GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SECRETARIAT
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

49th Legislature
Fourth Period

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE FUTURE

Distribution: 101/2023

File S/C

July 27, 2023

SECOND WORLD SUMMIT OF COMMITTEES OF THE FUTURE

Verbatim record of the meeting held on
July 27, 2023

ATTENDANCE

Chair: Legislator Rodrigo Goñi
Members: Legislators Graciela García, Gloria Rodríguez and Carmen Sanguinetti; and legislators Felipe Carballo, Martín Melazzi and Ismael Smith
Secretariat: Ms. María Elena Morán (Secretary) and Ms. Joseline Rattaro (Deputy Secretary); and Mr. Vladimir De Bellis Martínez (Secretary)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE FUTURE

(Meeting of July 27, 2023)

THE CHAIR (Rodrigo Goñi Reyes).—A quorum being present, the meeting is called to order.

(The time is 13:30)
We would like Lydia to update us on the agenda we have been working on, which remains preliminary, to see whether we agree with it and have any comments. There is still time to raise them, and there are some matters we need to decide among ourselves soon.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—I will mention three points, and then we can expand on them as interest arises.

An overall view of the agenda—that is, how all these preparatory Summit activities connect with the Committee for the Future and contribute to two main concepts the Committee has been developing, which run through the proposed Summit agenda: anticipatory governance and responsible anticipation.

I will now describe the agenda in words. It rests on four thematic components.

The first component, to be addressed on the first day, concerns entering into the context of change in which we find ourselves. Remember that the Summit's proposal concerns the democracy of the future in the context of evolving artificial intelligence. That morning, the current context of change will be addressed in three different ways, from different perspectives and practices.

One is the first roundtable, concerning international organizations and how this context of change—particularly artificial intelligence issues—enters the international agenda. The roundtable includes representatives of the United Nations, UNDP, UNESCO, OAS and various organizations that have also been supporting the Summit. We have titled it "Embracing complexity, uncertainty, surprise and ambiguity for a better world."

The second roundtable—I am still referring to the first component, the morning of Tuesday the 26th—concerns the challenges of parliamentary work in a context that requires opening the door to change and the future. It will be led by representatives of the IPU, the Inter-Parliamentary Union; Parlatino; the European Parliament; the African Parliament; and the Asia-Pacific Parliament. In other words, bringing in parliaments' needs from a futures perspective, according to each region's characteristics.

The third roundtable will invite representatives of applied artificial intelligence developers—that is, the major companies developing and deploying artificial intelligence in different ways. One of the latest developments, which has had considerable impact, is the

famous ChatGPT: these language models that confront us with natural-language interaction. This is the first time humanity has found itself in such a context. This is being debated in European parliaments. Although this year's artificial intelligence regulatory proposals, also called Acts, have been under development in 2017, 2018 and 2020, the various proposals had not reached a vote. The emergence of these new generative artificial intelligence models accelerated that process. I think the European Parliament voted on the first Act in June—I do not quite remember whether it was on the 14th—the first law regulating this area, based on a risk criterion ranging from serious to minor.

I shared with you the second "heading," the second hearing held a couple of days ago in the United States Congress; it is very interesting. I am transcribing the two-and-a-half-hour hearing, which I think could be very useful as material for understanding what is happening. This third roundtable is proposed on the model of such activities. I think the participants have not yet been finalized, but the companies have: Microsoft, Meta, Google and Amazon.
THE CHAIR (Rodrigo Goñi Reyes).—Those are the ones for now; others are asking to participate.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—I recommend watching those videos, as they are good examples. Although this will not be a "heading," a hearing, the proposal is precisely that parliamentarians—whoever is selected—put three or four questions to those companies' representatives.

That concludes component one, the morning of Tuesday the 26th.

For the afternoon of Tuesday the 26th, keynote speakers are scheduled, including Mr. Jerome Glenn, president of the Millennium Project. It is a global think tank that has been working for several years on the evolution of artificial intelligence and the need for global governance, framed in terms of how governance has been handled, for example, for atomic energy. There is also some urgency to create basic conditions that can be anticipatory rather than reactive—that is, after the problem has already taken hold.

