, so it becomes necessary to change a bit that taxonomy that so often leads us to classifications.

I wanted to ask you about those two topics in case you have anything to say.

MS. ACOSTA.— The thing is that there are rather homogenizing views that tend to think, “How great the algorithm is, it solves things!” In reality, we also insist that the real practice of work must be studied. For example, in the case of remote work, what has happened with this kind of established hybrid work is striking, where organizations, on the management side, find themselves faced with the need to generate a sense of belonging to the organization, and collaborative work, and have found very innovative and interesting solutions. For example, the other day we were doing an interview at a company and they told us they would meet on Wednesdays; the whole organization is together on Wednesdays; they have a full time and part time

work arrangement, but things like what is happening now are starting to occur and they have to be studied.

We all have an idea of what automation means and what could happen, but in reality we have to see how it unfolds—on the workers' side and also from the organizations' side—all of the human resources management and the entire work process. We all know that it is cut across by technology, which sometimes helps in the processes but also makes some organizational changes harder and requires adaptation on the part of workers. It is very interesting because we have to see what is actually happening in organizations.

I think the matter of the selection funnel goes along the same lines. We know which jobs are the most in demand and which skills are the most in demand; now, we have to see what we need to do to have those workers with those skills, workers who take on board the idea that they need to keep changing their competencies as their work goes on.

MR. BOTTINELLI.— I simply want to add that we should not focus only on what happens in the world of work or on that selection process, but on who does not gain access or is left out of a possible change. Also, in this process of the hybridization of work, we have to see what repercussions it has on daily life, on care, and on the minimum infrastructure needed to be able to carry out work outside the traditional organizational setting. That is why I said that, beyond thinking about work as an element in itself and the way it is organized, we have to think about everything these changes imply for other elements linked to people's daily lives and the ways they organize themselves, both within the company and in the repercussions they can have on people's daily lives, on possible demands for care, on education—in both public and private education—and on activities related to the education system. There are more elements that have been challenging societies for some time now in various sectors and, without a doubt, the pandemic accelerated a number of processes.

MR. VALDOMIR.— I join in the greeting for the initiative our colleagues from the Colegio de Sociólogos took to be received by our commission.

I am going to make a couple of comments.

First, it has to be acknowledged that Uruguayan sociologists have historically been connected to foreign associations, networks, and working groups on topics related to the sociology of work. Francisco Pucci was mentioned; he was secretary of the Latin American Association of Sociology of Work. Other works connected to the pulp industry have also been widely discussed and have been useful for the political discussion in the different settings in Parliament.

I want to ask the Colegio to put together a systematization of some classic articles on the sociology of work in Uruguay from recent years and to send it to

the secretariat of the Special Commission on Futures so that we have it as a thematic library tied to everything that professionals from our country have produced in this area.

Second, I want to mention that, as you well know, the Special Commission on Futures is taking its first steps. Although its creation had been under discussion since the previous legislature, we have only just begun taking our first steps last year or this year, and that is surely why we ended up overlooking some fundamental invitations to academic and professional actors who ought to be consulted permanently for the work of this commission. So we will surely be able to do things together with the Colegio de Sociólogos and with the thematic groups that are linked not only to the sociology of work but also to other topics. Perhaps, during the handling of this matter in the commission, we can explore some more permanent ties or some more specific kind of agreement or arrangement.

On the other hand, we cannot forget that this is a two-way street, so when the Colegio de Sociólogos or some other institution—for example, from the Udelar or the Faculty of Social Sciences—organizes activities, it would be good for us to be called and invited so as to bring the view from politics, with a forward-looking, future-oriented perspective, which is something new in terms of legislation for the national Parliament. We would surely be very happy from this commission if you invite us and call on us.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR.— If there are no more questions or comments, we thank the delegation of the Colegio de Sociólogos del Uruguay for being present at today's meeting.

I think it was made clear that we gladly receive your justified complaint. We have a fairly intense agenda, which from now through September we are going to define precisely today, and we will pass it on to you. The focus for this year is: “The Future of Work, the Work of the Future.” We have some proposals there for working along five dimensions and, of course, for analyzing some of them, and as we are going to divide up among ourselves the task of preparing the work on those thematic axes, we will gladly be calling on you, accepting your offer.

So thank you very much, and we will be seeing each other.

(The delegation of the Colegio de Sociólogos del Uruguay leaves the room).

—The third item on the agenda is to define the work regime and the coordination of upcoming events.

We have two or three important tasks to settle today.

A draft document has been distributed to each of the members of the commission.

