SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

SECOND WORLD FUTURES SUMMIT

Participation in a virtual colloquium organized by the International Institute for Democracy and Assistance Electoral (IDEA) on issues related to the summit

Shorthand version of the day's session
November 30, 2023

ATTENDANCE

Preside   : Mr. Legislator Rodrigo Goñi (President)

Members   : Mrs. Legislator Carmen Sanguinetti and gentlemen Legislators
       Aldo Charbonnier, Juan Andres Ramirez and Sebastian Valdomir

Secretariat   : Mrs. Maria Elena Moran (Secretary), Mr. Vladimir De Bellis
       (Secretary), and Mrs. Sofía Martorano and Mrs. Joseline Rattaro (Assistant
       Secretaries)

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

Virtual colloquium organized by the International Institute for Democracy and Social Assistance

Electoral –IDEA– on issues related to the Second World Summit of

Future Commissions

(Meeting held on November 30, 2023).

MR. FERNÁNDEZ.- (According to the interpreter's version).-Good afternoon.

(It's 12:35).

– We are here, from the other side of the world, and we welcome you to the event

Unraveling Democracy.

We will be talking a little about something that you may have already seen in the news: the

artificial intelligence.

I don't want to take up any more time, so I would like to invite our secretary.

General Kevin Casas-Zamora, who will make introductory remarks.

MR. CASAS-ZAMORA (According to the interpreter's version).-Thank you so much.

Good afternoon, ambassadors, representatives of the Council of Member States of

IDEA International, members of the advisory boards and distinguished guests. I would like to thank

A very warm welcome to all of you to this event on artificial intelligence and democracy,

the last of those made in this series.

For those of you who are present in Stockholm, it is a real pleasure to welcome you here,

at our headquarters. We also welcome a significant number of attendees who

are connected via the Internet.

My name is Kevin Casas-Zamora, Secretary General of IDEA International. As

As many of you know, it is an organization with 34 member states and has the mandate to

support democracy worldwide.

We have been honoured to have our headquarters here in Sweden since we were founded.

our institute, almost thirty years ago. In addition, we have offices all over the world

and, in different modalities, we work in more than sixty countries with different counterparts.

Our work combines the production of knowledge with capacity development, promotion

of dialogues and policy promotion.

IDEA International has been working especially on digital issues for many years,

from digital oversight of digital finance to codes of conduct for campaigns in

line. However, we recently launched a new stream of work, more

specifically focused on the impacts, risks and opportunities created by digitalization

for democracies. In this context, the growing influence of AI –artificial intelligence–,

As you might expect, it is of utmost importance.

In the remainder of my comments for today, I want to give you an overview of

how we view artificial intelligence and its intersection with our mandate and democracy.

Let me start with a brief anecdote.

When I was preparing this event, I asked ChatGPT for some famous quotes from

democracy and very quickly gave me ten, many of which were very wise.

that I can express, they were all said by real people. Now, here's the thing, of the

Of the ten people they cited, eight were Americans, nine were men, and all ten were from around the world.

Western. I do not take this as evidence that there is some kind of conspiracy with evil

intentions in the program, but ChatGPT and other large language models reflect

the internet and its human users, including their biases.

This anecdote does indeed highlight broader issues about what perspectives are being held.

prioritize in public discourse, but if we want to have a more democratic society

and more inclusive we cannot rely on prejudices in the name of technological experience.

This ability to keep something limited, whether intentional or not, is one of the challenges that

raises artificial intelligence for democracy.

The rise of artificial intelligence can also promote misinformation,

especially online, and disrupt the power between individuals, corporations and governments,

fundamentally, in what has to do with privacy issues. However, the same

Technology has the potential to improve and revitalize democracy. Digitalization diminishes

costs by creating new arenas for citizen engagement and improving sources

of information, and artificial intelligence is a fundamental part. To offer them simply

Some examples from a continent, companies in Ghana, Nigeria and Kenya are leveraging the

artificial intelligence to engage voters and make registration and registration easier for them;

They can also enable people to inform themselves and exercise their democratic rights.

Therefore, we need to discuss how to mitigate the risks involved in

artificial intelligence, as we explore and exploit the opportunities for democracy.