So the afternoon would begin with his talk, followed by two more experts. One is Virginia Dignum, who is Portuguese but lives in Sweden. She is a scientist, professor and teacher, and a leading voice on responsible artificial intelligence. That lasts an hour and a half. Then we would move to a workshop to deepen exchanges among parliamentarians in groups of 15, 18 or 20 people. The final arrangement will depend on how many people register.

The idea is to have 5 or 6 parallel workshops where these exchanges can take place, drawing on experiences, proposals and so on. They will

be moderated by a team that will begin working next week. The synthesis of that hour-and-a-half exercise will be presented in a plenary session.

Each workshop will have a spokesperson who will present in plenary, where some exchange will then be opened. That second component ends in the afternoon at around 18:00 or 18:30.

We now come to the third component, on Wednesday the 27th. The morning is expected to feature keynote speaker Mr. Daniel Innerarity. This session will probably be opened to a wider audience. After his presentation of about forty minutes, two other experts and two or three parliamentarians will take part in more of a colloquium format, completing that hour-and-a-half plenary module before a break. Then at 11:00 there will be another hour-and-a-half workshop, picking up on the previous day's work and going further into committees for the future and anticipatory governance in parliaments. Using the same format, the results will be presented in plenary to conclude that component.
Lunch follows, and in the afternoon comes the fourth component, focusing more specifically on parliaments' role in the democracy of the future, with some new developments and transformations. Since everything centers on evolving artificial intelligence, one of the main presentations will be by Professor José Luis Martí, with case studies of how parliaments are integrating artificial intelligence into their functions and everyday parliamentary practice. This is another new development, another form of artificial intelligence that affects parliaments: it concerns not only regulation or possible changes in society, but transformations within parliaments themselves. There are cases such as New Zealand, where it has been implemented and studied for several years. Countries including Greece, Finland, Estonia and Lithuania have been integrating not only digital transformation but also artificial intelligence into what has been called coding, or in some cases reflection on the algorithmization of parliamentary activity.

The idea is for that fourth component to focus more specifically on parliamentary activity. A team will support the collection of all the input gathered, from panelists, questions and answers during panels, and workshop syntheses. This will feed into the final interactive activity in the afternoon: developing recommendations and the final declaration, followed by a plenary session with the conclusions and that declaration. It will seek to capture three main aspects: highlighting the importance of parliamentary issues from a futures perspective; forming a global network of committees for the future or futures spaces within parliaments; and recommendations for the Summit of the Future organized by the United Nations in September 2024.

In the materials we have been sharing, everything I have described is shown graphically as the main themes, with the other themes linked to them, all contributing to reflection on the democracy of the future in the context of evolving artificial intelligence.
The aim is not just to have speakers give presentations, but to encourage these exchanges so that, during these two and a half days of work, a kind of collective intelligence curve develops. As I said, we will try to capture everything that emerges and then organize a record of the activity that can feed into the SEF.
How does all this connect with the SEF beyond the Summit itself? It is an opportunity to immerse ourselves in artificial intelligence, whose disruptive impacts are adding to and overlapping all the impacts or problems we may already face. It connects directly with the transformation of work, the future of work and the work of the future, the Committee's theme for this period, and also clearly raises everything concerning the need to regulate artificial intelligence.
As a fourth point, we have "Artificial intelligence in parliaments," which perhaps the Committee for the Future could begin examining. It is also an opportunity for "working," meaning those interactions with other committees and parliaments that have more years of experience with committees for the future, and an opportunity for a more participatory role in the United Nations agenda for the 2024 Summit and the Global Compact.

The third point—I will mention only its heading—is that all this contributes to a process that, as such, takes time to strengthen capabilities for anticipatory governance: moving from acting after things happen to trying to examine problems and act beforehand. This is linked to responsible anticipation, seeking better and more complete information for decisions that can be better aligned with the processes and pace of change we are experiencing.

