



SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Meeting of July 20, 2022)

(Present are Ms. María Inés Fariello and Ms. Fiorella Haim and Messrs. Leonardo Loureiro and Enrique Topolansky, and participating via Zoom are Messrs. Gabriel Burdín and Martín Inthamoussu)

THE CHAIR (Rodrigo Goñi Reyes).— We have a quorum, so the meeting is open.

(The time is 16 hours and 11 minutes)

(The Zoom connection is established)

—Good afternoon.

We are especially grateful to the experts who have been invited to this second meeting, which we have titled: "Vectors of transformation and emerging forces that imply new economic practices and new ways of producing value in the twenty-first century." We had already been working on some guiding questions.

We welcome Mr. Gabriel Burdín, who is taking part in this meeting via Zoom; we thank you for joining us.

Present in the room are Ms. María Inés Fariello, from the Faculty of Engineering of the Udelar; Ms. Fiorella Haim, representing Plan Ceibal; Mr. Leonardo Loureiro, representing the Uruguayan Chamber of Information Technologies (CUTI); and Mr. Enrique Topolansky, from ORT.

It is a somewhat complicated day for Parliament because the Rendición de Cuentas (budget review bill) is under consideration and today the authorities of the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining are attending. Some members of this Commission also sit on the Commission on Industry and on the Special Commission on Innovation, Science and Technology, so it has gotten complicated for us.

We are especially grateful for the presence of Senator Carmen Sanguinetti and Representatives Gustavo Olmos and Luis Alberto Posse, among other legislators whom we will name as we go.

We also thank Ms. Inés Fynn and Messrs. Bruno Gili, Agustín Borrazás and Pablo Arreche for being here.

Without further ado, we are going to begin this exchange. I don't think it is necessary to read out again the questions we had suggested in the introduction that was sent to you.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).— Following the recommendations Inés sent us, we were expecting the senator's opening words, but we will simply start ourselves.

THE CHAIR.— If you will allow me, Mr. Loureiro, I must excuse Senator Nane, because she had a last-minute family problem; she is in Colonia. She called us last night and again this morning. We specially excuse her; she will try to take part via Zoom.

I don't know whether you would like me to give the introduction.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).— No; that's fine.

THE CHAIR.— Perfect. Just in case, I have Senator Nane's instructions here.

So, if it seems right to you, let's begin.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).— Following the line of the guiding questions you sent us, which speak a great deal about the threats that can be glimpsed for work in the future, from the more technological perspective, which is where I come from, one of the things we are seeing most is the convergence of several technologies. Several technologies, per se, were already changing the future of work, and in the convergence of those technologies at the same time, as is happening today, some of them reinforce one another, which will affect both innovation and creativity much more.

Several of us took part in a survey by Equipos Consultores -I think it came out of the Commission, didn't it?- and they asked us some questions similar to that one. And what we saw is that the best-known technologies -we have specialists at the table, like María Inés-, such as data science, artificial intelligence, blockchain -Enrique can also talk quite a bit about that-, together with quantum computing, 3D printing and other technologies that are changing the world, are surely going to have a very significant impact on the future of work.

When we talk about vectors and impact, we see that, in Uruguay, luckily, we have creation of that knowledge. I believe one of the most important things we have to work on as a country is how we can boost those new technologies, and make sure they don't simply come to us ready-made. I use this idea a lot: if we don't participate -I forgot to mention robotics-, if we don't work actively on generating knowledge so that we can create our own

technological changes and be the owners of our future, it will come to us from other countries and we will have, as the jargon goes, a technological dependence.

So I believe our technological independence will be based, precisely, on our continuing to work all together on creating our own genuine knowledge. Fiorella has taken an active part in certain matters that I think are important; the possibility of having IoT robotics at Ceibal and the various labs that have been set up is important because, precisely, what we are working on is making sure these things don't come to us ready-made and built elsewhere. I would like to see, here in Uruguay in the future, things like what Boston Dynamics builds, and not have us import them. I think those are the kinds of things that can start to affect the future of work enormously. The more we get into the subject, the more those perspectives will keep changing. Bruno takes part as a vector for Uruguay at the World Economic Forum. If we consider what the future jobs are and what is going to be asked for and demanded, we see that it has absolutely nothing to do with what we are training people for today, or with the amount of job supply or labor that there may be in the country. In other words, we are not trained to be able to accept the work that we have. You have heard me talk several times about the shortage of labor in the technology sector. The other day, Carmen and I were talking, at an ANEP event, about the fact that there is no established training for the work that is being generated. There are five thousand jobs for which we are going out to look for people with training abroad, because in the country there aren't people trained to work in the high-technology sectors. In an age of knowledge that is increasingly driven by those changes, I think innovation and creativity are going to have to be much more sophisticated. We are going to have to work very hard on those activities.

I'll leave my first intervention there. Afterward, if you like, I can make some other contribution. As I was saying, convergence is important. And I'll give an example. What is foreseen to happen with quantum computing at full operation -let's call it that; I don't know how many of you are involved in the subject-, that is, when, soon, it is operational, is that it will greatly modify chemistry, pharma and artificial intelligence. I think it is important to keep that kind of thing in mind. Luckily, in Uruguay there is important knowledge about quantum computing in general at the Universidad de la República, at the UM a fairly strong unit has been created and, at ORT, for example, we have quantum computing oriented to artificial intelligence. I think those kinds of combinations are the ones that are going to accelerate certain processes; that is where we have to work actively to train people who can take on new jobs in those areas.

MR. TOPOLANSKY (Enrique).— First, I thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

Second, I share Leonardo's words about the importance of our being sovereign in technology and continuing to develop our own line. However, if we look at the challenges that companies foresee, I think digital transformation has much more to do with people, with companies, with the

business models than with technology. In other words, I think the technology sector is a benchmark; there is a reason we are exporting US\$1,000,000,000. I think the technology sector, in general, is doing things very well.

If you ask me what the challenge for business owners is today, I think it is understanding what this is all about. I think that is where we are at minus one hundred. I feel that today, in Uruguay, business owners and people in general have not the slightest idea of what is coming, or of what digital disruption is and how it is going to hit them. That is the first thing I want to make very clear. I have been working on this for more than four years, specifically on transformation, and people are absent, they don't understand what is going on. That is point number one.