As always, we have been working here with proposals, which we then settle among all of us. But time is passing, the last Monday of September is approaching, and the task ahead of us is quite significant, to put it one way. So, we have been working on a proposal for how to approach this topic that we have chosen—"The Future of Work, the Work of the Future"—and a month ago we already had a trigger session—which simply aimed to get the task started—with the presentations by the economists Munyo and Zunino.

Now the proposal is to take up five axes.

The first of them is "Vectors of transformation and emerging factors in the world of work in the twenty-first century," which in some way implies a more general approach.

The second is "Vectors of transformation and emerging factors that imply new economic and value-production practices in the twenty-first century," that is, how the digital and technological revolution, and so on, is bringing about changes in production and also in productivity.

The third axis refers to new capabilities for the twenty-first century, that is, everything that we already know is happening with respect to the new skills being required for the work of the future. Within that framework is the whole matter of capabilities, both for the new generations and for the current ones, and that lifelong learning that has to be undertaken even while holding a job that may seem stable.

The fourth axis is the matter of long-lived societies, that is, this situation known as "100+." Of course, this does not have to be literally so, but it is undoubtedly the case that people are reaching greater ages, which also generates a transformation in current jobs and the creation of new jobs for these new populations. There we are seeing the emergence of new ways of working for older people.

The fifth axis is "The governance of the Work of the Future: Regulation and Labor Policy in a Change of Era," that is, more focused on regulatory matters. I repeat that we are always talking about proposals. We are not going to deal with any specific bill here.

So, the proposal is to set at least five sessions of three hours each to work on each thematic axis between now and September 20. We should choose among ourselves which topic is our preference or which of them we feel we know most about or are most keen to study. We have a group of experts—more than twenty—who specialize in the subject of work. We also have other groups interested in working with us. Today the Colegio de Sociólogos appeared, but also, for

example—and we have discussed this—companies and personnel selection managers have asked to take part. As the Senator said a moment ago, there is a whole change taking place in personnel selection. In that regard, the Asociación de Empresas de Búsqueda y Selección has asked to take part. There is also a very interesting working group of public and also private companies that meet periodically to deal precisely with all of these transformations, and it has raised with us the possibility of taking part. Third, the group of labor lawyers has naturally asked to take part. As you can see, these groups are identified with, or linked more precisely to, one or another of the vectors.

In turn, within the more than twenty experts specific to this topic, there are also people more specialized in skills and others in technological and business changes, among other things.

We are fifteen members. So I think we should make the effort, between now and the weekend, to state what our preferences would be for preparing the activity, with everything that implies. Consider that we have to move toward a more internal activity. That is also what they are asking of us, and it is a learning process we are going through. Most of the experts and the groups that are asking to take part prefer a working session of exchange with us. In that sense, the format could be presentations of fifteen or twenty minutes. The idea would be that three or four experts, in an hour or an hour and ten minutes, give us very concise presentations of their perspectives and, from there, an exchange among the whole commission would begin to generate the inputs we are looking for.

Therefore, this document is a draft. So, if Representative Lilián Galán chooses “Vectors of transformation and emerging factors in the world of work in the twenty-first century” and wants to design other questions, those are set aside. I insist: it is simply a draft.

We have to choose, then, five days, with three hours each, and divide these axes among ourselves, unless a different one comes up. That is where we would begin the work of choosing the experts we are going to bring in. They do not all have to give presentations. In fact, most of them have told us that their intention is to take part. We do not have to feel obliged to give them ten, fifteen, or twenty minutes. Perhaps simply with the invitation to take part in the exchange that day just as we do, with a comment or a question.

So two or three of us would have to take charge of each thematic axis and we would divide up the dates among ourselves. We all have the data available, and the group of advisors and I are, of course, at your disposal. I insist: I think it would be good to divide up the work because it is also a way of incorporating or integrating profiles. All the experts are asking us for more personal contact with the different members of the commission, which seems entirely natural to me. So, this dynamic that I am suggesting would allow all of that at once.

MS. SANGUINETTI.— I would like to ask a question and make a comment.

The question is whether the list of experts is categorized by these areas.

The comment has more to do with the format. I think all of us who are legislators in Uruguay today have, on average, between three and six or seven events per week. I am referring to settings where there is a stage and speakers who present, in what is mainly one-way communication. Those of us who come from other fields know that nowadays spaces for exchange and dialogue that are much more participatory are being created. I could name five or six methodologies, but that is beside the point. What I am saying is that I think it would be good for us, from the Special Commission on Futures, to also have the audacity to start proposing exchange formats that break that linear structure, because, from my perspective, it belongs to another era, in which there was the sender and the receiver was a passive recipient of information. Today we are all senders and receivers, and these dialogues arise in all spaces.