In a way, a great deal of information is available, because all this has involved producing and finding materials. It is available, and we can expand on it later, so that the work being done for the Summit does not simply serve two or three days in September, but is seen as contributing to the Committee for the Future's work and Parliament as a whole, as it takes ownership of the process.

MS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).—A question occurred to me as I listened to the differences between workshop-style activities, keynote presentations and so on. Obviously this is aimed at us, members of the Committee for the Future, and people coming from abroad, but to what extent will it be opened to parliamentarians and perhaps interested students? In other words, how will we distinguish what is open and for what purpose? Perhaps this is not yet defined, but I do not think it is a minor issue, because some of

these topics could, for example, be of great interest to first-year university students, and it might be excellent for them to come. We can decide to do that or not. I think it is important for us to discuss such things at some point.

THE CHAIR.—Carmen, that is a very pertinent question, and we have to decide it ourselves. It is a political decision.

I have just sent Lydia's latest proposal to WhatsApp; it is a preliminary, proposed and open agenda. As members of the Committee for the Future, and because this is a parliamentary and political event, we are the ones who must decide such actions.

You have now seen the organizational work, which we absolutely had to launch to avoid being too late. It was very difficult, but everyone even contributed resources to make it happen. For questions such as those Carmen Sanguinetti raises—whom to include and how, with the possibility of side events involving young people—from today we have to delegate tasks to some members if we are going to decide such actions, because we are the ones who will say whom we include.

This is a framework, and we can be reassured that it is already being circulated. But all the other ingredients, which also concern political matters that are ours to decide, must be defined today. We have five Thursdays beforehand to make concrete proposals, like Senator Sanguinetti's now; if we approve them, we will then find ways to implement them. We will also need to delegate their implementation and execution to Committee members, because we are now beginning to see many logistical matters that need to be distributed.

Senator Sanguinetti, what would your suggestion or proposal be? I do not know whether it is something to decide now.

MS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).—I simply wanted to know whether any criteria had been defined and, if so, what they were. If not, I think it is something we should consider; I am not saying we must decide it now in this meeting, but since the topic generates so much interest, especially among younger generations, it would be good to have a reasonably clear idea of how invitations will work, whom they will address, and which spaces will be restricted and which will not.
THE CHAIR.—In response: that has not been defined, because it could not have been.

Lydia Garrido is working on this full-time and is available to develop proposals of the kind Senator Sanguinetti suggests, because there is still time; not once the framework is set, along with the major elements—funding, guests, speakers and so on. We could have done it earlier, but time did not allow. Nevertheless, there is still ample time to make it happen. Politically, this is an enormously significant issue because, as Senator Sanguinetti asks, whom will we include? There are very

important social actors: the University, the trade union movement, young people and academia in general. We must decide how to include them.

This event must be used so that, as Lydia Garrido rightly said, we can make the most of all the input it produces for Uruguayan society, for whose benefit the money to organize it is being spent.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—I am thinking of some of the experts invited to speak, such as Virginia Dignum. She is Portuguese, so she understands Spanish very well; she is a teacher and currently lives in Sweden. She is a leading consultant, including for the European Commission, on responsible artificial intelligence, and is willing to give a talk at a university and participate in this initiative; we simply need to coordinate with her. It is important to do so as soon as possible, because her travel dates will also depend on it.

We should remember that the Summit begins on Monday the 25th. There will be many activities that day because Parlatino will be holding meetings related to the interest in establishing a Futures Office within Parlatino. The official opening will be at six that Monday evening. Tuesday and Wednesday will be full workdays. So I think it could be Thursday. I mention this because, if you are interested and have questions for her, I could start passing them on.

THE CHAIR.—For a subsequent activity to have greater impact and purpose, or to be integrated, we need to find a way, as Senator Sanguinetti said, to connect it with the event itself. That is why we are trying to define the plenary lectures, for example, as soon as possible.