Point number two is that we have two types of companies. In Uruguay, there are some that are embedded in a global world -they are the minority-, that are indeed starting to see this, that have data-based organizations, that use artificial intelligence, that are trying to use all of these disruptive technological trends, but more than 90% of companies, which are SMEs, are the ones that are going to take the hit. Those are the ones that generate most of the employment in Uruguay, and they are the ones that worry me.

Today, I am working with Modo Digital of ANDE, which is a very good step -one that we applaud- in the right direction, but it is missing a lot; it is not enough. Today these small business owners need to be helped to change their mindset, to change the way they think and to realize that today the competition is no longer the person two blocks away. Until recently, a person with a grocery store in Florida looked at what slogan or what price the Galician on the corner put on a board or a blackboard, to give an example. Today he competes with a man who is buying through Alibaba, in China, he competes with business owners in Montevideo who sell through Mercado Libre, and he doesn't understand why, all of a sudden, they stopped buying the product they used to buy from him, which used to turn over tremendously. That is digital transformation brought down to earth.

When we talk today about the challenges companies have, we see that the first is to understand and, second, to give them the tools. And the technology sector has to be capable of bringing solutions closer to them. But there is a whole other leg, which is adoption, being able to have the skills to use everything from WhatsApp, which is the bare minimum, to somewhat more sophisticated tools for digital marketing, to be able to make themselves known where they operate and in the world. And that is possible through social networks, through platforms. Shopping malls are going to be replaced by Mercado Libres, by Shopify, and record stores by Spotify. So, if we don't understand what these new channels are, what the new shopping experience of users is, we don't stand a chance.

To close, because I could go on at great length, I consider that Uruguay has been doing things well. Uruguay has good basic technological infrastructure, it has a strong information technology sector, it has very prestigious academic institutions, but we need to agree on how to help these people in this process of transformation, which is not easy, because many of them are not going to have the

time to adapt. That is where, perhaps, through technology, we can create true artificial intelligence assistants that act like a powerful arm so that these SMEs can do certain things.

I'll leave my intervention there.

THE CHAIR.— We welcome Mr. Martín Inthamoussu, who is taking part via Zoom.

MR. INTHAMOUSSU (Martín).— Thank you very much. Greetings to all.

I want to add something to complement the comments I was hearing just now. I work from the side of the creative and cultural industries. And in that sense I do believe that in these industries we have a lot to contribute to the shortcomings that exist in other sectors, and it is indeed understood that we have to work with the traditional industries on generating innovation and user experience from another point of view.

I couldn't see who the last person to speak was, but what they said seemed very relevant to me. I was thinking, for example, of gastronomy, a sector in which the neighbor who has a restaurant now competes with a dark kitchen, with deliveries or with virtual restaurants, which are increasingly present.

In education, we have to work on the whole design of what has to do with virtual reality, augmented reality, artificial intelligence as part of educational strategies in all sectors. In the arts, without a doubt, we have to work on that; during the pandemic, only 15% of people stayed in digital format. During the pandemic, the cultural industries had enormous digital participation, generating an offer that was far too broad, but without monetizing any of it, because the public, the citizens, are not used to paying for those services. So there is a very big job to be done, first, to educate the public so that they understand that this has value, but also so that the industries value and monetize the work they do and do not proceed the way they did during the pandemic. It is perfectly understandable that it was almost an emergency strategy, but now that we are past that we have to see how we capitalize on it. And just as someone is going to sell through Mercado Libre, as you were saying, there are other platforms where other services of the creative and cultural industries can be sold, and we are not giving them the place they should have.

I go back to the first comment: I firmly believe that the training of the people who make up the creative and cultural industries, so that they can contribute to a future that has the value of ideas, which is an intangible, which is sustainable, which is not going to run out, has to be boosted from the educational system, but also from the labor system, with a permanent dialogue with the traditional industries. When the traditional industries see in the creative industries this exchange and the added

value they can bring to their companies, I think we will be able to take a quantitative and qualitative step in many of the services in various sectors.

MS. HAIM (Fiorella).— Good afternoon. Thank you very much for the invitation.

I want to talk about the organization of work, about how we are organizing it after the pandemic, when we had a lot of flexibility and this emergency arose of moving to other formats, to virtual formats. And we have to see how, on returning, we take what is good from those experiences.

Luckily, we have a telework law that gives companies more possibilities, but what we are seeing now is that more flexibility is needed in order, precisely, to add value. The traditional work scheme, from nine in the morning to five in the afternoon, of a person who comes in and has to sit in front of a computer during those hours, has lost some of its meaning. Now we know that some tasks can be done from home and that one can be much more productive, and that for team tasks in-person work is better. We also know that work modalities can be combined with the right technologies; for example, with a television the size of the one we have here and in a room of these dimensions, we can have mixed participation. In other words, we learned a lot, by force. But now that we know it, in many places they went backward; they went back to the previous system and it seems as if nothing had happened and as if we had learned nothing.

So, as Martín was just saying, we have to see how to add value, how to generate value and improve the experiences of consumers, of users, of beneficiaries, depending on each case. This can be done with better organization in companies, with greater flexibility, with another kind of motivation, with much more involvement in the mission of the company, including all the workers in it and not in such a vertical organization, as perhaps it used to be, in more of a factory scheme, from another era. It seems to me that it is interesting to try to go in that direction.

MR. BURDÍN (Gabriel).— I thank you for the invitation and for the opportunity to take part in the Commission. I also thank everyone present, in particular Bruno and Inés for technically coordinating the group's work.

My perspective on these processes of technological change, and on the opportunities and problems they pose, in particular for Uruguay, is more from academia, from labor economics and the economics of organizations.

What I noted down to comment on is closely related to what my colleagues just raised. My concern is not so much that Uruguay develop a cutting-edge technology sector; I am quite in line with what Mr. Topolansky said. It seems to me that things are well on track there. There are some bottlenecks in terms of the supply of skilled labor in those sectors, but Uruguay has, in those sectors,

important capabilities. My concern lies mostly in how technological change spreads through the economic activity as a whole and what repercussions it has from the labor, social and general-wellbeing standpoint of the population.

Within that framework are the comments I have to make, following the axis of discussion that was put to us.

A first point is that, for Uruguay, technological change holds opportunities for increasing productivity. For Uruguay, that is not an option; it is a necessity. A few days ago the updated United Nations population projections were published. They show the demographic dynamics the country is going to have; we already knew this, but there is updated information. So, increasing the productivity of the employed population is an indispensable condition for Uruguay to maintain and raise the standard of living of its population; the productivity of those who are employed must increase in order to sustain a set of services and protection systems both for children and for older adults. Increasing productivity is essential. It was already discussed in last year's sessions, if I remember correctly. So, within the framework of technological change, both the one linked to digitalization, which is already a more consolidated technological wave, the first wave of digitalization, and the one posed by the more advanced new technologies -robotics, artificial intelligence and others-, the potential productivity increase from those technologies, for Uruguay, poses a scenario of opportunities.