The time to have this discussion is now because many of the rules that are going to be

governing artificial intelligence are being decided at this very moment. The European Union

The European Union is finalising the regulation that will establish the legal framework for intelligence

artificial in Europe. The United States has just issued its first executive presidential order on

artificial intelligence and at the Artificial Intelligence Security Summit organized by the

United Kingdom, twenty-eight countries, from all continents, committed to work on

research and governance of artificial intelligence. The Council of Europe is working

in a framework convention; the United Nations is putting together a high-level advisory group, and the list

It goes on and on. We have to ensure that democracy is part of this global conversation.

and IDEA International is well placed to help lead this effort.

Our areas of knowledge, all of them, will be altered by the adoption of the

artificial intelligence. In that sense, all aspects of our work will be seen

influenced and our institute has to encourage and facilitate dialogue on this topic. That is what I

brings us back to today's topic. This session features an excellent panel that includes perspectives

government and the private sector. This diversity is essential because effective management of the

Artificial intelligence will require contributions from government, business and society

civil.

I am certainly very excited about the expanded digitalization work that we are doing.

It will allow us to work with very diverse actors and have common ground for the future of the

democracy and humanity, which is a fundamental aspect.

Today's event is part of that collaboration and to guide us in producing this discussion.

We are lucky to have Alberto Fernández, a benchmark in digitalization programs and

democracy.

Again I must say that it is wonderful to have you all here today and I am looking forward to

Let this discussion begin, it will give us a lot to think about.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-Thank you, Kevin Casas-Zamora.

I am Alberto Fernández, head of Digitalization in Democracy and today I will be

moderating this panel.

I always have mixed feelings when we talk about artificial intelligence.

I'm impressed by the technology; it's amazing. I think everyone is impressed with ChatGPT and I

I love this new trend where everyone is asking you to create something, as if you were

cooking a pizza, adding different ingredients to it; it's clearly mind-blowing.

Technology is amazing because it can help doctors detect cancers earlier than they are expected to.

long ago; it can give us the ability to better understand the data and, in addition, it

It shows the vulnerabilities of society. Some of the fundamental problems that

we have in our democratic societies is that the moment we receive the technology

and we have access to generative artificial intelligence we can be susceptible to manipulation.

(The connection is momentarily interrupted.)

– Again I would like to emphasize that we have heard about self-regulation and I think that

Companies that work primarily on the subject of human rights consider it very important.

important as a guiding principle, but we cannot simply rely on that. What

We have seen in recent years with social media is that we have been asking –for

Please! – give us information on how the system works and we are just getting started

receiving now, despite all that we have insisted on. I think we do not have to make the same mistake again.

that error, that we must push to increase transparency about how the development is carried out

artificial intelligence, as well as ensuring that we have regulations that require

access not only by governments but also by the affected civil society.

For me, the other big lesson from working with artificial intelligence is that we have to

ensure diversity properly when drafting regulations. We work

from the beginning in a very broad coalition, broader than in other coalitions.

For example, we have been working with migrant rights organizations and

minorities and that has allowed us to generalize the issues of the different groups in a way that

to be able to include them. That is just one example of one of the aspects that must be taken into account.

account.

Another aspect is the recognition of emotions and there are those who say that it is extremely important.

importance. What we did – because we were working with Europe – was to ask if there was

any member of any organization that represented autistic people and there was. We need to see the

people who have a different sensitivity, a different emotional impact. In that sense,

we also have to include them. That was very interesting for us and showed the value of

raise the bar. That also changes our position a bit on this. Those are the

most important aspects.

The last thing I want to say is that we have to be bold. Not all innovation is

good simply because it is innovation. Regulation has to try to encourage

certain advances and no longer promote others. We have to know what we want and what

No, and do not blindly dive into technological changes because some may have

very negative impacts.

Thank you so much.

MR. JATO (According to the interpreter's version).-I want to ask some questions, continue with

This issue of the role of regulation, above all, in the fact of defending rights

digital. How can they be protected when we are talking about the development of intelligence?

artificial at the international level?

