



SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES

(Meeting on July 20, 2022)

(Mrs. María Inés Fariello and Fiorella Haim and Mr. Leonardo Loureiro and Mr. Enrique Topolansky attend, and Mr. Gabriel Burdín and Mr. Martín Inthamoussu participate via Zoom)

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

(It is 16:11)

(Connection is established via Zoom)

— — Good afternoon.

We especially thank the experts who have been invited to this second meeting, which we called: "Transformation and emerging vectors that imply new economic practices and value production in the 21st century", had already been working on some guiding questions.

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

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

It's a bit of a complicated day for Parliament because it is being considered accountability and today the authorities of the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining are attending. Some members of this Commission also participate in the Industry Commission and the Special Commission on Innovation, Science and Technology, so it has become complicated for us.

We especially appreciate the presence of Senator Carmen Sanguinetti, of deputies Gustavo Olmos and Luis Alberto Posse, among other legislators that we will name.

We would also like to thank Ms. Inés Fynn and Mr. Bruno Gili, Mr. Agustín Borrazás and Mr. Pablo Arreche for their presence.

Without further ado, let's start this exchange. I think it is not necessary to go back to read the questions that we had suggested in the introduction that had been posed to them.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo). -Following the recommendations that Inés sent us, we were expecting the senator's opening remarks, but we will start directly.

MR. PRESIDENT. -If you allow me, Mr. Loureiro, I must excuse Senator Nane, because she had a last-minute family problem; she is in Cologne. She called us last night and also this morning. We especially excuse her; she will try to participate via Zoom.

I don't know if you want me to do the introduction.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo).-No, it's okay.

MR. PRESIDENT. -Perfect. Anyway, I have Senator Nane's instructions here.

So if it's okay with you, let's get started.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo). -Following the line of the guiding questions that were sent to us, which speak a lot about the threats that are foreseen for work in the future, from the more technological perspective, which is where I come from, one of the things that we are seeing the most is the convergence of several technologies. Several technologies, *per se*, were changing the future of work, and in the convergence of these technologies at the same time, as is happening today, some of them enhance each other, which will affect both innovation and creativity much more.

Several of us participated in a Teams survey
Consultants - I think it was from the Commission, right? - and they asked us some questions similar to that. And what we saw is that the best-known technologies - we have specialists at the table, like María Inés - such as data science, artificial intelligence, *blockchain*-Enrique can also talk a lot about that - added to quantum computing, 3D *printing* and other technologies that are changing the world will surely have a very important impact on the future of work.

When we talk about vectors and impact, we see that, in Uruguay, Luckily, we have the creation of that knowledge. I think that one of the most important things that we have to work on as a country is how we can promote these new technologies and not let them come to us. I often use this idea that if we do not participate - I forgot to mention robotics - if we do not work actively in the generation of knowledge to be able to create our own changes

technological and being masters of our future, will be given to us by other countries and we will have, as they say in the jargon, a technological dependence.

So, I think our technological independence will be based, precisely, that we continue working together in the creation of genuine knowledge of our own. Fiorella has actively participated in certain issues that I believe are important; the possibility of having IoT robotics and the different *labs*. The work that has been done is important because, precisely, what we are working on is that these things do not come to us given and built. I would like to see in the future, here in Uruguay, things like those that Boston Dynamics builds and not that we import them. I think that these types of things are what can begin to greatly affect the future of work. The more we get into the subject, the more we will change these perspectives. Bruno participates as a vector for Uruguay in the World Economic Forum. If we consider what the future jobs are and what will be requested and demanded, we see that it has absolutely nothing to do with what we are training today or with the amount of job offers or labor that there may be in the country. In other words, we are not trained to be able to accept the work that we have. You have heard me talk several times about the shortage of labor in the technological sector. We were talking the other day with Carmen, at an ANEP event, about the fact that there is no established training for the work that is being generated. There are five thousand jobs for which we are looking for people with training abroad, because in the country there are no people trained to work in high-tech sectors. In an era of knowledge increasingly encouraged by these changes, I believe that innovation and creativity are going to have to be much more sophisticated. We are going to have to work very hard on these activities.

Here I leave my first intervention. Afterwards, if you want, I will make some other Contribution. As I was saying, convergence is important. And I'll give an example. What we can see is going to happen with quantum computing in the system - let's call it that; I don't know how many people are involved in the subject - that is, when it is soon operational, is that it will greatly modify chemistry, pharma and artificial intelligence. I think it's important to keep these kinds of things in mind. Luckily, in Uruguay, there is important knowledge about quantum computing in general at the University of the Republic, at the UM a fairly strong unit has been created and, at the ORT, for example, we have quantum computing oriented towards artificial intelligence. I think that these kinds of combinations are what will accelerate certain processes; it is there where we have to work actively to train people who can take on new jobs in these areas.