The problem is that it is not guaranteed that the use of those technologies will result in an increase in productivity; I repeat, the productivity increase associated with the use of those technologies is not guaranteed. Even if the technologies are available at low cost, even if there is a developed digital infrastructure -as, luckily, Uruguay has-, whether the use of the technologies shows up as higher productivity depends on a set of factors. And there Uruguay is in a complicated position, for reasons that I am going to comment on next.

A second point is that technological change generates permanent upward pressure on inequality in the labor market. That requires the intervention of consistent policies in many areas -labor, production, education-, in terms of labor regulations.

Why do I say that technological change does not necessarily translate into an increase in productivity? We know it from previous technological waves in developed countries and also from evidence in developing countries: the effects of technology on productivity tend to be delayed, tend to occur with a lag and tend to be heterogeneous across productive sectors. It happened in previous technological waves, in the early eighties, in the United States, with the surge of investment in computers and information technology. Robert Solow said that technology was everywhere except in the productivity statistics. That referred to a process in which there was an increase in technological investment, but its expression in productivity dynamics did not occur. And a

fundamental element for which the availability of technology does not necessarily translate into an increase in productivity, or translates with a great lag and a great deal of heterogeneity across the business fabric, perhaps with star firms that do manage to take advantage of the technology, but that does not spill over to the business fabric as a whole, is that not all companies have the complementary organizational capabilities to make productive use of the available technology. A central point that I think has to be incorporated into the analysis is that one of the most important areas of development in empirical economics in recent years is the one that emphasizes the importance of companies' managerial practices in relation to productivity. To give you an idea, roughly a quarter or a third of the productivity differences between countries can be explained by the different quality of companies' managerial practices. When we talk about productivity differences, part of those differences responds to the ability of companies to use the available technology productively and efficiently. The quality of companies' management practices clearly affects the possibility of using technologies productively.

What factors affect the quality of these management practices? Competition is one of them. Environments with little competition allow unproductive, poorly managed companies to survive in the market.

Another relevant factor shown by this line of international research is that family ownership of companies, which is widespread in developing countries, also in Uruguay, is often problematic when it comes to selecting efficient managerial practices that are in a position to use technology productively. Sometimes, managerial positions in family businesses are not assigned on merit; other factors predominate because leadership positions in the company are passed down by inheritance and not necessarily for meritocratic reasons. For a set of reasons, family ownership is potentially problematic when it comes to fostering managerial practices that allow a productive use of technology.

So, for me, the problem is not so much that we are facing a technological wave that threatens employment in Uruguay; on the contrary, I am worried about a situation in which we have relatively poor or mediocre levels of technology adoption that get in the way of our taking advantage of the technological scenario to generate the productivity increases the country needs.

What can we do from this point of view? I suggest a few leads: competitive markets are essential; competition policies are essential. To make it possible for the companies that are in the best position to use technology to do so and to have the resources available, we need to think about interventions that improve the capabilities of micro and small companies to optimize the quality of their management practices and be in a better position to take advantage of technology. We need to improve the training of the labor force, which implies educational challenges, which will surely be the subject of specific meetings; also

challenges on the side of job training. The market works well for some things, but very poorly when it comes to providing incentives for job training, because companies are afraid that their workers will leave for other companies and, therefore, their investments in training will be exploited by the competition. When it comes to training in very specific skills, which the use of certain technologies sometimes requires, there are problems between workers and companies, because credible commitments to pay them adequately are not generated. That training cannot be used in other companies because it is specific. So, the role of public policy is very important, in order to shape the private and social incentives for people to get trained. The Inefop has a key role in this regard.

One last aspect that I want to raise in this first intervention is in line with this more organizational dimension of the technological choice, which seems to me extremely important, with the capabilities that companies have to adopt technology and use it productively. We must think about the technological choice in terms of the business fabric as a whole, not of the cutting-edge technology sectors. We must think about how traditional productive activities can use the new technologies productively. The technological choice is complex; it requires very significant processes of reorganization of companies, new skills in the labor force, managerial skills, and also internal cooperation among workers, that is, cooperative relationships between workers and the company, because the knowledge that workers have of the production process is essential for the adoption of technology. For that to happen, there have to be institutions that allow workers to have information, knowledge and the possibility of contributing to the discussion of companies' technology plans. That is the kind of operating rule that predominates in Europe, which is the one I know best, and which has made it possible that, in many cases, the processes of incorporating technology do not have the negative impacts on employment that they have had in countries with more deregulated labor schemes, such as the United States. Why? Because there is a process of retraining the labor force, of relocating workers to new tasks that are complementary to the technology, which allows technological incorporation to have less dramatic impacts on employment, compared with contexts in which companies' technological decisions are made unilaterally.

In summary, technological change is essential for increasing productivity. It is a necessity for Uruguay, not an option, by virtue of its demographic dynamics, but for technology to have the effects on productivity that we expect, a set of complementary business capabilities is required. There is a group of companies in Uruguay, especially micro and small companies, that have a significant deficit in terms of that type of practice and might not be in a position to use technology productively.

MS. FARIELLO (María Inés).— I think they have already said almost everything.

I would like to add one important aspect. When we talk about training and the lack of trained personnel -obviously I am going to focus mostly on data

science and machine learning or, in its marketing version, artificial intelligence, if you like that better- we often think that we only need more engineers or more people who specialize in artificial intelligence, but when CUTI was at the Roundtable where they spoke about data science and artificial intelligence -we held another event afterward- a lack of evangelization on these topics was detected. It is not only that people are needed to work, but to understand, above all at the managerial or senior levels, what they can ask of this technology, so that they don't let themselves be sold just anything. Often, magic solutions come from abroad, but then, as we talked about in the last session, I give all my data, it gets trapped there, and they give me back some little thing, but I completely lose the sovereignty -a word we used last time- over what is happening, and I don't even know what that model is being used for, how it was trained, what biases it has, or whether the data they used has anything to do with mine. The word evangelization was used, which seems to me very apt for these topics. When we are going to analyze a problem we need the expert who knows about artificial intelligence, but also the expert who knows the domain. If those two experts don't know how to talk to each other, we will probably end up solving a problem that was not the one we wanted and we won't manage to keep working; that happens to us a lot. Interdisciplinarity, in that sense, takes a lot of time.

