



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SECRETARIAT
GENERAL DIRECTION

XLIXth Legislature
Fourth Period

SPECIAL COMMISSION FOR FUTURES

File

S/C

Distributed:**95/2023**

May 25, 2023

II WORLD SUMMIT OF FUTURES COMMISSIONS

Shorthand version of the day's session
May 25, 2023

ATTENDANCE

- reside : Mr. Legislator Rodrigo Goñi Reyes (President)
- members : Ladies Legislators Veronica Mato, Gloria Rodriguez and Carmen Sanguinetti Masjuan; and gentlemen Legislators Sebastian Cal, Gustavo Olmos, Martin Melazzi and Alvaro Viviano
- Guests : Mrs. Lydia Garrido (UNESCO), Mr. Ambassador Alejandro Garofali from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mrs. Maria Gracia Delgado and Mr. Gabriel Botino (UNDP)
- secretaries : Mr. Vladimir De Bellis Martinez and Mrs. Maria Elena Moran
- secretary : Mrs. Joseline Rattaro

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Meeting on May 25, 2023)

MR. PRESIDENT (Rodrigo Goñi Reyes).-If there is a quorum, the session is open.

(It is 2:07 p.m.)

— — The Board informs that the President of the General Assembly, Beatriz Argimón, in addition to having other activities, informed us that she was very interested in participating in this meeting, which has as its main objective the organization of the World Summit of Future Commissions which, as you know, is the responsibility of the Uruguayan Parliament, and today we are exactly four months away from its realization.

We have delivered two working documents to the legislators. One is called *Second World Summit of the Committees of the Futures* in Uruguay. Although the title is in English, the document is also in Spanish, and contains a summary of the key issues related to the event.

In the other document, which is called *Parliaments bring the future into the present* -It is a draft, like all the ones we have so far - it develops, in the form of a proposal, the specific agenda for the two days of the Summit.

You all have, for some time now, what is called a "concept note" -*concept note*-. It is available in three languages, Spanish, English and French, and we have already disseminated it throughout the world. All the delegations of the Parliament that have an instance with other parliaments have been given this document. *concept note*, which contains the title; the objective; the invitation from the President of the General Assembly; the thematic axis - as you know, it is the democracy of the future in the present reflection and action - and everything that a General Assembly should have. *concept note*. Of course, we continue to handle it as a draft, fundamentally, because we lack the approval -and in some way, the complementation- of the IPU (*Inter-Parliamentary Union*) which, as you know, proposed that we co-organize the Summit, and we accepted. Therefore, if you look at the concept note, you will see that where it says "Organizers", it says "Parliament of Uruguay" and "Interparliamentary Union".

We also bring for consideration today - in more detail and as a draft proposal - another document containing a proposed agenda, with the presentations and the *workshop* which will take place between the 25th and the 27th, starting on the 25th, in the evening, with the presence of the President of the Republic and other high authorities of international organizations. In principle, everyone is invited, but the only presence that is confirmed is that of the President of the Republic, who will make a *speech* and will welcome you; this will be, approximately, at 6:00 p.m. on Monday 25th.

The presence of the president of the IPU and its general secretary has also been confirmed. They will also make the speech that day. *speech* initial welcome. It would be great if we had the opportunity to be joined by Achim Steiner from the UNDP and some senior UN officials.

- in addition to the president of the General Assembly:- the first day would be

basically in charge of them; the welcome cocktail and the opening of the event will take place there.

Today, Mrs. Lydia Garrido will make a very brief presentation, because we have half an hour or forty minutes, since we have to make *an impasse* because some legislators must leave to receive a Swiss delegation. In any case, with those who can stay, we can develop and discuss the proposed agenda, since we do not have much more time to close and define it, especially because each of the blocks has identified speakers and panelists and, since the vast majority are from abroad, we must confirm their invitation, with all that implies financing, etc. Therefore, it would be convenient if today we could come out with an idea about this proposed agenda, which is designed by Lydia Garrido, in consultation with Finland and with the IPU -for now, by letter-, which has so far given us the go-ahead for everything.

Referring to the first page of the material, which includes the list of topics, it is worth remembering that the event we are going to hold is the continuation of the one that took place in Helsinki, so it would be the *Second World Summit*, Continuing the first *summit* which was carried out in Finland. We are doing nothing but continuing with what was done; furthermore, that was our agreement and mandate in that declaration of the thirteen countries. Therefore, we are coordinating with the Finnish Parliament. Precisely, with Deputy Olmos we had a very good meeting with the new authorities of the Finnish Futures Committee; they changed their president, therefore, we had to reconnect.