It seems to me it would be a nice opportunity, as the Special Commission on Futures, to start thinking about more disruptive ways of holding these gatherings.

THE CHAIR.— I completely agree. It is along those lines that we are making our proposal. I take responsibility for what has been done so far in that format, because we needed to get started, but I think we are all asking of ourselves a different kind of dynamic.

It seems to me that in order to give this topic a comprehensive treatment we need to go through these five dimensions. Afterward, each person will be able to change their titles, expand them, refine them. Between the groups and the experts we have those five areas well covered. Guillermo Dutra, from Inefop, for example, was not specifically invited for the new skills, but when we invited him we thought he was heading in that direction, and each of the experts has a specific area. So we can easily place these groups in these thematic axes, but I would like it to be a decentralized effort.

Of course, the lists are not closed. It seemed important to me to call in the Colegio de Sociólogos today, which demanded to take part, to send a signal that this is open. Naturally, we have a line of experts—that is what we call it—meaning that those who come to work on an area in a given dimension must have knowledge of the subject and studies on it.

So, if the legislators agree, between now and the weekend we will work on this draft, which is a guide, and we will divide the different axes among ourselves according to each person's preferences. Perhaps we can then have a more operational, very concrete session next week to define the groups and, if need be, help each other distribute the experts, if we are not clear on that.

MS. NANE.— I think the work dynamic is fine, but I want to make a comment.

As Senator Sanguinetti was saying, the truth is that we do not discuss these topics much. It is true that we have opportunities to reach agreements on many things that today or tomorrow may perhaps become State policies, but I think we would be lacking a bit in honesty if at some point we did not exchange, in the form of a debate, a model of the society of the future. Everything is fine with the work of the future, but in what model of society? I raise it in terms of debate. Let us take the second topic, that is, what the productive transformation is going to be, and I think that there we have ideological elements that run through us. That is fine, because each one of us is here representing certain ways of thinking shaped by ideologies. So, when we get to the new models of production, even if it is in a forward-looking visualization, I think we may reach agreement on some things but have serious disagreements on others, and it is fine to put them on the table and give ourselves the chance to have those more ideological debates.

I also think one cannot expect a parliamentary commission to have no ideological debate. Even for those who come in, it is fine that discussions not always take place in a completely aseptic way, as if we all thought the same about the means of production, the economy, and that trickle-down is the same as the equal distribution of wealth, because it is not, and I raise it so that we can have a debate afterward. So I think that at some point—in one session, in two, in three, or in however many we see as necessary—we should have that discussion, which will be extremely interesting. We are all capable of having it. It would even serve to generate the evidence of the discussion because, otherwise, I think we would remain in the utopia that the future is going to be as each of us imagines it and is aseptic with respect to ideology, but I think that it is not.

Thank you very much.

MS. SANGUINETTI.— I wanted to respond or make a comment on what Senator Nane just pointed out. I can attest to the efforts that have been made to maintain balance and a plurality of views.

I also think it would be valuable to incorporate this phase of debate among the experts themselves who hold different views, because we debate all the time. Perhaps it would be novel to create a space for debate. I would love it. I do not know whether we are going off on a tangent—Senator Nane and I are quite good at that—but I think it would be interesting to think about it. It seems to me that many of the names we have there debating on one of these five thematic axes are worth renting balconies to watch.

MS. NANE.— I am going to add a couple more topics. This is going to end up cut across by an intergenerational debate at some point, by a gender debate, and possibly by a debate from a childhood and adolescence perspective.

MS. RODRÍGUEZ.— And an ethnic one.