Next time we are going to talk about training.

MR. GILI (Bruno).— I would like to refer to the final idea of being able to build a document that provides inputs for the debate through March. What I heard seemed very interesting to me and I would like to ask a few questions.

First of all, I would like an opinion, in general, from all of you, on the matter of the organization of companies, leadership and the impact on productivity. Not long ago an interesting paper reached me from MIT -it was a study comparing the productivity difference among the United States, Germany and Japan- which said that management is a technology, not an activity that one learns in practice or in a bar. It is a technology, a capability. The most relevant explanation I read was that American management was somewhat superior to German and Japanese management in achieving better productivity. I am not referring to questioning the models in those countries, but to the concept of managing a production, an organization to carry something forward. I want to make clear that when the document compared which one was better, there were in fact management styles and logic that led to the conclusion that these three countries are among the most powerful in the world, together with another three or four, that is, it was not a matter of one good and one bad. Effectively, there was a component there.

Second, given that today's Roundtable has a lot to do with the business world, it seems to me that it would be important to go deeper -taking up what Gabriel Burdín was saying- into what the conditions are or what should happen to improve this management globally at all levels of organizations, both in how they incorporate and develop their business from the intrusion of these technologies and of another one, which is missing today, because of how our profile turned out; we could have the same

comments about biotechnology. I don't want to leave this out; we dealt with it in last year's Roundtables. It is not easy to coordinate, but it would be interesting to think that Uruguay has a very important part in the intrusion of all the transformations the technology world is going through which, moreover, today is combined with digital technology, which makes a very powerful scheme, and, obviously, Uruguay is concerned with food production and everything to do with the life sciences, et cetera. Therefore, I would like you to reflect on this topic in your next interventions.

Another reflection I want to raise -perhaps it can wait for the second round if time allows- has to do with which things in the context of how our markets and our economy function you understand to be an obstacle to our having more insertion or development as a country, in terms of production of goods and services at the domestic and international levels. I think it is an important question, because there are things that do not depend on us but belong to the context. Gabriel threw out some ideas; Enrique Topolansky did too.

Lastly, I would like to ask for a reflection, because Parliament is part of the governance of the country, on what things you think should be put on the agenda, in this case of Parliament -someday it may also be important for the Executive Branch-, on what things should change in the overall way things work that would improve the productivity and development of these businesses, because, obviously, there is a technological transformation in the broad sense.

I think it would be good to start with the first one, because it would help us organize the scheme for how to take in contributions from the experts' concerns. This is one stage, which need not conclude today. It is a process of many months.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).— I am going to follow the line of what Bruno was raising and use an example from my own research.

Many of the new organizations are moving toward the concept of an ecosystem, which we have already used. Nowadays, companies are almost ecosystems.

I am going to mention an example that is being used a lot as a success case at MIT. The Chinese company Haier -really it is like two thousand companies in one- is made up of micro organizations that work collaboratively. This has changed the concept of governance a great deal -Bruno and I have talked several times about the importance of corporate governance-, because they are starting to be, as some call them, new organizations in a swarm mode, more like a beehive and not so much like the current structures of organizations. That not only changes the way of working a great deal, and has an impact on digital transformation, but also on how companies are carried out. That is why organizations using DAOs were born at MIT, which is this new thing of governance through the use of technologies. But this particular case of companies is being seen in many places, not only in China. Haier is a paradigmatic example. Bear in mind that it has revenues of more than US\$80,000,000,000, but they are a mountain of a company. Also, the

average DAO is twenty people per company, but they have a logic for how to work together, they have a number of pre-built rules, and that is changing things quite a bit. It is as if they were organized SMEs; it is the maximum expression of our cooperative concept -I don't want to use the wrong word-; they are better examples than the ones we have here and, unfortunately, they come up a lot in the press.

Basically, the world is moving toward that concept, toward companies organized in networks, not only the more structural criterion of one director, one company, one owner, one set of shares, but multiple companies working in that swarm-type mode, as it is called in various places.

I think the context of organizations is going in that direction, and leadership is distributed. If we are talking about having to work in a multicultural and multiprofessional way, this is going to be a bigger challenge. In Europe and in the United States there are examples; people are working in that mode of living ecosystems in several countries. In fact, many examples from biology are being taken up at the business level. In Spain there is the concept of ecoaldeas (eco-villages) -in my view, "eco" does not refer to ecological, as is thought, but to economy-, and they have some quite interesting organizations of the cooperative model. Let's call it that, since it is the one we know best in Uruguay. It is a quite disruptive model and, obviously, it is based on technology for management, but also on agreement and the writing down of governance in order to carry those companies forward. It is a quite important trend in the business world. That is a change that is coming. I say this as a contribution to the first point.

MS. FARRIERLO (María Inés).— I am struck by how little companies' own data analysis is used for management. Obviously, I don't come from the business world, but, since I am continually analyzing data, I talk with people who work in other places and little is known about what data companies have. When we did the artificial intelligence consulting for the IDB, it often happened that they didn't even know how their data was kept, where they kept it, how to access it, or what question they could ask of their own data. Besides, it happens that SMEs are small. A model that was used in Finland consisted of setting up a kind of ecosystem of companies working in the same sector, to which everyone contributes their data in order to improve, but not necessarily to pour it all in and then not use it; nowadays, federated learning is quite common, saying: "let's all use it."

As for the bio side, an example is if we want to make genetic improvements, each one will sequence their animals, but I don't want to give my sequence to another producer, because I would be giving them the information, but if I use a much larger database, I will be able to obtain much better data to improve my own livestock and so will the other producer. So, working in those ecosystems from the standpoint of sharing data without letting others see it can often lead to improving the amount of data, when in Uruguay we know that those are the problems that make it difficult for us to build models.

MR. TOPOLANSKY (Enrique).— Regarding Bruno's question, I want to say that the style of organization -what was called before structure and leadership style- precisely conditions whether the company continues to exist. See how far I am taking this. These days, I feel that a large part of success-failure lies in the speed of decision making. There are organizations whose structure generates bottlenecks and does not allow them to make decisions on time or, as María Inés said very well, they don't have the possibility of getting the data needed to make decisions on time. Why? Because we come from a world in which, rather than collaborating, people competed and, according to the traditional company, on the other side I have an enemy. The modern trend, above all in the ecosystems I am in, which are the entrepreneurial ecosystems, is that collaboration is the norm. In technology it happens much more; it is a sector that collaborates more than others.