Let me come back to the issue of regulation and regulation. We want,

Indeed, we regulate technologies and we have to find a balance between innovation and

regulation. That is a key issue and it is not easy to address. I have a background of people

working, for example, on disarmament. I keep wondering if we can have a framework

effective regulatory framework that, ultimately, is not really global, because one will always have that

problem of people or countries that are not part of a regulatory framework and that manage to

develop technologies that are not considered good, that are not considered correct in others

systems, which in turn will give the possibility of creating an imbalance in the system. We run

that risk. I think that maybe that is one of the most important challenges. Eventually

We could move from regulation at the European Union level to a global level. This is about

an area where I hope we can play an important role.

Then, as I was saying, I want to return to the issue of capacity building, which I consider to be

key and I think the Swedish Government can play an important role. We are currently

looking at how we can use our development cooperation in such a way that

allows us to promote digital resilience and also digital rights; both have a

technical perspective, but also a rights perspective, and I think that is fundamental.

MRS. ÖVREBY (According to the interpreter's version)).-I would like to ask a question.

Basically, your job is to build a bridge between governments, businesses and the

business management, in all of which you see that kind of thing constantly. So, I feel

curiosity about how governments and businesses can work together to ensure

that these advances are beneficial for democracy and politics. How would you like them to be?

What would you like to see from governments? What would you like governments to do?

will they hear from you?

Thank you so much.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-I think the president of our

organization visited Sweden and also many other organizations, including the one in Brussels,

highlighting the significance it has and how important it is to be responsible and, at the same time, bold.

with these technologies. Why daring? Because of the enormous contributions that these technologies can make.

technologies and the possibility of making the most of the available information: mitigating the

climate change, advancing medicine, in its practice, but also reducing the burdens

administrative and increasing our general knowledge. So in these things we have

We have to be bold. On the other hand, we have the responsibility of what we have to do.

as a company, our individual practice; we have to see what we can do as a sector and

how we can work in our sectors to do things right.

Last but not least, there is the cooperation that we have to

develop together with regulators. In other words, artificial intelligence is too

important enough not to regulate it, and I think you share this idea. At this moment

There are many discussions in Brussels about this. So what do we do in this area? I think

We want to be a good partner with civil society organisations and governments,

building capacity around this technology and how to work with it as a business

individual.

At the same time, I fully agree that we have to work with the Union.

European and with the United States, but we must also work globally.

The summit was criticized in advance for inviting China, but I consider

that it is really important to have a potential adversary at the table, talking about these issues.

So what we want to do is make sure that we harness the full potential for the

progress and see how we can adopt artificial intelligence to improve productivity

as a fundamental value. Therefore, we must have regulatory frameworks, because we have to

make sure that the workforce benefits, as this is another very difficult area, as

we mentioned.

In Sweden we are very proud because in the economic transition we were not

protectors of industries but of workers; we see that we can help with the

product development, but we also have to see that we can protect people. That is

a key area. We want to promote responsibility and reduce the risks of bad

use and that is why we must have governance and address things from multiple stakeholders.

We need to look at what discussions we need to have, what research to do, what benefits and

risks to consider and, as a result of the dialogues that arise, we are always trying to

be partners for the above-mentioned aspects.

Last but not least, we need to make sure we improve security.

global. Let us prevent negative actors from taking advantage of this available information.

We must work with our technical, commercial and political partners to reduce to a minimum

the potential for misuse. We have developed a secure AI framework and this is

an example of how we try to look at different aspects of cybersecurity, which

involves the use of artificial intelligence. We have also worked on the aspects of

governance and public-private partnerships to address these issues.

Thank you.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-I am new to this field, but I have been

I have been doing this work for two and a half months now and I am absolutely fascinated by the

role that industry sectors play. For example, if you look at Ukraine, its cyber defense

It is largely managed by companies like Google and Microsoft; not by the governments that

Yes, they are, but the assets that the cybersecurity industry provides are crucial to the

cyber defense and that is something new, that is to say that the private sector is helping to defend another

country that is being attacked.