MS. NANE.— Exactly, Senator Rodríguez, because the future is not going to be the same for everyone and it is not going to affect all of us equally. So, it seems to me that we have to start putting the differences on the table, because things are also built on the basis of them. I just wanted to say that we should not remain so aseptic in the discussions we hold and in our views.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR.— In response to those points, my view would be the following. There would be a first period to generate inputs, perspectives, to make contributions—as is aptly said in this methodology, “the emerging trends”—and to see where they are appearing, and without a doubt the experts, for the most part, are going to bring us novel matters. Now, after these five sessions in which the experts will play the leading role, we will have to move to the report phase—there will be a first draft report—and I think that is where the ideal moment, or the one with the most inputs, would arise for holding that debate. In fact, that report does not have to be agreed upon and will not be voted on, but the coincidences and the differences could be reflected in that final report. The idea is that this takes place between the end of September and March so that we have time and have a rougher preliminary report, with more inputs. The last Monday of September is what the law commands of us. It will contain all the contributions of the experts, who are very plural and speak about different aspects. In addition, we will also have a session of exchange, more a matter of questions—I would like that time to be longer—and once that phase is finished in September we will have to hold some event, which could be more outward-facing, with presentations, that can convey some of these things. Then we would have six quiet months to think it over and we would have the help of the advisors. Without a doubt, we are going to have points of agreement, because there are aspects of reality that, no matter how many different views we have, are plain, hard reality, and in many cases they have to be approached by a single path. If there are aspects that lead us to have different views about which way to go toward that future, I think there will be an opportunity for debate to explain why, for example, Representative Melazzi believes the way is this one and Senator Sanguinetti believes it is that one. This will also help us to reflect, because the other approach could bog us down from the start.

If it seems fine to you, we would use these five sessions, more from the perspective of inputs, with a more exchange-oriented methodology. Here I would take up Senator Sanguinetti's proposal that each group or subgroup propose the methodology it sees fit, because afterward we will keep learning and next year we will have a more sophisticated methodology that works better. Once that is done, we will give all the experts space to be with us, whether presenting for ten

minutes, exchanging ideas, or simply being there. Then, with those inputs, we will prepare a draft report and begin to discuss points of agreement, differences, and underlying reasons. In this regard, our function is to offer Parliament and society an answer as to which way we see those challenges and transitions heading; that is where the richness lies. A regulatory proposal may appear clearly—this is one of the discussions I have had—that we all see we need to anticipate, and why not include it and pass it naturally to the corresponding commission, but have it come from here. It is much easier for an anticipatory proposal—even if it may seem a little more distant—to come from here than to arise from the respective commission, where the current situation is. I think that is the function we have and that is where we are headed.

So, we agreed that we will divide up the topics by the weekend. We are finishing the month of May, we have June, July, August, and half of September left and, as they point out to me, the Rendición de Cuentas in the middle, because it starts on July 1. Taking that into account, we should have at least one session per month: in June, in July, in August, and in September, and then we will see when we hold a fifth. The first one, which is the one that will take us a little more time to prepare, should be around June 20. We have to think about dates; I will be throwing some out, but I did not want to do so before having this methodology approved. We settle this point in this way, with the clarification that it is a working draft and will be included in the verbatim record as such.

The second point that we also wanted to share and report has to do with the World Bank which, as you will remember, offered us a public opinion exploration project. Perhaps I am not using the best term, but in some way what it involves is carrying out a series of interviews with workers and business people, as well as with a group of young people and adults chosen by a certain methodology. The World Bank offered to do it with Equipos Consultores and we had no objection because it was a serious firm. So, they would be in a position to offer us that work, which has already begun, with a kind of focus group, although I do not know whether that is the right terminology. Basically, the chosen group is entirely diverse, plural, and representative, in order to explore, using the methodology of the question—and they are now going to send you what Equipos Consultores gave us—the views and perceptions of workers and workers about aspects of the transformations they imagine the world of work is going through and the challenges these impose on our society from a future-oriented perspective. The consultation is always from that perspective: imagining what is coming, what they are experiencing, what transformations they see and what threats, always in terms of the future.

In addition, they offer us the chance to take part in those focus groups. It happened by chance, and that is why I wondered about it today, the coincidence that the sociologist María Julia Acosta came, who is the person in charge of the work, always accompanied by the advisor Lydia Garrido and the UNDP team, but I repeat that this work is being done by Equipos Consultores. As I said, they offer us the chance to take part—apparently this is something that is always done—both in the sessions and in a meeting before the report is produced. So, beyond whether someone individually wants to take part in any of those

interviews, I think it would be good—and if you agree we can settle it now—to have that meeting before the report—because once it is done, it is done—so that they tell us what they worked on and what they saw, and also so that we can discuss with them what kind of report we want based on the inputs. Why? Because the World Bank always said that it wanted to collaborate with the Special Commission on Futures. They are not imposing a piece of work; they are always acting according to what we ask of them. So, on that basis I am letting you know what Equipos Consultores is working from and, if you agree, we will tell them that before finishing their work they should have a session with us to see how it is going and also to discuss on what basis to produce the report.

If you agree, we move on to the third and last item.

(Hear, hear).