Specifically, regarding the question, today there are two types of organizational structures. Companies that are born with a digital mindset already have an agile culture. Those companies follow lean and DevOps methodologies; all the ones we know of, which basically consist of a set of methodologies and architectures that allow organizations to quickly sense the trends that are emerging, take stock of the situation they are in, and from there, make data-based decisions and act fast. The faster they run that cycle, the better chance they have of surviving. This also comes from bio systems, that is, when you have the capacity to sense and react quickly, you survive, and if not, you're toast; it happens a lot in the jungle, so to speak. So, the companies of the dynamic ecosystem with digital mindsets already have those agile structures.

Traditional companies have to make a structural change. In this regard there are two models: the American one, which says let them survive, and if a startup comes along, let it eat them; and the European model, led by Michael Wade, which proposes how to get the incumbents, that is, companies that are a hundred years old, that provide an enormous amount of employment and that cannot disappear from one day to the next, to make a transition. Here it comes into play whether or not one has the culture and the capacity for change. There are very concrete factors that have to do with the leadership we have today. The question is whether that leadership is permeable to these changes. As you know, there are some very hard sectors in Uruguay where it is very difficult to get in with changes and transformations. Sometimes they cannot do it for regulatory reasons or because they are not allowed, as with, for example, banking or fintech sectors that want to go where the world is going but can't get in, because there are very strict regulations that don't let them. The Central Bank is working on that; in any case, it is a matter of pace. Specifically, these companies that have to change their structure and their management need to incorporate agile methodologies and, at the same time, as María Inés said, begin to obtain and use data in the day-to-day for decision making and, above all, learn to collaborate in an ecosystem. Nowadays, companies that stay closed die, unlike those that interact and start to move with university ecosystems and ecosystems of different types of innovation. It was announced that Microsoft is setting up a lab to work on data issues and this kind of thing. How many companies in Uruguay are going to dare? We also have to see with what

contracts; they will be given the data, but we have to see what they are going to do with it. In any case, nowadays, companies don't dare to put their data in to collaborate and have a better credit scoring system, risk analysis, which would be much better for everyone and we would optimize. Why? Because they come from the old management, the old way of thinking: "This is mine; it's my advantage, I'm not sharing it," and they distrust all the federated schemes, the blockchains, that could be built to avoid this kind of thing.

In summary, in Uruguay we have the structures that startups have, based on an ecosystem that was built over more than twenty years, in which we are working, which is extremely collaborative. Therefore, the entrepreneurial ecosystem is used to this kind of agile structure, to collaborating, which does not happen as much in more traditional sectors. There are some examples of collaboration, but they are very few specifically.

MS. NANE (Silvia).— As you can see, I am in a medical institution in Colonia because of family care; I sent you a letter.

I want to greet Leo, Topo, María Inés. It is always nice for me to reconnect with people from my previous life; it makes me feel closer to the field. The idea is to share with you some reflections on what you were talking about, precisely, the kind of capabilities that we have to go on generating, and to see a bit what challenges they imply, in line with what you were analyzing, and to be present, even if only for a little while.

You were talking about cooperation. What I am going to mention will sound familiar to Leonardo. In the computing industry we used to say there was a question between cooperation and competition, and with that we made the word "coopetition." Of course, the great challenge that cooperative methods have nowadays is that they go somewhat against the grain of the generic social mandate, which is, more or less, that everyone should fend for themselves. So, there is a matter of consumption and of individualism, fostered by a host of social vectors, and when one goes against that, it is difficult to find - above all when we are talking about the business world- governance models that make it possible to be in a world that goes one way, but working in a way that goes another way. There is that question between governance in a collaborative mode of work, which seems to me to generate the need for competition, for going from the micro to the macro, but in a race against the current. For that, it is necessary to exercise a kind of gymnastics, to go from the abstract to the concrete. In the abstract I solve models that I can then apply in concrete circumstances, but that requires certain skills that are developed in the world of education. For me the clearest thing in this regard is computational thinking and chess, which make it possible to see things and generate that gymnastics, that muscle for going from the abstract to the concrete and starting to generate the transformations.

In the business world -Enrique also mentioned it just now- there are risks that are taken and others that are not. Sometimes, companies, business owners or

entrepreneurs, men and women, take risks starting from a given situation. In this regard, it seems to me that we can reflect a bit on the role of public policy or of the State in creating incubators of pilots, which would allow a certain part of the risk to be absorbed, so that afterward, with part of the accumulated experience, knowledge can be generated, in order to disseminate or deepen certain knowledge or, simply, to collectivize it. Many times, in that interaction, we can begin to think about public policy models that go back and forth from the public to the private, in a kind of feedback loop, and from there begin to see, according to a strategic model, how collaboration can proceed from the private sphere, which always also involves aspects of education.

THE CHAIR.— Next, we will hold a final round in order to set out, although it has already been done, some proposed lines for public policy action, as Senator Nane was raising. So, if it seems right to you -participation is not mandatory- we will leave these last fifteen or twenty minutes for a final round.

MS. HAIM (Fiorella).— I will take the opportunity to answer some of Bruno's questions.

Regarding management style, I think that, in general, technology companies set a very good example on many topics, but above all in flexibility, in management, in motivation and in how those employment ties are created. Gabriel referred earlier to the importance of having the workers as partners, since they are the ones who know directly the product or service being provided.

In technology companies there are a great many good practices that could, in general, be extracted for more traditional companies. Often there are fears and roadblocks in that regard about what the possible challenges are with respect to legal issues. For example, when people talk about flexible hours, you say: "Well, but if the person asks me today to leave early because they have to run an errand, and the next day they have to stay later to finish a job, I'm going to have to pay them overtime for the other day." Technology companies already have those things worked out because they happen every day, and it is something quite natural. Mention to some more traditional, large company that there is no time clock, and it's like they look at you saying: "But everyone is going to demand overtime from us." It would be good to have that other perspective. Often there is no alternative; on the technology side we want to retain people because there is a great shortage and if they come and tell you: "We need fruit," well, yes, of course! I have even heard of companies that offer a panoramic view.

Perhaps without going to those extremes that we have in the technology world, many good practices that contribute to motivation can be adopted. If we are talking about a knowledge society in which we want to turn that knowledge into value, we need each of the members of companies to be in that process and to generate that productivity Gabriel was talking about, and take advantage of it there.