We would also like to remind you - this is in point 1C - that we are co-organising this event with the IPU, so we are not going to do it at our whim, but in coordination.

The second point refers to the structure and design of the *summit*-We are now going to move on to the proposal designed by Ms. Lydia Garrido, to the concept note - which has been circulated by all of us for some time now - and to the identification of experts and speakers. In this regard, we have about ten or twelve experts, not only identified, but also contacted to find out their availability; that is what we have to define.

The third point has to do with the organization and coordination group.
- As we agreed last week, we must have a group that meets every week - which would be made up of the President of the General Assembly; the President of the Chamber of Deputies; the members of the CEF - Nane, Sanguinetti, Olmos, Cal and myself -; Mrs. Lydia Garrido; Ambassador Garofali; Mrs. Carina Galvarisi, who is coordinating with IPU, and a representative of the UNDP: they will tell us later who it will be. As I said, this group should meet weekly, at least.

As for activities and the schedule, I must say that one of the most urgent tasks - we will have to do this during the first half of June - is sending invitations to all the parliaments of the world: that is what we agreed on. In this, of course, we will count on the great help of the IPU.

We also have to hire the organizing agency; if the president comes, I hope she will inform us about how that process is going. We are quite behind in defining hotels and places for dinners, and in confirming experts and speakers because, four months before the event, either we say yes to them or we release them.

Another important issue that we must define today has to do with the formation of a group of facilitators. We are going to have many *workshops* During those two days of *summit*-- between fifteen and twenty; therefore, facilitators are needed who are capable of carrying out this task. Please note that they will have to be trained and worked with on the various issues and, of course, there is also the language issue: since we cannot do the same, *workshops* With translation, we will do some in English and others in Spanish.

Regarding the definition of the places for the activities of the *summit*, for now we are managing the events room and other rooms of the Legislative Palace.

Finally, I would like to refer to the not insignificant issue of funding. Naturally, we are talking about a very significant figure. Parliament has already decided to make a contribution, but it will be based on what is achieved through the cooperation of other funders, collaborators and partners, including the IPU (Inter-Parliamentary Union), the European Union, the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), the World Bank. In addition, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, the IDB and the CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento) have announced their interest in participating and, of course, in collaborating.

If there are no questions, we would ask Lydia Garrido to give us an overview of the proposed agenda for the two and a half days of *summit*, with the topics and titles, and then go into point by point.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-Good afternoon.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

I want to put into context the privilege and responsibility that it means for Uruguay, for Parliament, to have the opportunity to organize this second world summit, and that Finland has passed the baton - so to speak - when I understand that those who participated in the first summit played a major role. There were many interested commissions in Latin America - for example, from Chile - and there was total agreement that Uruguay should do it.

In addition to the privilege and responsibility, I believe that it is an opportunity for the moment in which we find ourselves, in which it is imperative to make visible the importance of using the future in the present in the face of the great challenges we are facing.

This process was leading to the articulating axis of all the conversations under the great title of *The democracy of the future [...]*. Deputies Olmos and Goñi also presented the topic in Lithuania and in that presentation there is an interesting argument about why this topic exists in the context of what has been the rapid spread of various technologies, including artificial intelligence, which provokes and questions many issues that have to do with the most basic of our

humanity around this great theme, but not exclusively, but rather seeking to make visible the relationships with multiple problems involved.

I am going to speak from the more technical point of view of the process that is being sought with this summit. There is another challenge that overlaps with the above, that of the methodological design, which is in a dual format: on the one hand, the traditional exposition panels in which a certain agility in the presentations is sought, with active moderation and, on the other, generating inputs from these panels in order to, in the next instance, move on to the format of *workshop*, workshop, in which tables of seven, eight or ten people would be set up -this will depend on the specific design that is made- so that they can interact, exchange experiences and generate knowledge collectively. These instances of *workshop* They would conclude with a plenary session, in which what has been discussed at each of the tables would be presented. This is where Deputy Goñi came from regarding the importance of having a facilitation team that is previously trained.

In this sense, as part of this support, the School of Government is offering a course on using the future in the present, anticipatory capacities and skills. This morning I asked if there was interest in being part of this support team, and more than half said yes, they want to be there. The idea is to have national, local, and international support. We would do this online, remotely.