MR. TOPOLANSKY (Enrique). -First, I am grateful for the opportunity to be here today.

Second, I share Leonardo's words that it is important that we can be sovereign in technology and continue developing our own line. However, if we look at the challenges that companies see, I believe that digital transformation is much more about people, companies, and business models.

business than technology. I mean, I think the technology sector is a benchmark; there's a reason we're exporting US\$1,000,000,000. I think the technology sector, in general, is doing things very well.

If you ask me what the challenge is for entrepreneurs today, I believe That is to understand what it is about. I think we are less than a hundred there. I feel that today, in Uruguay, businessmen and people in general do not have the slightest idea of what is coming or what digital disruption is and how it will affect them. That is the first thing I want to make very clear. I have been working on this for more than four years, specifically in transformation, and people are absent, they do not understand what is happening. That is point number one.

Point number two is that we have two types of companies. In Uruguay, there are Some of them are part of a global world - they are the minority - that are beginning to visualise this, that have data-based organisations, that use artificial intelligence, that are trying to use all these disruptive technological trends, but more than 90% of the companies, which are SMEs, are the ones that are going to suffer. These are the ones that generate the majority of employment in Uruguay, and they are the ones that worry me.

Today, I am working with ANDE Digital Mode, which is a very good This is a step - which we applaud - in the desired direction, but it is still lacking a lot; it is not enough. Today, it is necessary to help these small business owners to change their *mindset*, to change their way of thinking and realize that today the competition is no longer the one who is two blocks away from them. Until recently, a person in a store in Florida looked at the slogan or the price that the Galician on the corner put on a board or a blackboard, for example. Today they compete with a man who is buying through Alibaba, in China, they compete with businessmen from Montevideo who sell through Mercado Libre, and they don't understand why, suddenly, they stopped buying the product that they used to buy from them and that had an impressive turnover. That is digital transformation brought to earth.

When we talk about the challenges that companies face today, we see that First, it is about understanding and, second, giving them the tools. And the technology sector has to be able to bring solutions to them. But there is another part, which is adoption, being able to have the skills to use everything from WhatsApp, which is the minimum, to slightly more sophisticated tools to do things. *marketingdigital*, to be able to make themselves known wherever they move and in the world. And that is possible through social networks, through platforms. *shopping mall* will be replaced by free markets, by *shopify*, and the record companies, for *spotify* So if we don't understand what these new channels are, what the new purchasing experience is for users, we have no chance.

To close, because I could go on for a long time, I think that Uruguay Uruguay is doing things well. Uruguay has a good technological infrastructure, it has a strong information technology sector, it has very prestigious academies, but we need to come to an agreement to help these people in this transformation process, which is not easy, because many will not be able to afford it.

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

I leave my intervention here.

MR. PRESIDENT. -We welcome Mr. Martín Inthamoussu, who is participating via Zoom.

MR INTHAMOUSSU (Martin). -Thank you very much. Greetings to everyone.

I would like to make some additions to complement the comments that I just heard. I have to work from the side of the creative and cultural industries. And in this sense, I do believe that in these industries we have a lot to contribute to the deficiencies that exist in other sectors and it is understood that we have to work with traditional industries in terms of generating innovation and user experience from another point of view.

I couldn't see who the last person was who spoke, but it seemed very relevant. What he said is relevant. I was thinking, for example, of gastronomy, a sector in which the neighbor who has a restaurant now competes with a *dark kitchen*, with the *deliveries* or with virtual restaurants, which are increasingly present.

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

I return to the first comment: I firmly believe that the formation of the people who make up the creative and cultural industries to contribute to a future that has the value of ideas, which is intangible, which is sustainable, which will not end, it has to be strengthened from the educational system, but also from the labor system with a permanent dialogue with traditional industries. When traditional industries see in the creative industries this exchange and the value

added value that they can give to their companies, I believe that we will be able to take a quantitative and qualitative step in many of the services in several sectors.

MRS. HAIM (Fiorella). -Good afternoon. Thank you very much for the invitation.

I want to talk about the organization of work, how we are organizing it. After the pandemic, where we had a lot of flexibility and there was this emergency of going to other formats, to virtual formats. And we have to see how we can, upon return, take the good from those experiences.

Luckily, we have a teleworking law that gives more possibilities to We are seeing a lot of companies, but what we are seeing now is that more flexibility is needed to, precisely, add value. The traditional work schedule, from nine in the morning to five in the afternoon, of a person coming in and having to sit in front of a computer during those hours, has lost a bit of its meaning. Now we know that you can work on certain tasks from home and be much more productive, and that for teamwork it is better to be in person. We also know that you can combine work modalities with the appropriate technologies; for example, with a television the size of the one we have here and in a room of these dimensions we can have mixed participation. In other words, there is a lot that we learned, the hard way. But now that we know it, in many places we went backwards; they went back to the old system and it seems that nothing had happened and that we had not learned anything.