On the other hand, ten, twenty, thirty or forty years ago all the innovations

fundamental, basically –in one way or another–, were sponsored or organized by the

States. There were state universities, and the Manhattan Project is perhaps the example

most important of this. Today, innovations are made by private companies, without

interference, without help and without funds from the States. I think that we, who represent the

Governments, these two examples show us that it is impossible to do without cooperation with the

sector, whether we like it or not. We cannot do without this cooperation. I think Google knows very well

well how to be a political actor and what can be achieved with cyber attacks from countries.

geopolitical aspect is very important.

Every time we talk about geopolitics we must also talk about the use of technologies

digital technologies by authoritarian countries. We could think, for example, of doctors who

They detect cancer earlier, but there are many authoritarian countries where the only thing they do is

What they think about is how to increase their power and deepen their authoritarian capacity. Intelligence

artificial can have this negative effect and lead to many consequences for development and

governance.

I would like to ask Stefanie Harter if she thinks that the international community, which supports

sustainable development, is ready for these challenges.

What should we do and think to ensure that artificial intelligence does not end up

in a crackdown that undoes all the amazing work that certain people are doing

agencies to improve governance and human rights? How can we leverage

that?

I know it's not an easy question, but I would say it applies to our countries equally. I think What needs to be done is to teach, raise awareness, improve transparency in the schools, invest in training in technology and ethics from a very early age, because Children or young people who spread content unwittingly promote misinformation, without even knowing it. So, this issue is very important and we need to act; I have talked about it with specialists who maintain that we do not help if we label something as disinformation that we detect as information, because people want to believe. So we have to teach ethics to ensure freedom of expression, but also to ensure that democracies do not suffer. Obviously, people talk about autocracies trying to undermine democratic countries, but sometimes they fall on fertile ground. So it is not the technology itself that undermines the confidence in the system, but it is the system that has to become resilient. Of course, Democracies cannot engage in counter-propaganda, but they can invest in the media independent and enlighten all citizens, and that is important.

Finally, I want to say that I am glad to have access here and that we have managed to establish this as a non-governmental force with influence, because when We want to have a multi-stakeholder approach, we face private actors and with very powerful companies. So, in my opinion, it is equally important to create economic incentives to use good artificial intelligence, to see what can be done to change the social media model and to verify and regulate the sale of information and training data. I find that task a little difficult with monopolies; as They mentioned, private companies are involved in wars and when I think that Starlink is the only satellite system that can guarantee data transmission, I am concerned about it little –to be honest–, because I would prefer that it were not only private companies that

guarantee that peace can be achieved, eventually. Why do I say this? Because the

autocracies – in my opinion this is the most crucial point – have access to a huge amount of data already

the corresponding tools that in the long run allow them to further stabilize their power. Even,

That is their dilemma, because since they don't have elections, they never really find out or want to know.

what the population wants and what they should do to avoid a revolution; for that reason, in the

In the past they had to rely on polls. Now China, for example, has a huge database

of data and has the tools to know well how to handle the

political spheres of commercial companies, and that gives them an advantage, in addition to the fact that it goes

determining what will happen in the long run. I think that, even in our countries – and this is also true

applies to partner countries – at some point voters will realise that the

Politicians rely on artificial intelligence to design their programs according to data

available and the results they have received through surveys and polls. Then,

They are going to be delegitimized because, who can a citizen believe when he thinks that he is a

machine that has been creating a program? So these are developments that for me are

important and what needs to be done is to raise awareness and teach people how to differentiate and,

ultimately also see where the values   are.

Let me say one last thing about the regulations, because I felt a little

I am intrigued by what you said, Mr. Ambassador, about the regulation of the United States level.

on a global level. I think that's the problem, because we're not fighting technologies against

technologies, but with technology there is always a system of values   and a vision of the

world that is exported and that is attached. The more countries, such as China and India, develop their

own technologies, obviously they are going to have their own ideas of what they want

transport.

I guess in the future we will really have to be ready and prepared, whether for

find compromise solutions or to defend our own system because, like you

He also said that governments have to rely on advice from companies and

organizations like Access Now to formulate good policy, since it is impossible

regulate the use of technology in its entirety and, in reality, that is not what it is either.

we want.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-Thank you very much, I think this

it is very interesting.