Today, the sector where this is happening the most is the technology world, and it would be good to take it as an example.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).— As for public policies, the last question that is raised is: what would we ask of Parliament?

Senator Sanguinetti helped several sectors, mainly the technology sector, but several sectors of economic activity are taking advantage of the telework law.

What Fiorella raises is much more sophisticated. The new labor relations have to be legislated; I think it could be a substantial change that has to be analyzed in the future.

(Dialogue)

—If there is going to be a labor relations bill, it is important to keep this in mind, although I don't know whether what I am going to say will be addressed in it.

As a technology sector -although we believe it can be important for all types of companies-, there are countries that are much more advanced than we are on this subject, such as, for example, Peru, which has several organizations and several companies in which the employees are in on the results, that is, they are part of the results. In other countries, that is legislated through the concept and existence of stock options, a subject we raised with both the previous government and the current one as a specific need of the technology sector. We believe it is an aspect that goes beyond this sector, that can be applied at the business level. In fact, in the United States it works for any company, not just a technology company. The concept can be that the employees themselves have results and are shareholders of their own companies. It is a subject that is being handled internationally and, as I said, there are countries such as Peru that surprise us by having particular legislation. Germany too, and it does not resolve it through stock options but through the distribution of dividends among the employees. And what everyone later agrees on is what the distribution model is. But that concept does exist; it will have to be there, but obviously legislated.

I would go to a more complicated subject; sometimes I am very direct, but I think that many times the answer is not to legislate and not to regulate. In certain things, growth is going to come from deregulating certain things. Obviously, there is a balance between how much I regulate and how much I don't, but for activity to grow in certain sectors, that kind of thing is important. On the subject of biotechnology we always gave the example in the technology sector: if I want to bring in a flying car because I would like this to be the first place where it was tested, we have great complexity in the regulations and other matters.

This kind of activity is important, and obviously it goes through Parliament.

It is one of the areas we would have to work on and that Parliament should take into account in the future.

MR. TOPOLANSKY (Enrique).— I am going to focus first on education, a key aspect for this new world of transformation, of digital disruption that we are facing. There is one aspect that has to do with flexibilization. These days we are in a world in which accreditation by competencies is going to be more and more necessary. Today, it is very normal for companies, above all in technology, to hire people who studied online, and when you meet them they are experts in artificial intelligence and data analytics. I am not saying that university studies should be replaced, far from it, but I think many doors are closed because we don't have real mechanisms to endorse the competencies of people who have studied.

The proposal is to make the educational system more flexible; the degree programs we have, so strict and traditional, are submitted to the MEC and stay there as if sealed in stone, today that is backward, above all when you look at the models in the United States, where you arrive and put together your recipe with an advisor, but you choose what to study as you go. Either we move to a much more flexible model, or we won't be able to respond to what Leo was saying a while ago, that more creativity and more innovation are needed. That is not achieved with closed models.

That is point number one on education.

Point number two is that Uruguay tends to be an innovation hub. This is happening with the presence of Google, of the Argentine unicorns, now of Microsoft. However, what happens to me is that I want to bring in students and I can't get a student visa. There is a problem that I suppose you know about, whereby, if you bring in a student for more than so many months, they entered as a tourist, and to bring them back you have to take them out to Buenos Aires; you have to invent a trip so that they can be in Uruguay.

If we really want to be a valley and an innovation hub, the universities have to be able to bring in three-year residence permits so that people do master's degrees and postgraduate programs in Uruguay, and that is not happening.

Another matter is that we have to promote research again, technology transfer with companies, the whole issue of donations. If we could rethink how to work with the universities to have resources to work with companies, to innovate projects of this type, it would be great. It is another item on the wish list that I am putting on the table.

Now I am going to move to the entrepreneurial ecosystem, another of the points that is key for me, and which has been the engine of three unicorns here in Uruguay that generate GDP, exports and employment in an incredible way.

Regarding the entrepreneurial ecosystem, there were great advances with the entrepreneurship law, with crowdfunding, but a lot is still missing. For what Leo was saying about having sandbox-type methods through which we can run tests on doing something with fintech, crypto, it is essential that regulatory frameworks be put together that allow us to run experiments from the sponsoring institutions with universities, in the context we want.

In that respect, with the entrepreneurial and innovation ecosystems, we should copy a little more the models of Israel and Sweden, a model that I was lucky enough to visit very recently and that today give much more freedom. Here we have an innovation model that is too centralized in the National Agency for Research and Innovation, and that can't be. If we want innovation, what do we need? Different visions. Today we have a board of experts who tell you: "This is innovation"; "This is not innovation." Sorry; I don't agree. We have to move toward a model that allows us to give freedom to those who are taking the risk of innovating, and afterward have them be responsible for the consequences. What is happening is a step backward.

Another point is what has to do with policies in particular. Close attention to the transition. I think the main problem we are going to have is the startups and unicorns that we have growing at an incredible speed, and leaving aside a high percentage of people who are going to become expendable, to borrow the words of Yuval Harari. That is going to happen in Uruguay, and all those expendable people who will somehow end up outside the system are going to end up generating violence and problems for us.

Don't forget to manage the transition; managing the transition is the perspective for those over fifty. There are people there who are in the system but are becoming obsolete. There is still a chance to train them and reinsert them in some way. But there are a lot of people who are already outside the system, and those people can't be retrained. We lie to ourselves when we say they can be retrained. But perhaps the technology sector can develop virtual assistants, like the ones that exist for translators, so that those people, aided by artificial intelligence without their knowing it -today we have them on our phones- manage to be included. And there I add more people: people with disabilities, et cetera. Today technologies can make a person, using an artificial intelligence assistant, very productive. A lot of effort has to be put into developing those kinds of tools so as not to leave too many people by the wayside in this process.

And the last point on the wish list. Uruguay has a big problem -and I don't know what Parliament can do- that has to do with connectivity. Every time you want to go anywhere, you have to take four, five connections, and we can't be an innovation hub if we don't solve the connectivity issue.