So, as Martin just said, we have to see how to add value, how generating value and improving the experiences of consumers, users, beneficiaries, depending on each case. This can be done with better organization in companies, with greater flexibility, with another type of motivation, with much more involvement in what is the mission of the company, including all workers in that and not in such a vertical organization, as perhaps it was before, in a more factory-like scheme, from another era. I think it is interesting to try to go in that direction.

MR. BURDÍN (Gabriel). -I am grateful for the invitation and the opportunity to participate in the Commission. I also thank all those present, in particular Bruno and Inés for technically coordinating the work of the group.

My perspective on these processes of technological changes and the opportunities and problems that they pose, particularly for Uruguay, are more from the academy, from labor economics and from the economics of organizations.

What I noted down to comment is very related to what I just said. My concern is not so much that Uruguay develops a cutting-edge technology sector; I am quite in line with what Mr. Topolansky was saying. I think that things are on the right track there. There are some bottlenecks in terms of the supply of qualified labor in those sectors, but Uruguay has it there.

important capabilities. My concern is mainly about how technological change affects economic activity as a whole and what repercussions it has from the point of view of employment, society and the general well-being of the population.

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

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

The problem is that there is no guarantee that the use of these technologies will result in increased productivity. I repeat, the increase in productivity associated with the use of these technologies is not guaranteed. Even if the technologies are available at low cost, even if there is a developed digital infrastructure - as, fortunately, Uruguay has - the fact that the use of technologies is reflected in increased productivity depends on a set of factors. And here Uruguay is in a complicated position, for reasons that I will discuss below.

A second point is that technological change generates pressures for a permanent rise in inequality in the labour market. This requires the intervention of consistent policies in many areas - labour, production, education - in terms of labour regulations.

Why do I argue that technological change does not necessarily translate to the productivity growth? We know this from previous technological waves in developed countries and also from evidence in developing countries: the effects of technology on productivity are often delayed, they usually occur with a lag, and they are usually heterogeneous at the level of productive sectors. This happened in previous technological waves, in the early 1980s in the United States, with the emergence of investments in computers and information technology. Robert Solow argued that technology was everywhere except in productivity statistics. This referred to a process by which there was an increase in technological investments, but their expression in the dynamics of productivity did not occur. And a

A fundamental element by which the availability of technology does not necessarily translate into an increase in productivity or it translates with a long delay and with a lot of heterogeneity at the level of the business fabric, suddenly, with star firms that do manage to take advantage of the technology, but that does not spill over into the whole business fabric, is because not all companies have the complementary organizational capacities to make productive use of the available technology. A central point that I think should be incorporated into the analysis is that one of the most important areas of development of empirical economics in recent years is the one that emphasizes the importance of the management practices of companies in relation to productivity. To give you an idea, more or less a quarter or a third of the differences in productivity between countries can be explained by the different quality of the management practices of companies. When we talk about productivity differences, part of these differences respond to the capacity of companies to productively and efficiently use the technology that is available. The quality of the management practices of companies clearly affects the possibility of using technologies productively.

What factors affect the quality of these management practices?

Competition is one of them. Uncompetitive environments encourage poorly managed, unproductive companies to survive in the market.

Another relevant factor that this line of international research shows is Family ownership of companies, which is widespread in developing countries, including Uruguay, is often problematic when it comes to selecting efficient management practices that are capable of using technology productively. Sometimes, management positions in family businesses are not assigned on a meritocratic basis; other factors predominate because business leadership positions are transmitted by heredity and not necessarily on meritocratic grounds. Due to a set of factors, family ownership is potentially problematic when it comes to promoting management practices that allow for productive use of technology.

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

What can we do from this point of view? I propose some clues: competitive markets are essential; competition policies are essential. To encourage companies that are best positioned to use technology to be able to do so and have the resources available, we need to think of interventions that improve the capabilities of micro and small businesses to optimize the quality of their management practices and be better able to take advantage of technology. We need to improve the training of the workforce, which implies educational challenges, which will surely be the subject of specific meetings; we also need to improve the quality of the technology.

There are challenges in terms of job training. The market works well in some things, but very poorly when it comes to providing incentives for job training, because companies are afraid that their workers will leave for other companies and, therefore, their investments in training will be taken advantage of by the competition. When it comes to training in very specific aspects, sometimes the use of certain technologies requires it, there are problems between workers and companies, because there are no credible commitments to remunerate them adequately. Such training cannot be used in other companies because it is specific. Therefore, the role of public policy is very important, in order to outline the private and social incentives for people to train. Inefop has a key role in this regard.