I wanted to ask you all a question and I'm also going to propose something difficult to you,

but they can answer in a minute.

There is apparently an urgent need to have regulations or principles that

work globally, global recommendations, a global agreement. To us, who

We work with artificial intelligence policies, every week they tell us – that is, the thing

never stops –: "This is the most important thing for the framework agreement of one thing or another." Without

However, when one wants to have an international agreement or framework, in fact, one must

to ensure that artificial intelligence does not harm democracy. I am not even talking about

strengthen it, but at least it should not harm democracy or human rights.

Is it possible? Can we do it with the current geopolitical scenario? Because we have a

imbalance if we want to fight for democratic rights. Is it possible? And if not, can we

achieve coherence between ongoing processes?

I'll give you one minute and the answers are voluntary.

What are we trying to regulate? When we want to regulate intelligence

artificial we try to cover something that is very broad, and with the regulations that simply

is based on technology, issues will not be resolved, because artificial intelligence is something

that enables many trends. An example of that is surveillance: we have seen the proliferation

from the use of *spyware*, biometric surveillance. Artificial intelligence is enabling this

evolution to increasingly monitor the population not only by the Government, but also by the

private sector. So regulating artificial intelligence is not going to solve that problem and therefore

so much is something to contemplate.

In the negotiations of the Council of Europe, for example, there is a big issue with the

cybersecurity by governments, which is not going to disappear, although it may do so, but

not because we regulate the issue of artificial intelligence. In terms of the

harmonization, I think it is misleading, and the great risk we face in having agreements

global or world-wide is that when things are made global enough, then they

things start to slip out of our hands. So, if we try to set the bar

too high, we may not achieve it.

There is a level below legally binding regulations. Probably

These rules may not be as effective as full-fledged regulations, but I think that

We continue to have an important value for the fact of including them, directing the activities of

those countries and stigmatize those who do not comply with them. At the level of standards, I believe that

There is the possibility of making some progress, at least. I think it is worth exploring everything.

this topic. We all have ICT standards at the United Nations and they can be expanded.

We also have international standards such as the human rights convention, that is, it is not

that things disappear because technology appears.

MRS. HARTER (According to the interpreter's version).-Can I add something?

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-Yeah.

MRS. HARTER (According to the interpreter's version).-I think that, ultimately, when one

There are rules too, please ensure that those who must enforce them,

have the ability, are well paid, are diverse and efficient with high performance in their

work, and that ultimately they know how to differentiate what is worth defending, because we have to

reconsider again. This applies to us too, as well as to other countries that are

willing to join a community that wants to regulate, but I think that is important and I have

been working for an organization that was the victim of a *fake* deep. Suddenly one

He sees his colleagues on the Russian news with totally distorted messages, and when I look

What is happening there I do not see in the near, foreseeable future, that Russia will be a country that is

willing to collaborate. So, we have to make sure that our people are good and know how to

why are they regulating.

MRS. ÖVREBY (According to the interpreter's version).-I think we have a very good point.

relevant: one cannot choose to export a value for technology and make it the only one.

We always try to have a better dialogue, at least between the United Nations and

United States and have good discussions in what we see as many areas of values.

to defend, value systems that we can work on to identify a standard for great

part of the world. I also agree with the previous speaker on the fact that having a

A global agreement is not so likely in the short term, but at least we can take some steps

and work over time towards achieving that, maintaining conversations with other parts of the

world and, of course, include other countries in the practice. That means that we are going to build and

to develop our technology around the world, so we have to make sure we have,

for example in Nigeria, large offices as well as in India. That is to say that we have to

make sure that the technology we build for people works for everyone

people. I think if democracies came together it would be a huge step in the right direction. I

I represent an intergovernmental organization of democracies and I see that this is very

important.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-We have about fifteen

minutes for questions from the public. I would encourage that time to be taken advantage of, that they be

specific and, if you want to direct the question to someone in particular, we ask that you do so

Please specify, so we give the floor to whoever is responsible.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-Thank you. This has been wonderful, I have

I've learned a lot and I want to look at this from a different angle. I'm going to refer to one thing

that was said a little in passing – Andrés Jato mentioned it – and I hate to say that I'm going to be a little

upset with some of our guests, but that is not my intention.

