



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SECRETARIAT
GENERAL DIRECTION

XLIXth Legislature
Fourth Period

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

File

S/C

Distributed: **101/2023**

July 27, 2023

II WORLD SUMMIT OF FUTURES COMMISSIONS

Shorthand version of the day's session
July 27, 2023

ATTENDANCE

reside : Mr. Legislator Rodrigo Goñi

members : Ladies Legislators Graciela Garcia, Gloria Rodriguez and Carmen Sanguinetti; and gentlemen Legislators Felipe Carballo, Martín Melazzi and Ismael Smith

secretary : Mrs. Maria Elena Moran (Secretary) and Mrs. Joseline Rattaro (Deputy Secretary); and Mr. Vladimir De Bellis Martínez (Secretary)

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Meeting on July 27, 2023)

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

(It is 1:30 p.m.)

We would like Lydia to give us an update on the agenda that has been worked on, which we always have in a preliminary stage, to see if we agree on that agenda, if we have observations, we are in time to raise them and there are some issues that we have to define among ourselves as soon as possible.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-I will mention three points and then, as there is interest, we can expand on them.

A comprehensive look at the agenda, that is, how all these preparatory activities of the Summit connect with the Futures Commission and how this contributes to two main concepts that have been worked on by the Futures Commission and that permeate the proposal of the agenda of the Summit. *Summit*, is what it has to do with anticipatory governance and responsible anticipation.

I will now put into words what the agenda would be. It is based on four thematic components.

The first component, which will be worked on on the first day, has to do with entering into the context of change in which we find ourselves. Let us bear in mind that the Summit's proposal is about the democracy of the future in the context of the evolution of artificial intelligence. On that morning, the current context of change will be discussed in three different ways, from different perspectives and practices.

One of them is the first round table and it has to do with international organizations and how this context of change - above all, the issues of artificial intelligence - enters the international agenda. It is a round table made up of representatives of the United Nations, UNDP, UNESCO, OAS and various organizations that have also been accompanying the *Summit*. We have given it the title "Embracing complexity, uncertainty, surprise and ambiguity for a better world."

The second roundtable - I am still referring to the first component, that is, the morning of Tuesday 26th - has to do with the challenges in parliamentary work for a context that requires giving that entry to change, to the future. This will be in charge of representatives of IPU, the Inter-Parliamentary Union; of Parlatino; of the European Parliament; of the African Parliament, and of the Asia Pacific Parliament. That is, depending on the characteristics of each region, bringing the needs of the parliaments in terms of the future.

The third round table will consist of inviting representatives of applied artificial intelligence developers, that is, large companies that are developing and deploying artificial intelligence in different ways. One of the latest, and one that has generated quite an impact, has been the

The famous ChatGPT, that is, these language models that put us in front of a natural language interaction; it is the first time that as humanity we find ourselves in such a context. This is being debated at the level of the European parliaments. And while this year the regulatory projects, also called *Act*, on artificial intelligence, they have been working on 2017, 2018, 2020, the different projects had not been voted on. Due to the emergence of novelty of these generative models of artificial intelligence, this process was rushed. I believe that in the European Parliament the first vote was taken in June *Act*. I don't remember well if it was the 14th, the first law that regulates this matter, and it is based on a risk criterion, ranging from serious to minor.

I shared the second one with you *heading*, the second hearing that was held a couple of days ago in the United States Congress; it is very interesting. I am doing the transcription of the two and a half hours of what was that hearing; I think it can be very interesting to be used as knowledge material about what is happening. Taking this type of activities as an example, this third table is proposed, in which I believe that who will participate has not yet been defined, but the names of the companies have: Microsoft; Meta; Google, and Amazon.

MR. PRESIDENT (Rodrigo Goñi Reyes).-For now, those are the ones; others are asking for it.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-I recommend watching those videos as they are good examples. While this is not going to be a complete guide, *heading*, a hearing, what is proposed is that, precisely, it is the parliamentarians - whoever is decided - who ask three or four questions to the representatives of these companies.

In this way, we close what is component one, on the morning of Tuesday 26th.

For the afternoon of Tuesday 26th there is the participation of the *keynote speakers*, in which Mr. Jerome Glenn, president of the Millennium Project, will participate; it is *a think tank* global, which they have been working on for several years now with these issues of the evolution of artificial intelligence and the need for global governance, placed at the level of how governance has been managed, for example, of atomic energy; also, with a certain urgency to be able to generate some basic conditions that can be anticipatory and not reactive, that is, after having the problem installed.