Another aspect that I find interesting is that this allows us to generate certain endogenous capacities and competencies, one of the main focuses of this design, which is to aim that from this experience - not only from those two and a half days, but from this entire process - we are left with capacities and competencies in the use of the future, that is, how to contextualize the problems we have, not only looking at what comes from behind or how they have arrived to today, but also what the future is giving us as information, based on three main issues: people, knowledge and processes as a large format of collective intelligence. Hence, the design proposal has a great emphasis on interaction.

So with that *in mind*, On the first day, in the afternoon, the more formal, welcoming activity would take place, and the other two days would be organized in that format - both in the morning and in the afternoon - with a part of panels and, immediately afterwards, the work in workshops.

For the first day, large titles are suggested to contextualize what would be addressed, also as a way of illustrating the focus, both for the panels and for the works in the *workshops* The idea is to start by making visible the characteristics of the context because what is, in some way, making the difference is precisely this context of complexity, uncertainty, surprise and ambiguity. Let's think about how we came out of Covid; then, there was the Russia-Ukraine war, and now this issue of artificial intelligence, situations of different natures, but which have the same characteristic of being something totally surprising that generates a series of intertwined problems that we find very difficult to address.

So, as a suggestion, in the first panel it is expected that the international organizations that are supporting and participating can

I will make a brief presentation of the main aspects of each of them. You will see that IPU is proposing to place them within the context of a change of era and of the reaction to anticipation. In other words, it is necessary to focus on this paradigmatic leap that we cannot continue making decisions, regulating or whatever after the events have occurred; we need to strengthen the anticipatory aspect.

In the case of the United Nations, the focus is on *Our Common Agenda* and, above all, at the world summit for next year and the global compact. In this regard, I would like to say that the Summit of Parliamentary Futures Committees has a very important meaning because it would be the only one prior to the summit and the activity of the United Nations global compact. The idea is, as a conclusion of this summit, to generate a series of recommendations and to make visible the importance of Parliaments in the world in this matter of the use of the future in the present.

As I said, what is provided for each of the organizations of the international system is by way of example, so that there can be a certain complementarity in the subject matter.

During the first morning, we plan to hold a first part of panels with international organisations - as you can see in the document - and a second part, with parliaments in the form of regional parliaments, as in the case of Latin America and the European Union. We have to define who can do the work for Africa and who for Asia Pacific. The idea is that all the major regions are represented. Here I missed North America.

On the first day - the document says day two, because day one is the inauguration - the focus would be directly on this great concept of anticipatory governance, for its role in better addressing change and strengthening democracy. A series of panelists have been suggested who have to do with this crossover between the area of future studies with decision-makers or government.

On the second day of activities - which is day three - the focus would be on the transition from artificial intelligence as we know it now - which has been technically called narrow artificial intelligence - to general artificial intelligence, which is what we are seeing around ChatGPT and all these other forms of artificial intelligence.

There is indeed a great deal of concern about this issue; I imagine that you are aware of it. This is being discussed at the level of the United States Congress, the European Parliament, networks of specialists in future studies, and academics. Chomsky's position, for example, is very critical of these issues. Daniel Innerarity, who will be one of the guests, has also been talking about this issue for some time. So, it is necessary to reflect on these aspects and take local actions, but coordinated with global actions.

Finally, on the afternoon of day three, we would look at how to bring this down in a more specific way, which could eventually be regulations or start discussions around regulations, the final declaration and the recommendations.

What is expected as a contribution from this instance, which would be something that this II Summit organized by the Parliament of Uruguay would propose, is the creation of a global network of Futures Commissions in Parliaments. Finland initiated the organization of the summits, proposing that importance be given to this. Uruguay would be adding by saying: "Let us act in a collaborative, coordinated, articulated manner."

I remain available for any questions you may have.

MR. PRESIDENT.-Lydia referred to the dual nature, the thematic axes and the presentations, but we would also like to know what the *workshops*, since the presentations every morning and every afternoon have them.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-The subject of the workshops is highly design-intensive. And when I say "highly design-intensive," I mean preparation; it's designing it as a process of collective intelligence.

Much of the content, beyond the titles that appear here, that is, the main topics, will be published at the same time. The idea is that immediately after the panels this interaction can take place working in small groups.