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

In short, technological change is essential to increasing productivity. It is a necessity for Uruguay, not an option, given its demographic dynamics, but for technology to have the effects on productivity that we expect, a set of complementary business capabilities is required. There is a set of companies in Uruguay, especially micro and small businesses, that have a significant deficit in terms of these types of practices and may not be in a position to use technology productively.

MRS. FARIELLO (Maria Ines). -I think they've already said almost everything.

I would like to add that an important aspect. When we talk about training and lack of trained personnel - obviously I'm going to focus mostly on science

- Data science and machine learning or the marketing version, artificial intelligence, if you prefer - many times, we think that we only need more engineers or more people specialized in artificial intelligence, but when CUTI was at the table where they talked about data science and artificial intelligence - later we held another event - the lack of evangelization on these topics was detected. Not only are people needed who work, but who understand, especially at the management or senior levels, what they can ask of this technology and who do not let themselves be sold anything. Many times, magical solutions come from outside, but then, as we talked about in the last session, I give all my data, they get trapped there, and they give me back some little thing, but I completely lose sovereignty - a word we used last time - of what is happening and I don't even know what that model is being used for, how it was trained, what biases it has, or if the data they used has to do with mine. The word evangelization was used, which I think is very appropriate for these topics. When we are going to analyze a problem, we need the expert who knows about artificial intelligence, but also the expert who knows the domain. If those two experts do not know how to talk to each other, we will probably end up solving a problem that was not the one we wanted and we will not be able to continue working; that happens to us many times. Interdisciplinarity, in that sense, takes a lot of time.

Next time we'll talk about training.

MR. GILI (Bruno). -I would like to refer to the final idea of being able to put together a document that will provide input for the debate until March. I found what I heard very interesting and I would like to ask you some questions.

First of all, I would like a general opinion, from everyone, on the subject of organization of companies, leadership and the impact on productivity. I recently received a message *paper* interesting from MIT University - it was a research that compared the difference in productivity between the United States, Germany and Japan - which said that the *management* It is a technology, not an activity that one learns in practice or in a bowling alley. It is a technology, a capability. The most relevant explanation I read was that the *management* American was slightly superior to German and Japanese in achieving better productivity. I am not referring to the questioning of the models in those countries, but to the concept of managing a production, an organization to carry something forward. I want to make it clear that when the document compared which was better, there were indeed styles and logic of *management* which led to the conclusion that these three countries are among the most powerful in the world, along with three or four others, that is, it was not a question of one good and one bad. Indeed, there was an element there.

Secondly, given the Table we have today that has a lot to do with With the business world, I think it would be important to go deeper - taking what Gabriel Burdín said - into what the conditions are or what should happen to improve this *management* globally at all levels of the organizations, both in how they incorporate and develop their business from the intrusion of these technologies and another, which is missing today, due to how we have the profile; we could have the same

Comments on biotechnology. I do not want to leave this out; we discussed it at last year's Roundtables. It is not easy to coordinate, but it would be interesting to think that Uruguay has a very important role in the intrusion of all the transformations that the world of technology is experiencing, which, in addition, is now combined with digital technology, which makes a very powerful scheme, and, obviously, Uruguay is concerned about food production and everything that has to do with the science of life, etc. Therefore, I would like you to reflect on this topic in your next interventions.

Another reflection I want to raise - perhaps it will be left for the second round if we -gives time- it has to do with what things in the context of the functioning of our markets and our economy, they understand that are being an obstacle for us not to have more insertion or development as a country, in terms of production of goods and services at the internal and international level. I think it is an important question, because there are things that do not depend on us, but are of the context. Gabriel threw out some ideas; Enrique Topolansky too.

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

I think it would be good to start with the first one, because it would help us to organize the outline of how to take input from the concerns that experts have. This is a stage, which does not have to end today. It is a process that will take many months.

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo). -I'm going to follow the line that Bruno was suggesting and use an example from my own research.

Many of the new organizations are moving towards the concept of ecosystem, which we have already used. Today, companies are almost ecosystems.

I'm going to mention an example that is being used a lot as a success story. at MIT. The Chinese company Haier - actually it is like two thousand companies in one - is made up of micro organizations that work collaboratively. This has changed the concept of governance a lot - we have spoken with Bruno several times about the importance of corporate governance - because they are starting to be, as some call them, new swarm-like organizations, more similar to a beehive and not so much to the current structures of organizations. This not only changes the way of working a lot, and has an impact on digital transformation, but also on the performance of companies. That is why organizations using DAO were born at MIT, which is this new thing about governance through the use of technologies. But this particular case of companies is being seen in many places, not only in China. Haier is a paradigmatic example. Let us keep in mind that it invoices more than US\$ 80,000,000,000, but it is a mountain of a company. In addition, the

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

Basically, the world is moving towards that concept, towards companies organized in a network, not only according to the most structural criteria of a director, a company, an owner, a set of shares, but rather multiple companies working in that swarm-type modality, as it is called in various places.