So, in the afternoon there would be that initial talk by him and then there would be two more experts. One of them is Virginia Dignum, who is Portuguese, but lives in Sweden. She is a scientist, professor, teacher and one of the leaders in responsible artificial intelligence. That lasts an hour and a half. Then, there would be a workshop, *workshop*, to delve deeper into exchanges between parliamentarians in group dynamics of 15, 18 or 20 people. In short, that will depend on the number of registrants we have.

The idea is that there are 5 or 6 parallel workshops, where these exchanges can be generated based on experiences, approaches, etc.

will be moderated by a team that will begin working next week and what is summarized from this hour and a half dynamic will be presented in plenary session format.

There will be a spokesperson for each of these workshops, who will present them in plenary session and there will be some kind of exchange. This second component ends in the afternoon, around 6 or 6:30 p.m.

We now move on to the third component of Wednesday 27th. In the morning, the main speaker, Mr. Daniel Innerarity, is expected to take part. This will probably be an event that will be open to a wider audience. After his presentation, which will last approximately forty minutes, two other experts will intervene in a more colloquium-like manner with two or three parliamentarians, closing this plenary module of an hour and a half, and then moving on to *abreak*. Then, at 11 a.m., also in an hour and a half there will be another workshop that will resume what was worked on the previous day and will continue to delve into instances of future commissions, of anticipatory governance in Parliaments. Using the same modality, it will be presented in a plenary session and that component will be closed.

Afterwards, lunch will take place and, in the afternoon, we have the fourth component, where we will focus more specifically on the role of Parliaments in the democracy of the future, with some new developments and transformations. As everything is focused on the environment of the evolution of artificial intelligence, one of the main presentations will be that of Professor José Luis Martí, with examples of cases of how Parliaments are integrating artificial intelligence into their daily parliamentary function and practice. This is another novelty, another form of artificial intelligence, but one that affects Parliaments, because it affects not only the aspect of regulation or the changes that may occur in society, but also the transformations within Parliaments. There are cases, such as New Zealand, in which they have been implementing and studying it for some years. Several countries, such as Greece, Finland, Estonia and Lithuania, have been integrating everything that has to do not only with digital transformation, but also with artificial intelligence in what has been called coding or, in some cases, what they call reflection on the algorithmization of parliamentary activity.

The idea is that this fourth component will focus more specifically on the activity of the Parliaments. With all the inputs that have been collected, there will be a team that will be supporting this information recovery, both from the panelists, from the questions and answers that are made in the panel sessions and from the summary of the workshops, all of which will be an input for, in the afternoon, as the last activity of the dynamics, to make the recommendations, the final declaration and move on to a plenary session with the conclusions and this declaration that will try to collect three main aspects: one, what has to do with this visibility of the importance of the themes of the Parliaments in terms of futures; the formation of a global network of futures commissions or futures spaces in the Parliaments and the recommendations for the *Summit* of the United Nations Futures Summit in September 2024.

In the materials we have been sharing, everything I told you is represented in the form of the main themes, the other themes are correlated; everything contributes to a reflection on the democracy of the future in the context of the evolution of artificial intelligence.

The aim of this is not just to present the speakers, but to stimulate these exchanges in order to generate, during these two and a half days of work, a kind of collective intelligence curve. As I said, we are going to try to recover everything that has emerged and then a form of systematization of what was the activity that can feed the SEF.

How does all this connect with the SEF, beyond the specifics of the Summit? Well, it is an opportunity to dive into the topic of artificial intelligence, which really has disruptive impacts that add up, overlap with all the impacts or problems that we may be having today. It has a direct link with the transformation of work, with the future of work and the work of the future, which is the theme of the Futures Commission for this period and also clearly sets out everything related to the needs for regulation of artificial intelligence.

As a fourth point, we have "Artificial intelligence in Parliaments", which perhaps the Futures Commission can begin to look at. It is also the opportunity for *working* That is, those interactions with other Commissions, with other Parliaments that already have more years of experience with Futures Commissions and it is also an opportunity for a role of greater participation in the United Nations agenda of the 2024 Summit and the Global Compact.

The third point - I only mention it as a headline - is that all of this is contributing to a process and, as such, it takes time in terms of strengthening capacities in what has to do with anticipatory governance, that is, moving from acting after things happen to trying to look at problems and act beforehand. This is linked to the concept of responsible anticipation, in order to obtain better information, more complete information also for decisions that may be more closely aligned with the processes of change and the times of change in which we find ourselves.