Generally, so that exchanges can take place and everyone can participate, there can be seven, eight or nine members. In this case, it will depend on the number of participants, which will be the number of small groups at tables that will work according to certain instructions, which is part of this previous design that must be carried out. What is set out in this document are headlines - which is not simply choosing any title - that are already thought of as a process that comes from the context, and that goes into the specific question that is of interest regarding anticipatory capacities and competencies, in terms of what this is about bringing the future into present decision-making to a more concrete, more practical, applied level, which could be around regulatory, normative challenges, their interrelations, opportunities that technology may have for some of the problems.

In parallel, we have the substantive issue or the substantive concrete descents with what can be a cross-hybridization, according to the experiences, with the different capacities and competences. I refer to this because delegations will come that already have many years of experience working, using the future; there will be others that have never done it and others that are in an initial or intermediate process, like us. That is also a difference with the summit that Finland organized, which placed the focus on those who already had experience, already had this institutionalized space. Uruguay has made a broader, more plural, more diverse call. What is important is that own capacities are generated - that is why, when I speak of endogenous, I mean own -; not that an expert from outside comes with a manual, a recipe, a step-by-step of what needs to be done, but that these capacities are introduced into the practice of the parliamentarians themselves. For this reason, a more open call is made.

As for the guests, there are several suggested in the document and there would be many more. It is necessary to invite some from Latin America, which would be

It is worth considering that they could be a support - I am referring to professionals in the area of futures studies - to generate this crossover with parliamentarians.

MR. PRESIDENT.-I would like to point out that what is not stated here - and it is important - is that, according to the estimate we have today, there would be a participation of one hundred parliamentarians, which corresponds to about thirty parliaments. The majority of Latin American parliaments have confirmed their presence and participation, as well as Canada, and the United States is in the process. In Europe, there are, at least today, eight or nine parliaments that have confirmed their presence. Work is being done to have three or four parliaments from Africa come and participate, which was one of Uruguay's commitments. As for Asia Pacific, there are many countries that are working very well on this, but there is a question - I hope it is interpreted correctly - of democracy. Naturally, we are focusing on the democracy of the future; that is what the thematic axis is called.

(Taking of the shorthand version is suspended)

— — We are thinking of thirty Parliaments, with more than one hundred parliamentarians. To this we must add approximately fifteen experts from abroad, with all that this implies in terms of logistics and financing. Naturally, there will be a group from the Uruguayan Parliament and Uruguayan experts - and there are some very good ones - that we will integrate into a group of facilitators. For example, the ANII (National Agency for Research and Innovation), among other organizations, has expressed its express and explicit willingness to actively participate, above all, in the logistics of this event with facilitators.

I am a little worried about the timing. Remember that those of us who went to Finland had a commitment to Lithuania not to do a big publicity campaign until its Congress. The Lithuanian Congress was last week, so we have no more excuses. We must finish defining our scheme and confirm the participation of Parliaments, because one thing is to invite and another is to have them come. We have to follow up. We cannot just assume that the IPU is going to invite and have the best good will.

As an additional point, I want to point out that the IPU offered - which is very good information - to inaugurate the regional office for Latin America the day after or before this is going to take place. *summit*. So, we already have the entire IPU board, its main authorities, who are all parliamentarians - from the president down - and there are quite a few of them. The president of the General Assembly, Beatriz Argimón, who is vice-president of IPU, will coordinate the regional office. We are counting on that. But with Deputy Olmos we saw, in Lithuania, that the countries that go do so because they are being monitored, and they have to be contacted twenty times to confirm their presence.

The other difficulty we have is that in July and August there are holidays in northern Europe, and that means that what is not done between now and June 20 for the invitations and the confirmation of experts will be difficult to carry out.

Therefore, if we approve all these points in this document, they must start working as of today. That is the proposal and the reason for the meeting.

The President of the General Assembly was invited, because we are just getting started. We have to get started and start working with what we have.

MR. OLMOS (Gustavo).-I think we are in a risk zone due to the delay we have in this matter, when organizing an event of this nature and with this variety of guests, both panelists and delegations, since it requires a brutal effort.

In Finland they told us that they had started sending out invitations in December for the event in October, that is, ten months before. I think that if we don't pull together all the forces from all sides, in a few days we won't be able to get anywhere. I think it's good news that we're all here and that the ambassador is here as a link with the embassies, which will be an important help.