I think the context of organizations goes in that direction, and leadership is distributed. If we talk about having to work in a multicultural and multi-professional way, this is going to be a bigger challenge. In Europe and the United States there are examples; work is being done in this modality of living ecosystems in several countries. In fact, many examples are being taken from biology at the business level. In Spain there is the concept of ecovillages - in my opinion, "eco" does not refer to ecological, as is thought, but to economy - and they have quite interesting organizations of the cooperative model. Let's call it that because it is the one we know best in Uruguay. It is a quite disruptive model and, obviously, it is based on technology for management, but also on agreement and writing of governance to be able to carry out these companies. It is a quite important trend in the business world. That is a change that is coming. I say this as a contribution to the first point.

MRS. FARIELLO (Maria Ines). -I am impressed by how little companies' own data analysis is used for the *management*. Obviously, I don't come from the business world, but since I am constantly analyzing data, I talk to people who work in other places and there is little knowledge of what data companies have. When we did the artificial intelligence consultancy for the IDB, it often happened that they didn't even know how they had the data, where they had it, how to access it or what questions they could ask their own data. Also, it happens that SMEs are small. A model that was used in Finland consisted of creating a kind of ecosystem of companies that work in the same field, to which they all contribute their data to improve, but not necessarily to dump it all so that we don't use it; today, there is a lot of federated learning to say: "let's all use it."

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

MR. TOPOLANSKY (Enrique). -Regarding Bruno's question, I want to say that the style of organization - previously called structure and leadership style - determines, precisely, the continued existence of the company. Look at how far I am taking it. Today, I feel that a large part of success-failure is in the speed of decision-making. There are organizations whose structure creates bottlenecks and does not allow them to make decisions in time or, as María Inés said very well, they do not have the possibility of obtaining the data needed to make decisions in time. Why? Because we come from a world in which, rather than collaborating, we competed and, in accordance with the traditional company, on the other side I have an enemy. The modern trend, especially in the ecosystems in which I am, which are entrepreneurial ecosystems, collaboration is the norm. In technology it happens much more; it is a sector that collaborates more than others.

Specifically, regarding the question, today there are two types of organizational structures. Companies that are born with a *mindset* digital already have an agile culture. These companies follow lean methodologies, DevOps; all the ones we know that basically consist of a *set* of methodologies and architectures that allow organizations to quickly survey the trends that are occurring, take the situation they are in, and from there, make decisions based on data and act quickly. The faster they execute that cycle, the more chance they have of surviving. This also comes from bio systems, that is, when you have the capacity to survey and react quickly, you survive, if not, you are fired; it happens a lot in the jungle, so to speak. So, companies in the dynamic ecosystem with *mindset* digital already have these agile structures.

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

contracts; they will be given the data, but it remains to be seen what they will do with it. In any case, today, companies do not dare to provide their data to collaborate and have a better system *credit scoring*, of risk analysis, which would be much better for everyone and we would optimize. Why? Because they come from the old *management*, from the old way of thinking: "This is mine; it is my advantage, I do not share it," and they distrust all federated schemes, *blockchain*, that can be done to avoid this type of thing.

In short, in Uruguay we have the structures that have the *startup*, based on an ecosystem that was built over more than twenty years, in which we are working, which is highly collaborative. Therefore, the entrepreneurial ecosystem is accustomed to this type of agile structures, to collaborating, which, in more traditional sectors, does not happen so much. There are some examples of collaboration, but they are very few in particular.

MRS. NANE (Silvia). -As you can see, I am in a medical institution in Cologne for family care; I sent them a letter.

I want to say hello to Leo, Topo, and Maria Ines. It's always nice for me. I want to meet people from my previous life again; it brings me closer to the field. The idea is to share with you some reflections on what you were talking about, precisely, on the type of capabilities that we have to generate and see a little about the challenges that they imply, in line with what you were analyzing, and to be present, even if it is for a little while.

You were talking about cooperation. Leonardo will be familiar with this. I will name them. In the IT industry we used to say that there was a question between cooperation and competition, and with that we made the word "co-competition". Of course, the great challenge that cooperative methods have today is that they go against the grain of the generic social mandate, which is, more or less, that everyone gets by. So, there is a question of consumption and individualism, encouraged by a lot of social vectors, and when one goes against that it is difficult to find - especially when we are talking about the business world - governance models that allow us to be in a world that goes one way, but working in a way that goes another way. There is this question between governance in a collaborative way of working, which seems to me to generate the need for competition, to go from the micro to the macro, but racing against the current. To do this it is necessary to exercise gymnastics, to go from the abstract to the concrete. In the abstract, I solve models that I can then apply in concrete circumstances, but that requires certain skills that are developed in the world of education. For me, the clearest thing in this regard is computational thinking and chess, which allow us to see things and generate that gymnastics, that muscle to go from the abstract to the concrete and begin to generate transformations.