Let's look at the issue of regulating artificial intelligence for a second and imagine the

best of all worlds, where we could regulate things in such a way that maximizes

the potential good and minimize the bad. The development of artificial intelligence as a

Technology demands such resources that in practice it is concentrating power in very few

corporate actors, who have an impressive power over all of us and that in itself is

enemy of democracy, who deep down seeks to disperse and diffuse power.

I think this raises very uncomfortable questions about antitrust policies in terms of

make sure that the square operates in what has to do with artificial intelligence and, even, is

– this is where things get really annoying – the question of nationalization of the

assets, because the best analogy I can think of, in terms of their power, is as if the

nuclear energy would have been developed by private actors, which was not the case. So how

We deal with the fact that developing artificial intelligence has the potential to harm the democracy concentrating power, giving strength and power to unaccountable actors?

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-We can take, perhaps, a couple of more questions, but I have an online question that I'm going to read, and it's asked on behalf of the Government of Uruguay's futures committee. It reads as follows: "Today we are gathered in extraordinary session to participate in this event and we want to ask how they think they should position parliaments in the face of developments in the context of artificial intelligence and its imminent progress».

Maybe we can take a couple more questions.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-My question is for Sara Övreby and Daniel Leufer: We all have, as consumers, a digital footprint. I am speaking as an activist of human rights and democracy, in a country that is not to be called an autocracy, but yes authoritarian. I am from Türkiye and that is what I am thinking about. If I wanted to erase my footprint digital to have a kind of digital passport, how would that be possible? For example, I made speeches here, while I was being persecuted in Türkiye. Then, when I traveled to Türkiye, I had to ask the associations that put my speeches on Youtube to remove them so that I can travel safely to that country. I wonder, then, how can one have a digital identity? protected.

Thank you.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-Artificial intelligence is advancing quickly. Something that is AGI – artificial general intelligence – would supposedly have to take the best decisions like self-driving vehicles.

Google is going to launch Gemini in 2024, and OpenAI is working on it. I wonder if

That has something to do with the best policies, how they are made and whether, potentially, they could

affect democracy in general.

Thank you.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-We already have four questions. I don't know.

feel obliged to answer them all, but perhaps Sara Övreby can answer

some.

MRS. ÖVREBY (According to the interpreter's version).-As for antitrust and

concentration of power, there are many regulations. There are precedents in the United States, and in

Europe too, on this subject and I think that it will be concluded on this matter. It has been

working on it.

The law on digital markets, for example, is a way of trying to define and

to ensure that companies do not exercise a... – let's see, how can I put it – that they have

too much power in a particular market. Maybe there are people who can speak with more

ownership over this.

As for having a new digital identity – it is difficult to speak about everyone – in the

practical, if one wants to delete Google, one can export all data from all services

from Google My Account –My Google Account– to delete all traces of all the

services. At least in Europe you can apply the law of the right to be forgotten to erase

our traces on the internet, depending on which service you request to be used

delete, and they have the right to do it for you.

Regarding the role of parliamentarians – it seems to me that it was Uruguay that

he asked – and of the politicians, I think that, really, it is extremely important. There is nothing that

We would like more, like Google and many other companies that work with politicians to

to establish regulations in different areas, to make things move forward. We are interested in the

politicians want to learn, to be interested and to want to understand why, as a company,

My role is to explain what we do and how we see it. In turn, the role of politicians is to take into account

It takes into account our perspective, but also that of all the other actors. That is to say, the role of the

parliamentarians is absolutely important. In Sweden I try to encourage this dialogue.

AN ASSISTANT (According to the interpreter's version).-I'm not sure I understood the

question about whether it was AGI, that is, Generative Artificial Intelligence. The product of

Google is an experiment we did. We call it an "experiment" because we want to have

be very careful with the products we launch. It is also a model with a lesser language,

smaller. We want to avoid unintended consequences. I don't know exactly what date,

But you will surely find out when it comes out.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-Does anyone else want to receive any?

question? Do you have anything to say about any of those questions?

I want to make a brief comment on the concentration of power as

consequence of the development of these technologies in a slightly different angle than that which was given

on the specific question.