THE CHAIR.— You have the experience from working on it, and you were one of those who contributed the most to the entrepreneurship law, which was very preliminary. Just yesterday, the regulation was finished

that allows simplified joint-stock companies to be incorporated entirely digitally, and that was thanks to a law, otherwise we would still be up in the air. That entrepreneurship law, in which many of the people at this table took part, had planned some of the things that, for example, Leonardo Loureiro was raising. It was not possible because at the time we didn't have the consensus to pass it, but it was a much more ambitious bill. Knowing that the law can in many cases be a path to developing the full entrepreneurial potential, one of the objectives of these exchanges is to learn more. Naturally, there are other opportunities, cases, circumstances in which a law can hold things back, and in that we all have a lot to contribute and to know when a law, far from helping, distorts or holds things back.

So far, the entrepreneurship law has been all advantages and I think we are in a position -one of the objectives for finishing this year is to seek the second stage of the entrepreneurship law, in the same way we did on the previous occasion, which naturally arose from the entrepreneurs- to recover all these proposals, which of course will have to be modernized. Conceptually they are about how to adapt a business structure to the new dynamics which, although at some point could have been an option, now become necessities, or as happened to us with the SAS, if we don't do it here, the Uruguayan entrepreneur goes to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, et cetera.

MR. GILI (Bruno).— I want to give a brief introduction, which triggers a question for Gabriel and for anyone who wants to answer it.

In this we always end up with there being an education roundtable and a labor relations roundtable; although we will always talk about those subjects, these are going to be inputs that will reach those two roundtables. That is what we are trying to do.

There is something that one knows happens and that seems quite relevant to me, and that is why I was raising the market restrictions and also public policy ones.

Since the World Economic Forum was mentioned, one of the categories we use when we try to understand markets is that the boundary of business has blurred, you don't know who you are competing with. I don't know whether I compete with a bank; in old talks eight, nine years ago we used to say that you didn't know who you were competing with, a fintech, a telephone company, a retail company, a technology company, which in reality turns into a fintech. In fact, there are proposals from companies offering the technology so that anyone can become a bank; it doesn't matter what you do, you can present it. It is a Uruguayan firm that goes around the world doing those things, and I'm not referring to dLocal, I'm referring to another one.

For me, that concept that the boundaries of business are being erased is very relevant to how markets function internationally and nationally, and moreover this is globalizing.

I would like Gabriel, who stressed the subject of problems, speaking about the lack of competition in markets and the incentives to cooperate, because there also have to be incentives, to extend his view on how these aggregate problems would be keeping productivity from improving, because I think it is an important subject.

THE CHAIR.— Gabriel, we'll give you a few minutes to think about your answer.

We give the floor to Ms. Fariello, to close with Gabriel Burdín's intervention.

MS. FARIELLO (María Inés).— I want to say something that has a lot to do with what was mentioned: how we manage to articulate the system of entrepreneurs, companies and academia, above all in this area of artificial intelligence. Leonardo was giving me a scolding; the thing is that I don't have time. There really is a lot of demand for training in data science and artificial intelligence, and at the same time there is a lack of resources, which we will surely talk about on another occasion.

There are companies in the sector that ask you: "Tell me, what do you need?" And they are in that dynamic of "If you ask me, I'll give," but what are the mechanisms? So, once again the issue appears of how to handle donations from private parties to the University, and of asking ourselves -here they also scolded me when we raised it at the end of the data science consultancy- that what we perhaps need is to set up a data science and machine learning center. Just as there was an INIA at one point when the country needed to push into agriculture and find producers, academic institutions, et cetera, and it is still working, a meeting place, a very well-oiled mechanism in which academia gets together with producers to solve things.

Sometimes it goes a bit through the National Agency for Research and Innovation and saying: "Look, you have the instrument," because we have a call for companies with academia, or if a company wants to have someone do a master's or a doctorate. Those resources exist, but the problem is where we meet and how we find the place for that to really be agile and dynamic, and not have it said: "I'm academia. I need this, I want to look for which company has that problem that I can solve." It seems to me that sometimes there is a bit of a lack of dialogue and a meeting place.

Let's remember that at one point we had an INIA, an Institut Pasteur when we needed to take off in biotechnology, but we need Uruguay to keep training people. Nowadays what happens is that many companies end up training people in-house, and what already happened in Canada, which has a system, and academia did this, they saw that small companies end up working as trainers and the big ones, which is somewhat what was described, take the people. They end up investing in training so as to take them afterward. In fact it happens to us, Google is taking people away from us abroad. But that happens worldwide; it is a very fierce war. Sometimes I think we should do like soccer players and set up a transfer market. "If you trained them for the company, at least leave me something to take them from you." I think it is impossible to have a market in player

transfers like in soccer. I think about it. If it exists in that area, why couldn't it exist in this case? We already know why: afterward we have no merchandising to sell.

Really thinking about how we can articulate that. All the time we are forming roundtables, we meet for a little while, we chat and say: "Wow, this problem is great. We'll look at it later." And what happens to us all the time is the lack of capacity. The idea is to see how to find, from public policy, a place that ends up bringing together all those synergy capabilities.

We talk about all the ecosystems in the world except this ecosystem, which I think is quite important.

THE CHAIR.— We take the proposal. We note it down and we are going to pick it up.

MS. FARIELLO (María Inés).— It is written down; in the consultancy report the proposal for the Center is laid out with different dimensions.

THE CHAIR.— We will take it up, it will be picked up, and as a Commission we will try to carry it forward.

MR. BURDÍN (Gabriel).— I will try to answer the questions Bruno raised, to then give a closing reflection.

I insist: it seems important to me to think about these issues from the perspective of the dynamic component of the entrepreneurial system, of the technology sector, but I am much more concerned about how these processes impact the business fabric as a whole, because that is where the fundamental game is played in terms of the economic and social consequences of these processes.

I am concerned about the majority of the population employed in low-productivity, non-tradable sectors, in tourism, about how technologies spill over into those sectors and make companies and people more productive. From that point of view, it seems to me that the public policy areas we should be thinking about -and now touching on subjects that will be addressed at other roundtables, but that have been addressed today- are how we generate in the business fabric those complementary organizational capabilities without which technology has no effect on productivity, improving the quality of management, improving the training of the labor force, improving the opportunities workers have to take part in the processes of technological change in companies, and what information they have available to take part in those processes. Because just as companies don't like to share their data with other companies, they also have no incentives to share information about their plans, about their economic accounts, about their financial accounts, with their workers, which is why in a good number of countries, above all European ones, legislation covers those aspects. And that internal transparency within companies is what makes it possible to speed up technology implementation processes and moderate their negative impacts on workers.