In this regard, I would like to say that we do not have much time to wax poetic about the proposed agenda and way of working. I think that there is good work done by Ms Lydia Garrido. Unless someone sees something that particularly catches their attention, I would move forward very quickly with this and with the confirmations of the people because, otherwise, we run the risk of not getting there.

On the other hand, there are all the organizational aspects. We must have an event organizing company - which is urgent -, have the hotels where people are going to go, know the rooms we can use. Lydia said that we can have many *workshops*, but that implies having many rooms - eventually, like this one, but many - in which they can be carried out.

We also have to look at the logistics regarding interpreters. We have to see if we can work in the plenary session of the House, which would seem to be the most reasonable option; we have to see where they are placed, what the booths are like; in other words, there are a number of details that urgently need to be addressed.

Therefore, my proposal is that, if there are no major objections - we already had this material, but we can have one more day to review it again - we can move quickly to the confirmations and begin to elaborate what Ms. Lydia Garrido suggested. This requires in-depth work to ensure that those *workshops* be productive and, although it is not in the document, we also have to think about what the final product is.

After we do all this, what is the *output*? What will this event have?

These are issues that I believe require time and thought. This organization and coordination group must begin to act immediately and follow up on all the issues, making an internal distribution of tasks to try to reverse this significant delay that we have.

MR. MELAZZI (Martin).-There is one issue that always worries me in relation to this type of summit - perhaps Lydia can enlighten us a little on this subject - and that is its ending: how do we continue afterwards?

I see that in the comments - this is one of the questions I wanted to ask - it says: "Post-Summit Follow-up". Is it an initiative of the Uruguayan Parliament to start having a post-summit follow-up? Because very interesting topics are discussed, but then it would be good if all the Parliaments that make up this Summit, and those that join year after year, could start to share their knowledge on what they are advancing, not only with respect to what is going to be discussed here in Uruguay, but also what was discussed at the time in Finland. I remember that we discussed about fourteen or fifteen points among which were longevity - more than 99 years -, artificial meat, artificial intelligence, the use and good management of water quality, that is, all those areas in which the Uruguayan Parliament has been advancing, but it can continue to share that knowledge, what it advanced, how it did it, so that, in some way, we can provide feedback. Otherwise, it remains a task that we carry out here, in which we can exchange information, comparative law, etc. with other parliamentarians. That's all well and good, but it would be good if, as all parliaments are making progress on legislative issues, what is discussed at this summit, as at the previous one and the following ones, could be put forward somewhere and we could be enriched. I'm not saying that it is an obligation, but rather a commitment to move forward in that direction.

MR. PRESIDENT.-On page 5, the *workshop*4 we put it with Lydia, as the title of the *workshop*. But in reality - I think we are going to do it like this; you will understand - the Final Declaration and Recommendations has a section at the end, and it would be good to think about where it is going to go; naturally, it must also be done in coordination with the other actors.

Based on what we have been discussing with other parliaments and with the IPU - which is the one that integrates the hundred or so parliaments of the world - the idea is to create a parliamentary and global ecosystem on future areas. If you read the main newspapers in the world today, all of them have on the front page the main representatives of artificial intelligence systems declaring - the United States and the European Union; the main representatives of artificial intelligence systems - the European Union and the United States. *popes* Yes, now we are recognising that artificial intelligence puts democracy and society at risk as we know them, an issue that is becoming an absolutely political matter; political at the micro or macro level; it has ceased to be a business, social, cultural issue, to become a political issue, and the main Congresses of the world are calling for the heads and those responsible for artificial intelligence systems. This necessarily leads all Parliaments to assume the responsibility of integrating permanent schemes to deal with these issues, because they are so complex and global that they require permanent work, and it is not going to be invented by each Parliament. Europe has been saying every day for two years: "Tomorrow we will approve the law on artificial intelligence", and that "tomorrow" has been postponed for two years. Why? Firstly, because it is not easy. Secondly, because every day it presents new challenges. Now, everyone recognises the famous black box; it has ceased to be a paranoia to become a recognised reality. Therefore, I believe that this will be confirmed by the actions of the United Nations General Assembly in 2024.

What the IPU has proposed to us is that this *summit* generate proposals and recommendations to create such a space, both within the IPU and globally.

Yes, Mr. Melazzi, at this point it is absolutely essential to address these issues at the highest level, where Parliaments cannot be absent. That is where we are headed.