Clearly, workshops at the parliamentary event will be more restricted to parliamentarians and moderators. This is the other point I want us to define clearly today: moderators are part of the event, and this is a way of involving all of academia beyond the panels. The speakers are very, very good.

On the topic itself, very important news is emerging every day; the leading congresses and parliaments in the world are addressing it, and the leading figures attend, like the latest one reported in the press yesterday. Congresses devote hours to this issue. Why? We have already discussed it, so I will not repeat it, but I will say that artificial intelligence is affecting democratic processes. And when I say democratic processes, I do not mean parliamentary processes, but democratic ones. So it includes and involves society as a whole.

Therefore, if we want our approach to be consistent in recognizing that artificial intelligence development affects democratic processes for good or ill, including in threatening ways, we should somehow involve the different sectors of society in the Summit.

That is one of the points under discussion; Lydia has not put it on paper because it is something we must decide ourselves.

There is still time to do it; we must propose it and examine the methodology to find a workable approach.

MS. GARCÍA (Graciela).—To add to Senator Sanguinetti's question, I think this topic interests not only students but also institutions and universities. I have heard there is controversy in some university institutions because there is concern; not everything is nice, good and positive, is it? Universities are concerned about how to approach this issue.

So it would be good to find a way to include the different institutions, whether public or private.

THE CHAIR.—Yes, Senator. That is right, and I think we cannot avoid these questions; it would be a serious political mistake to evade the issue of how to include them. It has always been under discussion, but we have not implemented it.

That is why I think we must invite sectors, groups and collectives, as well as sectors clearly involved in the subject.

I think we should invite all the academic participants in the Committee for the Future who have been contributing material, data, experts and so on for Thursday, August 10. Specifically, I propose inviting them on Thursday, August 10.

(Discussion)

—I leave open the possibility of discussing it, but I propose inviting academic-sector representatives and experts on the topic for Thursday the 10th at 13:00, to discuss the agenda and invite them to help moderate the Summit—we will have several workshops and panels. Some of the institutions we should invite that day—and we must think directly of individuals—include all universities, including UTEC; each is working specifically on artificial intelligence, some on artificial intelligence and democracy. Also institutions such as Agesic and ANII, and we can consider social organizations not currently working on this but which could be a good starting point. I think there should be no more than fifteen. Then we on this Committee will need to identify who could participate in and join the Summit we are proposing.

(Expressions of support)

—And we will discuss possible names.

MR. MELAZZI (Martín).—Perhaps it has already been mentioned, but I would like to know whether there are plans to broadcast the sessions online. I want to know whether all these stakeholders we are discussing could follow each session, in an organized way, of course.

I also do not know whether consideration has been given to having a short period when the main panelists come forward—fifteen minutes,

for example—for these organizations to ask questions about the topic, naturally brief questions with brief answers. I think that would create a different dynamic and interaction. I understand this was not the case at the Helsinki Summit; only panelists spoke. I think this could bring together what we have been discussing and give all organizations and different stakeholders an opportunity, by following the proceedings, to ask questions and receive relevant responses.
THE CHAIR.—On broadcasting, the initial idea is to livestream the lectures. For now, we have three or four lectures.

I do not think broadcasting the working groups would be good, and we do not have a way to do it either, because they must be an exchange. For the panels, we would need to see whether we can find a way to do it.

I think the other proposal is a very good idea, Deputy Melazzi: including them through questions as well. That said, I think we must find a way for this Summit to be developed by all the important actors connected with the democracy of the future and democracy and artificial intelligence, our central theme.
MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—I find Deputy Melazzi's proposal very interesting, and I think it allows us to consider a parallel design. We have many constraints: one is that it will take place over two days; another is that—you were in Finland; theoretically this is the second Summit of Committees of the Future—we have proposed a very different Summit, perhaps somewhat ambitious, but very open. With this in mind, institutions, organizations and groups might be interested in simultaneous, parallel participation, following the Summit, moderating and collecting questions. As we said at the start, let us see this as a process over time rather than simply two or three days. This preparation is already generating input and knowledge, but work can continue afterward as well.
So I think this opens a space, because we also have to learn to think in this way, in simultaneous parallel worlds; it opens an interesting space to broaden the range of participants. Those interactive dynamics will also generate different viewpoints, knowledge, interests and cultures. That is good; it adds a little more organizational work, but I find it very interesting.