In terms of regulations, it seems to me that this is a fundamental area. Another, obviously, is education; a 40% graduation rate from Secondary school is a very complicated baseline condition for thinking about the future of these issues in Uruguay. It is a whole separate subject that will be addressed, that has been addressed for some time; there we have a structural bottleneck.

Likewise, what was raised today about transitions seems central to me. Technology displaces certain tasks, certain jobs, and creates new tasks, creates new occupations. Obviously, there is turbulence, transitions of workers, companies that are born, companies that are destroyed. In part, that process is positive for the economy, but it generates many costs, and there is not much magic there: what is needed are minimum welfare floors financed with general taxes, social protection that allows workers to make those transitions and have a certain income support so that those transitions are relatively less dramatic.

It is important to understand that job loss has very significant consequences for people in terms of health, and also, let us not forget, that workers who lose their jobs have children who are accumulating human capital and who will be the ones who experience the economy of the future. So, ensuring that those transitions are as untraumatic as possible is a fundamental element when thinking about those issues. There is not much magic there: what is required is a strong welfare state, financed with general taxes, that makes it possible to defuse the drama of the transitions associated with technological change. That will reduce the pressures toward greater inequality, but it will also benefit the functioning of the economy and the very dynamics of technology adoption by companies.

MR. MELAZZI (Martín).— I thank the panelists for their presentations; it was a pleasure to listen to you.

I am simply going to make a few remarks, because I come from the business world, from micro and small companies; it is an area I know. I was president of the Soriano Commercial and Industrial Center for many, many years.

I value almost everything you said, but I must be honest, I am always known for that. Many of these assessments are made from a more capital-city way of thinking. Why do I say this? Some of you elaborated on the subject of education. In Soriano, Colonia and some other departments we don't even have the possibility of tertiary degree programs being offered. For many micro and small business owners, building them takes us our whole lives, looking after it, adapting to these technological changes. Taking a step of transformation that could mean, overnight, our making a mistake and losing our companies makes each one of us very conservative.

I think that in Uruguay the business sector is characterized by taking care of its companies, by being conservative, it is hard for us to make decisions because many times

we don't know, as you rightly said here, because we don't share information within the same lines of activity. And I say this with great authority because I happened to travel with nine producers, I drove the vehicle, and each one of them had a little notebook of his own to do the same planting work. What is more: they kept the information to themselves to keep the other from being as productive or more so, because if I pour out all my information, I don't share it... We had an impressive degree of selfishness.

Regarding young entrepreneurs, I know many of them through programs such as Semilla ANDE. They have competed, and they had the possibility of having managers who help them with their ventures. Up to there, everything is going fine.

But to keep growing in the business world, because we must also say that we are a small country -we could have a long discussion-, especially those of us from the interior, in principle our approach to selling products and services is toward our localities, then at the national level and then to the world, one of the biggest problems we have is access to credit, but not just any credit, access to credit at really affordable interest rates, which encourages us to take on money to invest and take risks. Today it becomes very difficult for any entrepreneur -I am not going to talk about the specific technology sector because I think it is different from the sector of micro and small companies, above all small companies that sell products specifically- to achieve accelerated growth, even with the good will and the capacity and the education needed to carry out correct policies within the company.

I always say that micro and small business owners, today, with the business models they run, have a very high tendency to disappear.

And if new entrepreneurs are not instilled with an entrepreneurial culture from the educational system, it becomes very difficult to think that we are going to have young graduates with the drive to be generators of sources of employment. It also has to be said, as a business owner or microbusiness owner I have to say it, that we have always carried the heavy backpack of being seen differently for saying that we are "business owners," when the definition is someone who defines capital and labor, who combines capital and labor. That is to say, a street-fair vendor is a business owner.

We have underlying issues, barriers to break down, we have to put a lot of focus on the interior of the country. We have to avoid condemning those kids, for not having tertiary education, to remain in total informality. We have to work on educating new business owners about the importance of being in the formal system. We have to work on unfair competition. In the interior of the country, delivery services are a big problem. In my department, in the city of Mercedes, restaurants practically don't exist. We have gotten used to the delivery system, which obviously competes, not all of them, some in a fairly unfair way, which makes it very hard to maintain the structures.

And if we go, as was well said, to Shopify, well, yes! You bet, when you in Montevideo go to pick up a product, they open a gate and inside there is a whole business organization! I saw it on one occasion when I went to pick up a product I bought through Mercado Libre and I said to myself: "I've got the wrong place. This can't be it."

We have those changes of production models, but it is our duty as legislators to make sure that those who are going to compete do so legally.

MS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).— First of all, I want to thank the panel of experts for the presentation; it is a pleasure to listen to you. I think there are many of us taking notes like crazy of all those tasks, the number of suggestions, inputs and so on.

Fiorella mentioned -luckily we have a telework law- the matter of flexible hours. It's not that I want to be self-referential, but it did seem to me that, given that we are talking about this subject and that it was mentioned, I think it is a fairly apt example to demonstrate this resistance to change that we have in Uruguay. And without getting into politicizing the issue, and of course we know who opposed what has to do with the weekly count of hours -I don't want to get into the political debate-, I find quite symbolic what this issue implies, and many of the matters that you, among the wish list and so on, mention have to do with an agility that today, as a State, we are finding hard.

I think that in this space of the Special Commission on Futures, which is precisely dreaming up the future, we should go deeper into these questions, which are clearly a demand from the various experts who have come. It seems to me that, if we add it to Uruguay's challenges because of scale, the central issue and core knot we have at the level of productivity and so on, there is no choice but to take on this question which, personally, and I believe the whole commission, take on as a challenge for the coming months.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR.— We are enormously grateful to Ms. María Inés Fariello, Ms. Fiorella Haim, and Messrs. Leonardo Loureiro, Enrique Topolansky, Gabriel Burdín -from England- and Martín Inthamoussu.

Silvia Nane was going to coordinate this session; she would have done it much better than I, but because of a health matter involving a very close relative, she could not. We thank her very much for joining us for this stretch via Zoom.

As I said, everything that is exchanged and proposed here is going to be processed and taken up, as we have done on other occasions. Naturally, our commitment is to make concrete those things that we see need a legal regulation in order to help, promote, foster and facilitate.

We remind you that on Thursday, August 11, at 16 hours, we will hold the third thematic axis: New capabilities for the twenty-first century, lifelong learning, coordinated by legislators Carmen Sanguinetti and Martín Melazzi and a group of experts who joined us.

The meeting is adjourned.

(The time is 17 hours and 47 minutes)

Montevideo, Uruguay. Legislative Branch.