With Lydia we did not want to outline the recommendations because theoretically the recommendations will come out of the work of those two days, but they will emerge naturally, and we all know that the recommendations also begin to be worked on in coordination with the other members, at least several weeks before. In Lithuania - the same thing happened in Finland - on the morning of the last day a declaration with recommendations was already being shared, but now it also implies the creation of more permanent spaces.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-Representative Olmos is not present at the moment, but in response to what he said about us being behind, I would like to comment that this progress has been supported, since December, by conversations with IPU and by recommendations they made to us; they gave us suggestions based on what they have also been working on.

The same thing happened during the Futures Congress in Chile in January, in which several deputies and senators participated, as well as the Futures Commission of Finland. We had several meetings in which they even gave us the detailed agenda of the entire organisation process and the subsequent comments. It also feeds on other discussions that are taking place and contacts that we have with the OECD, in specific groups on these topics in governments with the European Parliament.

The Lithuanian Congress also contributed to the entire process that was being developed to obtain the documents that we have.

Finally, we participated in the Parlatino with a module in the proposed course, with a specific space for the topic of futures. There I had the opportunity to speak with the vice president or alternate president, Mr. Rolando González, from Cuba. We had a very interesting and long conversation, in complete harmony and with the willingness of support from Parlatino for this activity and the topic of the future in decision-making. The same occurred with the technical advisor, who was three times president of Parlatino, Mr. Alfredo Jiménez. They were extremely enthusiastic about this initiative of the Uruguay summit.

Also present at these meetings in Panama were the representatives Sebastián Cal, Nicolás Viera and Pablo Viana. The three have been interacting with other parliamentarians from Latin America, and there is really a great interest in the participation and in the subject. I mention this so that we have an idea that there is already a certain degree of interest, work and interaction, all "hung up" in principle, but that can quickly precipitate into something forceful to begin to work on concrete, defined lines of the organization.

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).-I agree that we probably don't have much room to be creative with the proposal, but I want to raise a concern that I had at the time and it seems to me that after a few years of work, if I considered it important back then, it is even more so now. It has to do with how the Future Commission - and what is done by the Future Commission - permeates the work that is done, in our case, in the Uruguayan Parliament, and I believe in all the other Parliaments. Sometimes, one comes face to face with certain realities when one proposes certain issues that, ultimately, have to do with breaking certain boundaries.*status quoor* with the idea that "it has always been done this way." I understand that this is a much more practical, tangible and mundane dimension of the issue, but it seems to me that we in the Futures Commission have a debt there; at least, that is how I understand it.

I'm not necessarily suggesting that this be included as a topic. What I'm saying is that we hear all this, which is super interesting, and we see that the gap with our daily lives is huge.

We therefore need to address these issues. The work period of the Futures Commission is over, and beyond all these issues - which are very interesting and which are obviously essential for the agenda of a futures commission - the other aspects should also be incorporated; that is my view.

Thank you so much.

MR. PRESIDENT.-I think the great challenge - which was raised in the Lithuanian instance - is how to permeate this conception or this anticipatory vision to the rest of the parliamentary action; this is also one of the objectives.

We can continue to think about this; sometimes, objectives have to be written down. They are included in one of the documents. On page 8 of the document we have, at the end, there is a reference to the expected contributions of the Second Summit. There we can be more precise, consolidate and emphasize what Senator Sanguinetti is proposing. What we are looking for is for that to be there. We fully agree that this vision, this new way of legislating, must be ingrained, which does not imply excluding the previous one. What happens is that new times demand a paradigm shift, as we said in Lithuania.

MR. GARÓFALI (Alejandro).-May I?

I apologize, but I have to go.

I appreciate being invited. I am more than available for any discussion that this matter requires. We have been working on it for quite some time now.

MR. PRESIDENT.-The Commission thanks you for your presence.

(Ambassador Alejandro Garófali leaves the room)

— — If we are in a position to approve, at least, the main lines that we have proposed for the *summit*-Assuming that we are all against the clock, so to speak, we would start working.

There are other activities related to the *summit* that will emerge and for which, obviously, we count on all the members of the Commission.

We also have to finish the activity that has to do with the future of work and the work of the future. Senator Gloria Rodríguez was preparing the fifth vector, related to longevity. At some point, we would have to make an effort to develop, in half a day or a day, this very important topic, close this stage and also make the final report on the matter in 2023.