THE CHAIR.—We have a youth issue to address. I insist that we cannot fail to include younger generations; it would be unforgivable.
So the way forward here is through the parties and parliamentary groups. I think we must find a mechanism for at least thirty young people to participate somehow in the Summit. It would be an extraordinary opportunity for those thirty young people to experience the most current, forward-looking, interesting and complex issue in politics today,

and exchange views with leading experts and parliamentarians from around the world working on it. I would ask Lydia to develop a methodological proposal so that, if you agree, we can soon decide how to include the younger generation in this Summit, with a group of thirty.

The other point is that at least five, six or seven of us—without making it compulsory—must participate and play a leading role in the various activities. Those of us who have attended other summits know that the organizing committee for the future participates actively, as moderators, on panels, at the opening and closing, and so on.
So I think five, six or seven of us on the Committee for the Future must also have a visible role. We must begin preparing that now, discussing it with Lydia and then deciding, because it signals outwardly that this is an issue where all parties and perspectives interact; it is, of course, a long-term matter. These are the other aspects we must begin defining from now on, once the framework is in place.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—If you identify with the teams you are working with and there is interest in getting involved in the Summit—we know participant numbers are limited—or in these simultaneous, parallel activities linked to it, I am available to present the topics, materials and participants. Everyone has my contact details, and I am available to take part.

MS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).—The keynote speakers coming probably have I do not know how many books published, but if there were some material, some papers of 20, 30 or 50 pages—not reading 400 books, although I wish we could; I have identified some of them and not others—it would be good to have them.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—Thank you, Carmen.

I have it here, because this one is worthwhile throughout. From my perspective, this twenty-five-page paper by Daniel Innerarity from 2020 on artificial intelligence’s impact on democracy is very interesting. It is also in Spanish; that would be a first item.

THE CHAIR.—Lydia will send it to Vladimir so he can add it to WhatsApp. Beyond the Innerarity paper you mentioned, there is another by Jerome Glenn on artificial intelligence, the future, democracy and global governance, which will be the Summit’s theme. It is very current, also in Spanish, and I think it is very important.

It is also important that we all know about the contracts with the two main speakers presenting papers. This Committee must therefore have access, initially with some discretion, to what the speakers request until they bring it. In the coming days, they will submit preliminary versions of their presentations, which can naturally be revised later. As soon as we have them, they must reach the Committee. Really,

although they have already been working on these topics, they are contracted to provide two written presentations.

Speaker José Luis Martí, who has been contracted by UNDP, also has a paper that is very useful for parliamentarians, because it offers a very concise update on how parliaments are using artificial intelligence in different dimensions, including representation and legislation. At the event we will also learn about truly extraordinary things which, as we understand it, some parliaments are already using. Those are the tasks still ahead of us.

So we will meet on the 10th at 13:00.

I also want to say, unless Senator Gloria Rodríguez objects, that we must finish the futures work report this year, 2023; the area of longevity, long-lived societies and so on remains. Senator Gloria Rodríguez is working on it and is prepared. There is a very interesting proposal from Endeavor: they want to hold a silver economy event with us, which I think is international. We told them we were working on this with Senator Gloria Rodríguez, and they got in touch.

The idea, then, is to get through this Summit, which is absorbing all our attention, and hold a major event on long-lived societies in October, completing the fifth factor for the work of the future so that we can also produce the final report in 2023, as agreed.

MS. GARRIDO (Lydia).—Again, I am available to complement the discussion of long-lived societies with the relationships among different generations.

THE CHAIR.—To be clear, when I refer to Senator Gloria Rodríguez, it is not just about her. When we allocated the areas, one person was made responsible for leading each, but of course it is for everyone.

Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

(The time is 14:33)