—Time is passing and we have at least two international events in which we are going to take part. One is the one that was already set, the one in Finland, which is going full steam ahead. Through the embassy we are going to have, among other things that I do not remember right now, cultural contributions. There will be participation by artists who are going from Uruguay, because they are going to start a tour through Helsinki on that same date.

Likewise, in mid-July a first meeting of futures commissions is going to be held at the Parlatino. We are even given a fairly important role because, since our beginnings, many countries have been consulting us and have been creating their own futures commissions. I have taken part in some. Last week I was virtually in the middle of a session of the futures commission of Paraguay. The truth is that in this we regard ourselves as pioneers in Latin America. They have also asked us for a significant participation in that first meeting of futures commissions at the Parlatino, in Panama. Perhaps some of you are more versed in it; I clarify that I have never taken part in the Parlatino in Panama. We have to think that at least three of the members of this commission must take part in that session, which would be around July 20 in Panama. Our representatives at the Parlatino, Representative Juan Rodríguez and Sánchez, are working on it, and they were the ones who have been keeping us informed. Naturally, they are going to bring us details because they have some meetings this week. What we need to know is that on July 20, for at least three days, we must attend that meeting. And on June 23 at 16:00 the UNDP is organizing a session. All the representatives of each country in the Americas are going to gather here in Montevideo, and they want to have a meeting with us on June 23 at 16:00. The idea is for that meeting to be short and for us to present in it the work we are doing. Other activities will also be generated there, like the one you just mentioned, around June 20. It is an initiative that comes from the UNDP. Luckily there are quite a few of us. Those of us who can be there on June 23 at 16:00, great; it will be only one hour. We will have a nice meeting in one of the anterooms. The number two at the UNDP is coming. That program is very enthusiastic about the work it is doing with us and, naturally, wants to promote it in other countries. That is why, from there, it wants to have that meeting on June 23, at 16:00 in the anteroom and, I repeat, it is only one hour.

I do not know whether we have any other topic. If not, we are left with those assignments and we will be seeing each other.

The work by Equipos Consultores will now reach you by email.

Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

(The time is 15:09).

(Document that it was resolved to include in the verbatim record).

“Special Commission on Futures: Lines of Work 2022

The Future of Work and the Work of the Future

Working Draft Document

Lydia Garrido

Methodological Advisor on Futures.

UNESCO Chair in Anticipation and Resilience

Bruno Gili

Coordinator, Expert Group

Support

Technical Secretariat of the UNDP

The Special Commission on Futures has the mandate to produce a “Report on the Future” within the period of each legislature on topics of strategic relevance for the country. During the current legislature, the challenge is the construction of shared meaning that makes it possible to generate inputs and to delve deeper into the challenges entailed by The Future of Work and the Work of the Future. Specifically, the objective is the production of a document arising from a process of collective intelligence, which will nourish with an anticipatory outlook the various political spheres of decision-making, as well as society as a whole. A progress report will be presented in September 2022 and a final report in March 2023.

We are living in times when we have to learn to pay greater attention to what is new, different, not known, as a fulcrum for “making sense” of what is happening and becoming. A series of intertwined phenomena (vectors of change) are creating an environment that is not only changing but disruptive. This requires other capabilities and skills to move through it. In this sense, the pandemic has been—and is being—a kind of learning classroom to train ourselves in acquiring a greater capacity for orientation when everything habitual and known changes on us. Among its lessons, it brought the need to let go of linear logics of forecasting and planning, and it obliged us to learn skills for a third form of anticipation, which is the one that, in an environment of novelty, surprise, and uncertainty in the face of the unknown, nonetheless manages to find orientation.

We can no longer plan linearly from A to arrive at B, pretending that we have a lot of time (years) and that the rest of the environment will remain the same and without influence. Today we are in dynamics of change that are not only accelerated but multiple and intertwined, which makes change itself change.

And among the things that have changed is the axis of support for understanding change. It has become obsolete to rely exclusively on what is known, on what has been coming from the past; instead, it becomes essential to let in the future, what is not yet but is being and becoming. We need a double ambidexterity: on the one hand, to articulate simultaneously the here and now (the present) with the medium and long term; and to distinguish and articulate what is known and comes from the past with what is new and different that the future brings and that is also in the present (even if it is not yet obvious, because it is not “seen” at a glance, because it is still taking shape). And it is precisely this specificity of the nature of the future (which is not yet...) that gives us the possibility of having an influence, of transforming the future before it is (before it is a “fait accompli”) and thus creating other futures. This places a particular difficulty and

complexity on the topics and problems that are posed “in a futures key,” requiring logics and methodological frameworks different from those we generally use.