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

Entrepreneurs take risks based on a given situation. In this regard, I think we can reflect a little on the role of public policy or the State in the generation of pilot incubators, which allow for the absorption of a certain part of the risk, so that, later, with part of the accumulated experience, knowledge can be generated, in order to disseminate or deepen certain knowledge or, simply, collectivize it. Many times, in this interaction, we can begin to think of public policy models that go back and forth from the public to the private, in a kind of feedback, and from there begin to see, based on a strategic model, how collaboration can be achieved from the private sector, which always involves, in addition, aspects of education.

MR. PRESIDENT. -We will then do a final round to present, although this has already been done, some proposed lines of public policy action, as proposed by Senator Nane. So, if you like - speaking is not obligatory - we will leave these last fifteen or twenty minutes for a final round.

MRS. HAIM (Fiorella). -I take this opportunity to answer some of Bruno's questions.

Regarding the style of *management* I think that, in general, companies Technology companies set a very good example in many areas, but above all in flexibility, management, motivation and how these work links are generated. Gabriel referred earlier to the importance of having workers as partners, who are those who directly know the product or service that is being provided.

In technology companies there are many good practices that, in In general, they could be extracted for the more traditional companies. Many times there are fears and obstacles in that of what the possible challenges are in terms of legal issues. For example, when talking about flexible hours, you say: "Well, but if the person asks me to leave early today because they have to do some paperwork, and the next day they have to stay longer to finish a job, I'm going to have to pay them the extra hour from the other day." Technology companies already have these things resolved because they happen every day, and it's something quite natural. Mentioning a more traditional, larger company, that doesn't have a clock, it's like they look at you saying: "But everyone is going to ask us for overtime." It would be good to have that other perspective. Many times there is no other option; on the more technological side we want to retain people because there is a lot of shortage and if they come and say: "We need fruit," well, yes, of course! I even heard companies that offer the panoramic view.

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

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

MR. LOUREIRO (Leonardo). -As regards public policies, the final question is: what would we ask of Parliament?

Senator Sanguinetti helped several sectors, mainly the technological, but several sectors of economic activity are taking advantage of the teleworking law.

What Fiorella proposes is much more sophisticated. The new relationships Labor laws must be legislated; I think that this could be a substantial change that must be analyzed in the future.

(Dialogues)

— — If there is going to be a project on labour relations, it is important to keep this in mind, although I do not know if what I am going to say will be said in this regard.

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

I would go to a more complicated topic. Sometimes I am very direct, but I think that many times we should not legislate and not regulate. In certain things, growth will be determined by the deregulation of certain things. Obviously, there is a balance between how much I regulate and how much I do not regulate, but for the activity to grow in certain sectors, these types of things are important. In the matter of biotechnology, we always set the example in the technological sector: if I want to bring a flying car because I would like it to be the first place where it is tested here, we have a great complexity in the regulations and other issues.

This type of activity is important, and obviously it involves Parliament.

It is one of the areas in which we should work and which Parliament should should take into account in the future.

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

The proposal is to make the educational system more flexible; the strict courses and The traditional ones that we have are presented to the MEC and remain there as if sealed in stone, today it is a backwardness, especially when you look at the models in the United States, where one arrives and the cooking recipe is put together with a *advisor*, but you choose what to study. Either we go to a much more flexible model, or we will not be able to respond to what Leo said a while ago, that more creativity and more innovation are needed. That is not achieved with closed models.

This is the number one point of education.

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

If we really want to be a *valley* and a *hub* of innovation, universities They have to be able to bring three-year residencies to do master's and postgraduate studies in Uruguay, and that is not happening.

Another issue is that we have to encourage research again, Technology transfer with companies, the whole issue of donations. If we could rethink how to work with universities to have resources to work with companies, to innovate projects of this type, that would be great. It is another one of the wish list that I put on the table.

Now I'm going to move towards the entrepreneurial ecosystem, another of the points For me, it is key and has been the driving force behind three unicorns here in Uruguay that generate GDP, exports, and employment in an incredible way.

Regarding the entrepreneurial ecosystem, there were great advances with the law of ventures, with the *crowdfunding*, but there is still a long way to go. For this that Leo was saying about having type of method *sandbox* for which we can have evidence of doing something with *fintech, crypto* It is essential that regulatory frameworks be created that allow us to carry out experiments from sponsoring institutions with universities, in the context we want.

In this regard, entrepreneurial and innovation ecosystems, copy a little more the models of Israel, of Sweden, a model that I was lucky enough to visit very recently and that today gives much more freedom. Here we have an innovation model that is too centralized in the National Agency for Research and Innovation, and that cannot be. If we want innovation, what do we need? Different visions. Today we have a *board* of experts who tell you: "This is innovation"; "This is not innovation." Sorry, I do not agree. We have to move towards a model that allows us to give freedom to those who are taking risks in innovation, and then make them take responsibility for the consequences. What is happening is a regression.