In a way, there is a lot of information available because all this has involved generating and searching for materials; it is available, and the same can be done to expand on it at another time, so that everything that has been worked on for the Summit is not simply work for two or three days in September, but that it is felt that all this is contributing to the work of the Futures Commission and the Parliament as a whole, to the extent that it takes ownership of the process.

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).-A doubt arose to me while I was listening to the differences between the more workshop-like modality, the presentations with *keynote speakers* and so on. Obviously, this is directed at us, those of us who are part of the Futures Commission, at people who come from outside, but to what extent is this going to be opened up to parliamentarians, to students, if they are interested? That is, how is it going to be segmented what is open and for what? Maybe it is not something that is defined yet, but it does not seem to me to be a minor issue, because there are some of

These are topics that can, for example, arouse a lot of interest in first-year college students, and it might be great if they come. Well, we can take that definition or not. I think it is important that we discuss these kinds of things at some point.

MR. PRESIDENT.-Carmen: A very pertinent question, and we have to decide. That is a political decision.

This last proposal that Lydia has just presented, I have just sent it to WhatsApp; it is a preliminary, proposed and open agenda. We, based on the fact that we are the members of the Futures Commission and it is a parliamentary event of a political nature, are the ones who have to define this type of actions.

From now on you saw the organizational part that, yes or yes, We had to leave, because otherwise we would be late. It was very difficult for us, but everyone put in the resources to do it. For these types of questions like those that Carmen Sanguinetti raises, such as, for example, who are we going to integrate, the way in which we are going to do it - there is the possibility of doing it *side events*, collateral events with young people -, from today we have to delegate the task to some members if we are going to decide on that type of actions because we are the ones who are going to say who we are going to integrate.

This is a skeleton and, in fact, we can rest assured that this skeleton is already being disseminated. But all those ingredients, which also have to do with political issues that are ours, we have to define today. We have five previous Thursdays, where we can make concrete proposals, like those that Senator Sanguinetti is making now, and if we approve them, then we will look for a way to implement them. There we will also have to delegate their implementation and execution to members of the Commission, because now one begins to observe a number of logistical things that we have to distribute.

Senator Sanguinetti: What would be your suggestion or proposal, I don't know if it is for now?

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).-I simply wanted to know if any criteria had been defined and, if so, to know what they were. If not, I think it is something that needs to be thought about. I am not saying that we have to define it now, in this session, but since it is a topic that generates so much interest, especially among the new generations, it would be good to have a somewhat defined idea of what the call will be like, to whom, what spaces will be restricted and which will not.

MR. PRESIDENT.-In response to that question: that is not defined because it could not be.

Lydia Garrido is taking *carefull throttle* of this and is available to work on this type of proposals, as Senator Sanguinetti suggests, because we are in time; not so once the skeleton is put together, as well as the thickest part -let's say-: the financing, the guests, the *speakers*, etc. We could have done it before, but we did not have the time. In any case, we are still very much in time to make it happen. It is an issue of enormous political importance because, as Senator Sanguinetti raises: who are we going to integrate? There are very important social actors.

important: the University, the trade union movement, young people, the Academy in general. We have to define how we can integrate them.

This event has to be used in such a way that - as Lydia Garrido said - we can take advantage of all the inputs that come out of it for Uruguayan society, which is the one for which the expense is being made to organize it.

MRS. 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 top-level consultant - also for the European Commission - on responsible artificial intelligence, and she is willing to give a talk at a university and participate in this issue; it just needs to be coordinated with her. It is important to do it as soon as possible because the date of her passage will also depend on that.

We must take into account that the Summit begins on Monday 25th; that day there will be many activities because Parlatino will be holding some meetings related to the interest in establishing a Futures Office at the Parlatino level. At six o'clock in the afternoon on that Monday there will be the official opening. On Tuesday and Wednesday we will be working *full throttle*. So, I think it could be Thursday..I tell you this because if you are interested and want to ask her some questions, I could pass them on to her.

MR. PRESIDENT.-In order for it to have more force, more meaning or to be integrated into any subsequent activity, we must find, as Senator Sanguinetti said, a way to add it to the event itself, in some way. That is why we are trying to define, as soon as possible, for example, the plenary conferences.

It is clear that the *workshops*At the parliamentary event there will be a more closed environment between parliamentarians and moderators. This is the other point that I want us to clearly define today because the moderators are part of the event, and that is a way of integrating the entire Academy, beyond the panels. *speaker*they are very very good.