The purpose in approaching the problems related to “Work” is not to predict what will happen in the future in the world of work, but to explore alternatives by reflecting, in a futures key, on aspects and interrelationships linked to this topic. In this way we will be better able to capture “emerging factors,” “vectors of change,” and complex interactions and interdependencies that lead us to reframe and rethink what is “known,” giving room to the new and different that is coming into being by bringing in other systemic parameters to explore novelty. Put another way, to use approaches that are not based on “more of the same,” the known, the past, but conceived “outside the box” of the habitual; to reframe problems in order to rethink them. In this way, we seek to generate information of higher quality and relevance to broaden the alternatives and options we have in the present. These inputs can be useful for decision-making from an anticipation that transforms the future in the present (in other words, an anticipation that creates futures).

With the objective of producing a report on the Future of Work in an anticipation key, the following five thematic axes are proposed: 1. Vectors of transformation and emerging factors that imply a rethinking of the world of work as we knew it in the last century: continuities and differences, what challenges does it pose for us?;

2. Vectors of transformation and emerging factors that imply a rethinking of the economic and value-production practices of the future: new technologies, sectors, practices, and actors in value production for a sustainable world from an innovative ecosystem framework; 3. New skills for the twenty-first century: Lifelong learning (“Learning-Intensive Societies”); 4. Long-lived societies (100+): Transitions toward a future of longevity. Its impact on the world of work; 5. The governance of the work of the future: regulation and labor policy for a change of era. They will be worked on in five working meetings with the participation of members of the expert group and legislators of the CEF. In addition, seminars will be held (some public and others internal, in CEF sessions) where members of the expert group will present their work. As a complement, interviews will be conducted with members of the expert group, which will be recorded and made available for dissemination through a cycle of podcasts. The inputs will be systematized and analyzed within a methodological framework in a futures key so as to have an initial matrix that makes it possible to identify challenges to work on: vectors of systemic transformation, signals of change, emerging factors, identification of threats, opportunities, inhibitors, and enablers of change. Various methodologies from futures studies will be articulated for the production, systematization, and analysis of knowledge. (See Methodological Plan).

Below are the details of the five thematic axes that will guide this stage of the CEF's work agenda during 2022, which are based on the process generated up to this point (with contributions to date from more than thirty experts). Some questions and dynamics are indicated for addressing them collectively.

1. Vectors of transformation and emerging factors in the world of work in the twenty-first century

The world of work is in a process of radical change in which very probably what we do not know is greater than what we do know. One thing we do know is that the condition of permanent creation of novelty brings with it “perpetual disturbance.” And in and for this context we should assume that we must start working immediately. There are vectors and signals of change already identified, for example, automation, the development of robots and artificial intelligence, digital platforms, and modes of collaborative economy, to mention some of the best known, which already directly impact the workforce, the content of work, and labor relations.

The problem is that these changes are in turn part of much broader phenomena such as the powerful technological platform that interconnects nanotechnology, biotechnology, and the computational and cognitive sciences, which are permanently creating new materials, new products, new processes, and modes of production and organization of knowledge and work. This is intertwined with other dimensions and phenomena such as the stress on planetary boundaries, which urgently demands that we change modes of production and consumption. And to mention just one more that adds novelty and also complexity (it opens possibilities and also new gaps): the active elongation of human life, long-lived societies and people who change needs and aspirations, with a direct relation to the world of work, production, and the economy in general.

All of this is defining new conditions for the “future of work” theme as a problem of high complexity. It is in this context and given the nature of the problem that Uruguay faces the challenge of how to pose and re-pose this topic in such a way as to articulate our needs and aspirations, accompanying the change [sic: “e1”] on the terms of the change. One of the main challenges is to achieve capabilities in the political system that allow for anticipatory governance.

Suggestions for discussion:

- Identify the main vectors and phenomena of change in the larger context in which we are embedded. Distinguish some of their intertwinings (cross-impacts). Technology is a main vector, but there are also others that likewise carry

potential for disruptive changes. It is important to see the interrelations with other dimensions and vectors of transformation.

–SWOT matrix: identify threats, opportunities, strengths (enhancers/enablers of change), and weaknesses (inhibitors/obstacles). Based on the above, suggest challenges that are main focuses for deepening and generating information for decision-making and the definition of actions.

2. Vectors of transformation and emerging factors that imply new economic and value-production practices in the twenty-first century.