MRS. RODRIGUEZ (Gloria).-We are already working on the topic of the future of work and the work of the future. We are preparing to launch a call for proposals to address the issue of long-lived societies and what is known as the "silver economy".

We agree with the president to organize a half-day or full-day event, to bring together national leaders on the subject. We had thought of inviting the economist Enrique Iglesias - who has the Astur Foundation -, Daniel Rossman - from Tata - and a representative of Endeavor, because the subject he addresses is extremely important. If they agree, we could hold the meeting in July or August. We have that issue pending, but we are prepared to address it.

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).-I understand that Rossman would be invited by the Seniors Foundation, because he is working on that.

We should also invite Ana Castillo, from the Inter-American Development Bank, an expert on this topic who came recently; I don't remember her name, but I promise to pass on the information because she is working in that direction.

MR. PRESIDENT.-I think this would allow us to finish the work that we had pending last year, because we did not have the time.

We have received very good feedback and comments on the first report, which we did in a preliminary form. It was stated there that longevity was a vector of change, but we were not able to work on it.

So, if you don't mind, we can make some time to discuss this matter.

We thank the senator, who was entrusted by the Commission to coordinate and, of course, those who wish to accompany her in order to find a day in July to meet. Without distracting ourselves from the *summit*, this work could perfectly be integrated because, then, comes 2024, which - as we know - is an election year.

(Dialogues)

— — So, the work day would take place in the second half of July.

MR. BOTTINO (Gabriel).-On behalf of UNDP, I would simply like to thank you for the opportunity to share this space, which allows us to keep abreast of how the preparatory actions are developing.

We are available not only for the logistics part, but also for the technical part.

I would also like to inform you that we are beginning to work on a line of work on artificial intelligence - an internal topic - that can feed into any of the tables that Lydia was talking about. This can be analyzed later; you will know how to use it to the best of your knowledge.

On the operational side, as always, we are available to support and accompany you in order to reach a safe conclusion; we are sure that this will be the case.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-Senator Carmen Sanguinetti pointed out something that I think is extremely important.

I would also like to recall what I have already mentioned: that the Parliamentary School of Government is developing a course. From my perspective, it was very interesting. Senators, male and female senators, male and female deputies were enrolled. In the last two months, the course coincided with the discussion of some topics, which were very intense. Consequently, those who share the office, that is, the secretaries, the advisers, continued to participate. This medium level of the dynamic has been very interesting, with specific detours to topics that are of interest and on which deputies, male and female senators are working. This could be a parallel path, another alternative, for this question of using the future to raise problems and make decisions here and now.

This process has been very interesting. We have been through six or seven sessions of the course. There has been a qualitative change, appreciated by them, from day zero until today. So much so that in a quick consultation to see if anyone would be interested in being part of a support team, eleven participants quickly raised their hands and said yes.

So, this could be a path that the Uruguayan Parliament can take, together with the more specific one that is being done in the Futures Commission and in other instances, to generate synergies.

MR. VIVIANO (Álvaro).-It's like volunteering.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-It is a learning volunteering, which they value as interesting.

There are participants who had no idea about artificial intelligence and who are now incorporating it, linking it to different problems and learning how to tackle it. So this can be a path of support.

MR. PRESIDENT.-So if we agree, the last deadline would be next week, because we have to pass the *Concept note* in three languages; this has its cost. I clarify that it has everything: invitations, thematic axes, participants, contributions, objectives, etc. It is eight pages long. Obviously, there is also a letter from the Futures Commission stating what we are inviting people to.

Secondly, I ask you to review the agenda with the proposed topics and titles. We have to start defining, above all, because the experts we are going to bring must have a very specific agenda and, in addition, they have their cost.

We have identified experts who are legitimized; we are not making things up. All the experts listed here have different perspectives. - even ideological ones - but they are focused on serious and professional work. They are experts from different countries, whom we have identified at the summits. All those listed here have told us that they are willing to participate. If anyone comes up with the idea of inviting another expert on the subject, they will be welcome.

Thirdly, we must take into account that starting next week we will have a weekly meeting with the group, open, to start meeting the established deadlines; we are sure that we will be able to achieve this.

Finally, the concept note will be distributed - in English and Spanish - and the final invitation, which will be released tomorrow. *urbi et orbi*, calling everyone.

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned. (It is 3:15 p.m.)