As for the topic, very important news is emerging every day on this subject; the main congresses and parliaments of the world are dealing with this issue, and the main leaders go there, like the last one that appeared yesterday in the press. In congresses they dedicate hours to this issue. Why? We have already talked about it, so I am not going to repeat it, but I am going to say that artificial intelligence is influencing democratic processes. And when I talk about democratic processes, I am not referring to parliamentary processes, but to democratic processes. So, it includes and involves society as a whole.

Therefore, if we want to be consistent in our approach regarding the fact that the development of artificial intelligence is influencing, whether for good or bad - also in a threatening way - democratic processes, then we should integrate the various sectors of society into the *Summit*, somehow.

That is one of the points that has been on the table; Lydia has not put it on paper because it is an issue that we have to define.

We still have time to do it; we must propose it and see the methodology to find the formula.

MRS. GARCIA (Graciela).-To complement the question asked by Senator Sanguinetti, I think that this issue is not only of interest to students, but also to institutions and universities. I have heard that there is controversy in some university institutions about this issue because there is concern; not everything is nice, good and positive, right? Universities are concerned about how to approach this issue.

It would therefore be good to find a way to integrate the different institutions, whether public or private.

MR. PRESIDENT.-Yes, Senator. That is the case, and I believe that we cannot avoid these issues; we would be making a serious political mistake if we avoid the way to integrate. That has always been on the table, but we have not implemented it.

That is why I think we need to bring together the sectors, groups or collectives, but also the sectors that are clearly involved in the issue.

I think that we should call for a meeting on Thursday, August 10, of the entire Academy that is participating in the Futures Commission and that has been providing us with elements, data, experts, etc. Specifically, I propose that we call for a meeting on Thursday, August 10.

(Dialogues)

— — I leave open the possibility of discussing it, but I propose to call for Thursday 10th, at 13:00, the representatives and experts of the academic sector who have to do with the subject in order to discuss the agenda and invite them to be part of the moderation - we are going to have several *workshops*, various panels- of the *Summit*. Some of the institutions that we have to call for that day -we must think directly about people-, for example, are: all universities, including UTEC
- each university is working specifically on the topic of artificial intelligence and some on artificial intelligence and democracy-; institutions such as Agesic and ANII, and we can think of social organizations that are not currently working on this, but that could be a good starting point. I believe that the number should not exceed fifteen. Then, those of us who make up this Commission will have to visualize who will be able to participate and integrate this Summit that we are proposing.

(Supported)

— — And we're talking about possible names.

MR. MELAZZI (Martin).-Maybe you mentioned it before, but I would like to know if you are thinking of streaming the sessions? *on line* via the Internet. I would like to know if it is possible for all of these actors we are talking about, obviously in an organized way, to be able to follow each of the sessions.

Also, I don't know if it was taken into account that when the main panelists come forward, there may be a short fifteen-minute interval,

for example, so that these organizations can ask some questions - obviously, brief, with brief answers as well - on the topic being discussed. I think that would give a different dynamic and interaction. I understand that in the *Summit* The one in Helsinki was not like that; it was simply the panelists who spoke. I think this sums up what we were talking about and in this way we would be giving participation to all the organizations and the different actors so that, through the follow-up, they can make their queries and obtain the relevant feedback.

MR. PRESIDENT.-As for the question about transmission, in principle, the idea is that the conferences will be transmitted via *streaming*. For now, we have three or four conferences.

I don't think it's a good idea to broadcast the working groups, and we don't have a way of doing it either because it has to be an exchange. As for the panels, we would have to see if we can find some way of doing it.

The other proposal seems to me to be a very good idea, Deputy Melazzi, to also integrate them through the questions. Without prejudice to that, I think we have to find a way for this *Summit* be developed by all the important actors who have to do with the democracy of the future and democracy and artificial intelligence, which is the axis we are dealing with.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-I find what Deputy Melazzi is proposing extremely interesting, and I think that this enables us to think of a parallel design. What happens is that we have many constraints; one of them is that it will be held in two days, and another is that - you were in Finland; theoretically, this is the second Summit of Futures Commissions - we have made a proposal *Summit* very different, perhaps, somewhat ambitious, but very open. Thinking about this, there may be institutions, organizations and groups that are interested in participating in a way that, as I said, is simultaneous and parallel, because they can be following up on the Summit, moderating and taking questions. As we said at the beginning, let's see this as a process over time, not just two or three days. In this preparation, inputs and knowledge are already being generated, but it can also be done *a posteriori*.