The trends underlying the process of transformation of work have substantial impacts on the traditional pathways that generate productivity. The digital and biotechnological revolution, demographic and behavioral changes, the knowledge economy, as well as the stress on planetary boundaries imply profound changes in companies' models of competition and in the organization of markets and consumption. This new paradigm is characterized by a new form of global integration, where globalization and hyperlocalization come together (interdependent autonomies), the rise of the networked economy that allows the global, the local, and the singular at the same time, new business models based on platforms of products, services, and audiovisual content, virtual reality and immersive reality, parallel digital worlds (metaverse), an explosion in the diversity and singularity of products and services, articulated decentralization (blockchain economy), changes in the ways of competing and collaborating (at the same time), the obsolescence of industries and industrial sectors, changes in the trade in goods and services, strong global integration (and also simultaneous decentralization) of goods and services.

All of this directly affects the industries and productive sectors of the economy, business models, business organization, and even the roles that the State occupies. Uruguay faces the challenge of imagining various alternatives and opportunities in a futures key (potentialities in the present that create futures) that make it possible to identify which sectors, areas, systems, models, processes, and products are threatened by the process of transformation of work and, at the same time, to detect which are the key sectors for boosting productivity in the future. In turn, the digital world—and in particular the changes associated with digital platforms and automation—is modifying how labor relations take place. This entails organizational challenges for companies, which must restructure to accompany and boost these changes that demand organizational agility, labor flexibility, digital leadership, continuous training and education, technology transfer, automation, and reassignment of tasks, among others. In this way, when thinking about the future of work it becomes necessary to distinguish novelty and change (in their potential), in their multiplicity and diversity of alternatives, threats, and opportunities, in order to move from a logic of survival (reactive, after the changes have already occurred) to a creative (anticipatory) adaptation oriented toward

sustainable prosperity from an innovative ecosystem logic that permeates business organizations and their role in a context of transformation of the world of work.

Guiding suggestions for the exchange are:

- Identify the main vectors and phenomena of change in the larger context in which companies are embedded.

- Reframing:

- (i) Rethink from an ecosystem logic: what are the dimensions and the actors involved;

- (ii) Rethink as organizations that play a key role in value creation: what threats are glimpsed? What opportunities and potentialities are imagined? What strengths are identified (enhancers/enablers of change)? Which weaknesses? (inhibitors/obstacles to change)?

- Some specific aspects: What will be the role of companies in the various scenarios of the future of work? What organizational transformation actions are necessary?

3. New capabilities for the twenty-first century: Lifelong learning

The series of transformations in which we are immersed, that condition of permanent creation of novelty (and one of its manifestations, the “permanent disturbance” of the known), reconfigures the context of capabilities, competencies, and skills for coping with the conditions that the twenty-first century is prefiguring: the need for permanent intensive learning. This becomes a condition and characterization of the era: learning-intensive societies. This, among other things, also calls into question the traditional segmentation that understands work, skills, and the capacity to work as separate spheres, since it demands that people be learning permanently (in addition to constantly updating their knowledge).

One of the implications is that training (and the attitude toward learning) must be actively available throughout a person's whole life and for the whole of society. This requires that training be a constitutive element of work and also that work be understood as a learning opportunity.

In addition to specific knowledge in the world of work (which demands ever greater expertise, not only in one disciplinary area, but inter- and transdisciplinary),

other needs concretely arise, for example those associated with so-called non-cognitive skills or metaskills (mental flexibility, capacity to learn and relearn, self-management, critical thinking, creativity, interaction skills, empathy, resilience, collaboration, and interconnection) that make it possible to navigate the uncertainty of a labor market in constant and accelerated change and to take advantage of the opportunities that this also entails.

In this context, Uruguay faces the challenge of imagining which capabilities, competencies, and skills the future of work (that future which is today in the present) is already demanding of us in order to think and act in education and capability training. Likewise, the integration of training and work demands rethinking the organization of the education system and its articulation with the world of work (work as a space for learning and for the integral development of people and societies, beyond a “market” logic). labor”).

Guiding suggestions for the dynamic of exchanges:

- Rethink the “meaning of work” and learning for a world in a context of permanent novelty and change.
- What are the main challenges that Uruguay faces in order to accompany the change in context and its requirements for performing (individuals, collectives, companies) in the world of the future of work?
- What education systems and models do we need to implement for learning of permanent updating?

4. Long-lived Societies (100+): Transitions toward a future of longevity

What the demographic transformation brings us as a novelty is not all negative. There is one aspect that has been downplayed and that implies great news: the increase in the potential of active life (in healthy conditions) is extending beyond demographic projections and linear trends.