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

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

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

MR. PRESIDENT. -You have experience from working and you were one of those who contributed most to the entrepreneurship law that was very initial. Precisely yesterday, it was completed.

to regulate the possibility of simplified corporations being formed entirely digitally, and that was thanks to a law, otherwise we would still be in limbo. That entrepreneurship law in which many of those at this table participated, had projected some of the things that, for example, Leonardo Loureiro proposed. It was not possible because at the time we did not have the consensus to approve it, but it was a much more ambitious bill. Knowing that the law in many cases can be a path to develop all entrepreneurial potential, one of the objectives of these exchanges is to learn more. Naturally, there are other opportunities, cases, circumstances in which a law can hinder, and in that we all have a lot to contribute and to know when a law, far from helping, distorts or slows down.

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

MR. GILI (Bruno). -I want to make a brief introduction, which raises a question for Gabriel and for whoever wants to answer it.

In this we always end up with there being an education table and a table of labor relations; although we will always talk about these issues, these will be inputs that will reach those two tables. It is about looking for that.

There is something that one knows happens and that seems very relevant to me, and that is why I raised market restrictions as well as public policy restrictions.

Since the World Economic Forum was mentioned, one of the categories that we use this term when we understand markets, it's that the boundaries of business have blurred, we don't know who we're competing with. I don't know if I'm competing with a bank; in old conversations that are eight, nine years old we used to say that we don't know who we're competing with, with a bank. *fintech*, with a telephone, with *aretail*, with a technology company, which actually becomes *afintech*. In fact, there are proposals from companies proposing the technology so that anyone can become a bank; it doesn't matter what you do, you can present it. It's a Uruguayan company that is doing these things around the world, and I'm not referring to dLocal, I'm referring to another one.

For me, this concept of erasing the boundaries of business is very relevant to the functioning of markets at international and national levels and this is also globalized.

I would like Gabriel, who stressed the issue of problems Speaking about the lack of competition in the markets, the incentives to cooperate, because there must be incentives, too, please expand on your view that these added problems would be causing productivity not to improve, because I think that is an important issue.

MR. PRESIDENT. -Gabriel, we'll give you a few minutes to think about your answer.

We now give the floor to Mrs. Fariello, to close with the intervention of Gabriel Burdín.

MRS. FARIELLO (Maria Ines). -I want to say something that has a lot to do with what was mentioned: how we manage to articulate the system of entrepreneurs, companies, academies, especially in this matter of artificial intelligence. Leonardo was complaining to me; the thing is that I don't have time. There is really a lot of demand for training in data science and artificial intelligence, and at the same time there is a lack of resources, which we will surely talk about another time.

There are companies in the sector that ask you: "Tell me, what do you need?" And they are in that dynamic of "If you ask me, I'll give you," but what are the mechanisms? So, the issue of how to manage private donations to the University comes up again and we ask ourselves - here they also grumbled at me when we raised the issue at the end of the science and data consultation - that what we might need is to create a data science and machine learning center. Just as there was an INIA at a time when the country needed to get into agriculture and find producers, academies, etc. and that continues to function, a meeting place, a well-oiled mechanism in which academia meets with producers to solve things.

Sometimes it goes through the National Agency for Research and Innovation and say: "Look, you have the instrument," because we have a call for companies with academia or if a company wants to have someone who does a master's or doctorate. These resources exist, but the problem is where we are and how we find the place so that it is really agile, dynamic and not say: "I am an academic. I need this, I want to find out which company has this problem that I can solve." It seems to me that sometimes there is a lack of dialogue and a meeting place.

Let us think that at one time we had an INIA, a Pasteur Institute when We need to take off in biotechnology, but we need Uruguay to continue training. Today, it happens that many companies end up training people internally, and what already happened in Canada, which has a system and the Academy did this, they saw that small companies end up working as trainers and the big ones, which was a bit what they said, take people away. They end up investing in training to later take them away. In fact, it happens to us, Google is taking people away from us. But that happens worldwide, it is a very strong war. Sometimes I think that we should do like the soccer players and have a transfer market. "If you formed the company, at least leave me something to take with you." I think it is impossible to have a transfer market.

passes like in football. I think about it. If it exists in that area, why couldn't it exist in this case. We already know why: we don't have *merchandising* then to sell.

Really think about how we can articulate that. We're always We form tables, we meet for a while, we chat and we say: "Oh, this problem is really cool. We'll see about it later." And what happens to us all the time is the lack of capacity. The idea is to see how to find a place within public policy that ends up bringing together all these capacities for synergy.