We haven't talked about it yet, but it's something that's potentially linked to the

democracy and with the development of democratic discourse in the future. What will happen if the

Automation, supported by generative artificial intelligence, will completely change the

labour market, in the sense that low-skilled or even skilled workers

media be replaced by robots or basically by automation? One can see a

potential scenario in which countries that are already developed with a technological sector

strong would continue to employ engineers and everything related to the sector, while in other parts

of the world – potentially, it does not mean that it will happen, but it can happen – will be recorded

a high unemployment rate, because they will not need workers. So one can see

a concentration of power, a displacement of power or a reinforcement of the inequities that already exist

They exist as a potential scenario. There is a lot of discussion about this, but it is not impossible,

Well, one can see, at least, the trends. I think this is going to have a very significant impact.

important in democracies between and within countries.

Perhaps all this is worth another discussion.

MR. JATO (According to the interpreter's version).-I would like to say something about the monopoly because,

In fact, I had it in my notes.

Regarding facial recognition, I want to point out that these are technologies that are

export, too. Technologies create dependency and have costs involved. What

We can see that if there are non-democratic countries that sell and export these technologies to

Other partners are implementing quite strong links. I would also agree with

that this reinforces the monopoly situation, which I find dangerous.

On the other hand, I would say that the barriers to entry into the market are also quite high.

I understand that Google seeks cooperation with parliamentarians and politicians, but

At the same time, there are other entities also involved that find it difficult to access them,

so they resort to an alternative use to how the market should be regulated. I warn a little

the danger of a self-perpetuating system, as there is a collision between the large monopolies

and those countries that can afford to have the technology. Inequalities will grow,

Not only in the labor market, but also among rich countries that can afford the

development of this type of technology, and other countries that cannot afford that luxury.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-I agree with much of what

that was said.

As for the concentration of power, it seems to me that it is one of the most important issues.

important at this time, as we are at a crossroads in terms of open source and

how to make all these models work. There is a whole topic here in terms of negotiation

artificial intelligence. You may know that there are a couple of *startups* European – one in France and

another in Germany – who were doing open source artificial intelligence, while

Discussions in the United States – such as the Google company – fundamentally tend to

warn against its use. For example, regarding access to ChatGPT, it was considered to do so through

of an API, to have better control over its use. There are serious dangers in both approaches, but

I would rather take the risk of open source than reinforce existing monopolies that have

been accumulating in recent years. This is something that the parliamentarians have already mentioned, but

There are all these trends, as Stefanie Harter said. One of them is the cloud. If you

They integrate, for example, generative artificial intelligence into their governments, they are clients of *cloud*

computing. Amazon invested a lot, a huge amount, in the cloud. You have to see the type

of pressure that exists for the adoption of artificial intelligence, holistically. Who is the

owner of cloud computing? Who is going to benefit economically or

financially with that? There are companies that criticize the approach; some blame others.

There are those who use open source; there are others who criticize it saying that it promotes

proliferation of crimes linked to child pornography and the abuse of women. That is,

I repeat, some blame others. So, we must define the values   that are integrated

in each system and we see that we have to start controlling the content of the networks

social. We will continue to discuss that.

Thank you so much.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-We ran out of time, but

I still have a very simple question or I ask the four of you for a very simple answer

Panelists. You may answer with one word.

In five years, do you think our opinion of artificial intelligence will be more

positive or more negative than now?

MRS. HARTER (According to the interpreter's version).-I had the microphone off;

What I said is complicated.

MR. LEUFER (According to the interpreter's version).-I think it's going to be like with the networks

Social: Initially it will be positive, but things will sour a bit in the following years.

MR. JATO (According to the interpreter's version).-I'm afraid I would answer more or less the same,

But I was born an optimist. I hope I have learned from the topic of social networks.

MR. FERNÁNDEZ (According to the interpreter's version).-I would like to thank Stefanie Harter,

Andrés Jato, Daniel Leufer and Sara Övreby for their contributions, for their perspective and I thank

all of you for attending this event.

Thanks a lot.

We conclude the meeting.

(It is 2:12 p.m.)