Although there is a “potentiality” factor here that is subject to technologies applied to health and medicine, as well as to changes in habits, customs, and cultural behaviors (diet, sport, preventive practices, etc.), it seems to be very auspicious. Today the need is being considered to reframe and rethink institutions that were designed for societies with an average life expectancy of a little over 50-60 years at the beginning and middle of the twentieth century) for societies approaching 100 years and more (long-lived societies, 100+). Obviously this implies addressing the threat of new gaps (which will be added to those we already have, such as, for example, guaranteeing access to that extension of human life under equal conditions).

With regard to work in concrete terms, today it is necessary to rethink all institutions and conditions in order to also extend guarantees of access: in health, education, job opportunities, etc.

Seen in this way, the problem of the current social security system is only one of the problems, and one that can also be rethought by taking into account a reframing of the main question, which is the extension of human life.

Technology opens Multiple alternatives to also make Multiple solutions viable in each of the aspects of this topic, which also becomes a “complex problem,” not for that reason negative, but its complexity is due to its intertwining with various other problems and its character of potentiality that opens positive and also negative possibilities. Taking advantage of and boosting the positive from a transformative anticipation seems to be a key challenge we have with regard to thinking about work in a futures key.

Suggestions for the exchange are:

- Reframe the problem by rethinking the topic of longevity.
- What do we need in order to improve guarantees of access to work for long-lived people and societies? How could we rethink institutions and inclusive and sustainable access?
Matrix of alternatives.
- Take into account how to stimulate intergenerational cooperation.
- Do we need a new social contract? What draft lines could we move forward on?

5. The governance of the work of the future: Regulation and labor policy in a change of era

In the face of the process of transformation of the world of work, the governance of work faces the challenge of building anticipatory institutionality that facilitates certain processes and channels others toward paths that lead to desirable future scenarios. Part of the challenge involves not only innovation in governance mechanisms and institutional instruments of regulation at the national level, but also in international coordination and cooperation, thinking about a global labor market.

Moreover, the future of the governance of work is also given by the future of labor relations and social dialogue. Workers' organizations and workers' unions face challenges that are not only economic but also

organizational. The future of work in Uruguay may be very different from the one we know today, where governments, workers, and employers negotiate working conditions in a tripartite manner. Thinking about future scenarios of work also implies reflecting on how the institutionality that regulates work will be established and through what mechanisms the actors involved will participate in the process of elaborating labor policy.

Some guiding questions for the exchange are:

- What institutional and regulatory mechanisms might be necessary to facilitate certain processes for the opening of alternatives and possibilities?
- How possible/probable do we imagine the construction of this institutionality to be?
- Where are the main difficulties/inhibitors of change? And what could be the enhancers/enablers of change?
- What role(s) will workers' and employees' organizations (unions) play in the creation of alternative futures for work?

References

Abreu, Ramiro (Ed.). (2021). *Cracking the future of work. Automation and labor platform in the Global South*. Available at: <https://fowigs.net/publication/crackine-the-future-of-work-automation-and-labor-platforms-in-the-global-south>

Albrieu, Ramiro and Gonzalo Zunino (2022). *América Latina. El futuro del trabajo en el jardín de senderos que se bifurcan*. Available at: <https://fowies.net/publication/latin-america-regional-views-future-of-work/>

Gokce, T., Draskovic, D., Drinic, A., Kylymnyk, I., Seyidzade, L., and Tilavov, M. (2021). La naturaleza cambiante del trabajo. 30 señales a tener en cuenta para un futuro sostenible. UNDP Accelerator Labs.

ILO (2017) Informe Inicial para la Comisión Mundial sobre el Futuro del Trabajo. International Labour Office – Geneva.

ILO (2019) Trabajar para un futuro más prometedor – Comisión Mundial sobre el Futuro del Trabajo. International Labour Office – Geneva.

Oksanen, Kaisa (2017) Informe del Gobierno sobre el futuro. Una comprensión compartida de la transformación del trabajo. Publications of the Office of the Prime Minister of Finland.

World Economic Forum (2020) Informe sobre el futuro del empleo. Available at: <https://www.weforum.org/1a1atforins/centre-for-the-new-economy-and-society>

World Economic Forum (2021) Reconstruir de manera más amplia: caminos de política para una transformación económica. Centre for the New Economy and Society, Community Document”.

Montevideo, Uruguay. Legislative Branch.