So, it seems to me that this opens up a space, because we also have to learn to think like this, like in simultaneous parallel worlds; it opens up an interesting space to expand the actors who can participate. At the same time, different points of view, knowledge, interests and different cultures will also be generated in these interaction dynamics. That's good; it means adding a little more work to the organization, but I find it very interesting.

MR. PRESIDENT.-We have a youth issue. I insist, we cannot stop integrating the new generations; it would be unforgivable.

Therefore, the way to proceed here is through the parties, through the parliamentary groups. It seems to me that we have to find a mechanism where at least thirty young people can participate in the *Summit*, in some way. I think this would be an extraordinary opportunity for those thirty young people to experience being involved in the most current, most forward-looking, most interesting and most complex topic in politics today,

that they can exchange ideas with the main experts and parliamentarians from all over the world who are involved in the subject. I would ask Lydia to make a methodological proposal and that we, if you like, in a number of thirty, can soon define how to integrate the new generation into this *Summit*.

The other point is that at least five, six or seven of us - without it being a compulsive thing - have to participate and be leading actors in the various activities. Those of us who have participated in other *Summit* We know that the organizing Futures Committee participates actively, either as a moderator, in some of the panels, in the *opening*, in the closing, etc.

So, I think that we too - five, six, seven of us who make up the Futures Commission, we have to start preparing this from now on; we have to talk about it with Lydia and then define it - have to play a visible role, because it is the signal to the outside world that this is an issue in which all parties are interacting, with all visions, since, of course, it is a long-term issue. These are the issues in which we, from now on and once it is set up, have to start defining those other aspects.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-If you identify with the teams you are working with and are interested in getting involved in the Summit - we know that the number of participants is limited - or in these simultaneous and parallel issues, but with links to the Summit, I am available to make a presentation of the topics, the materials and who will participate. Everyone has my contact information and I am available to participate in that.

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen).-Surely, the *keynote speakers* Those who are coming will have I don't know how many books published and so on, but if there were some material, some *papers* 20, 30 or 50 pages -not reading 400 books, although I hope we can; I have some mapped out and others not-, it would be good to have them.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-Thank you, Carmen.

I have it here, because this one is priceless. From my perspective, this one *paper* Daniel Innerarity's 2020 paper, twenty-five pages long, on the impact of artificial intelligence on democracy, is very interesting. Furthermore, it is in Spanish; this would be the first question.

MR. PRESIDENT.-Lydia will pass it on to Vladimir so he can integrate her into WhatsApp. Beyond the fact that you are mentioning that work by Innerarity, there is another work by Jerome Glenn on artificial intelligence, the future, democracy and global governance, which will be the theme of the Summit, which is very current and is also in Spanish, which I think is very important.

It is also important that we all know about the hiring of the two *speakers* main authors who submit papers. Therefore, this Commission must agree in principle, with some reservation, to what the authors are asking for. *speakers* until they bring it. In the next few days they will present some advances of their reports. Naturally, these are advances that can be corrected later. As soon as we have them, they will have to reach the Commission. Really,

Although they have already been working on these issues, they are hired with two written presentations.

The speaker José Luis Martí, who has been hired by the UNDP, also has some work that is very useful at the parliamentary level because he provides a very summarized update of everything that Parliaments are using in terms of artificial intelligence in the different dimensions, the task of representation, of legislation, beyond the fact that at the event we are going to learn about truly extraordinary things and that, as far as we know, there are already some Parliaments that are using it. Those tasks remain pending.

So, on the 10th we met at 1:00 p.m.

I would also like to say, if Senator Gloria Rodríguez does not object, that we have to finish the report on future work in 2023; we still have the area of longevity, long-lived societies, etc. Senator Gloria Rodríguez is working on it and is prepared. There is a very interesting proposal from Endeavor; they want to do an event with us on the silver economy that, I believe, is international. We told them that we are working on that together with Senator Gloria Rodríguez and they got in touch.

So the idea is to get out of this *Summit*, which has us completely absorbed, and in October, hold a major event on long-lived societies and then be able to finish the fifth factor that we had for the work of the future, in order to also make the final report in 2023, as we had agreed.

MRS. GARRIDO (Lydia).-I repeat, I am available to complement this question of long-lived societies with that of the relationships between different generations.

MR. PRESIDENT.-I clarify that when I speak of Senator Gloria Rodríguez, it is not just about her. When we awarded the areas, there was one person in charge of leading, but of course, it is for everyone.

Thank you so much.

The meeting is adjourned.

(It is 2:33 p.m.)