We talk about all the ecosystems in the world except this ecosystem that I think it's quite important.

MR. PRESIDENT. -We took the proposal, wrote it down and went to pick it up.

MRS. FARIELLO (Maria Ines). -It is written; the consultancy report contains the proposal for the Centre with different dimensions.

MR. PRESIDENT. -We will take it, it will be accepted and as a Commission we will try to move it forward.

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

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

I am concerned about the majority of the population employed in low-income sectors. productivity, non-tradables, in tourism, how technologies spill over into these sectors and make companies and people more productive. From that point of view, it seems to me that the areas of public policy that we should think about - and touching on issues that will be addressed in other roundtables, but that have been addressed today - is how we generate in the business fabric those complementary organizational capacities without which technology has no effect on productivity, improve the quality of management, improve the training of the workforce, improve the opportunities that workers have to participate in the processes of technological change in companies, what information they have available to participate in these processes. Because in the same way that companies do not like to share their data with other companies, they also do not have incentives to share information about their plans, about their economic accounts, about their financial accounts, with their workers, that is why in many countries, especially European ones, legislation is passed on these aspects. And this internal transparency of companies is what allows the technological implementation processes to be expedited and their negative impacts on workers to be moderated.

In terms of regulations, I think this is a key area. Another issue is obviously education; 40% of secondary school graduates are a very complicated basic condition for thinking about the future of these issues in Uruguay. It is a whole separate issue that will be addressed, and has been addressed for some time; there we have a structural bottleneck.

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

It is important to understand that job loss has very serious consequences. These are important for people in terms of health, and also in terms of not forgetting that workers who lose jobs have children who are accumulating human capital and who will be the ones who will experience the economy of the future. So, ensuring that these transitions are as little traumatic as possible is a fundamental element when thinking about these issues. There is not much magic here: a powerful welfare state is required, financed with general taxes and which allows the transitions associated with technological change to be downplayed. This will reduce the pressures for increasing inequality, but it will also benefit the functioning of the economy and the dynamics of technological incorporation by companies.

MR. MELAZZI (Martin). -I appreciate the introduction of the panelists; it was a pleasure to listen to them.

I'm just going to make some comments, because I come from the world business, micro and small businesses; it is an area that I know. I was president of the Soriano Commercial and Industrial Center for many years.

I appreciate almost everything they said, but I have to be honest, I always characterize myself That's why. Many of these assessments are made from a more capitalist perspective. Why do I say this? Some of you have elaborated on the subject of education. In Soriano, Colonia and some other departments we don't even have the possibility of taking tertiary courses. For many micro and small business owners, building them takes a lifetime, taking care of them, adapting to these technological changes. Taking a step towards transformation that could mean making a mistake overnight and losing our companies, makes each one of us very conservative.

I think that in Uruguay the business sector is characterized by taking care of its Companies, being conservative, find it difficult to make decisions because many times

We don't know, as they said here, because we don't share information in the same areas of activity. And I say this with great certainty because I had to travel with nine producers. I drove the vehicle and each of them had a separate booklet to do the same planting work. What's more, they kept the information to themselves to prevent the other from being as productive or more, because if I spill all my information, I don't share it... We had an impressive level of selfishness.

Regarding young entrepreneurs, I know many through plans like Semilla ANDE. They have competed and had the opportunity to have managers who help them in their ventures. So far, so good.

But to continue growing in the business world, because it also We must say that we are a small country - we can have a long discussion - especially those of us who are from the interior. In principle, our focus on selling products and services is towards our localities, then at a national level and then to the world. One of the biggest problems we have is access to credit, but not just any credit, access to credit with really affordable interest rates, which encourages us to take money to invest and take risks. Today it is very difficult for any entrepreneur - I am not going to talk about the specific technology sector because I think it is different from the sector of micro and small businesses, especially small businesses that sell specific products - to grow rapidly, even if they have the good will and the capacity and education necessary to carry out correct policies within the company.

I always say that the micro and small entrepreneur, today with the models of businesses that are carried out have a very high tendency to disappear.

And if new entrepreneurs are not introduced to an entrepreneurial culture From the educational system, it is very difficult to think that we will have young graduates eager to be job generators. It must also be said, as a businessman or micro-businessman, I have to say that we have always carried the heavy burden of being seen differently for saying that we are "businessmen", when the definition is that which defines capital and work, which combines capital and work. In other words, a fairground worker is a businessman.

We have underlying issues, barriers to break down, we have to put a lot of effort into it. focus on the interior of the country. We have to avoid condemning these children for not having tertiary education to remain in total informality. We have to work on educating new entrepreneurs about the importance of being in the formal system. We have to work on unfair competition. In the interior of the country, *delivery* They are a big problem. In my department, in the city of Mercedes, there are practically no restaurants. We have become accustomed to the system *delivery* Obviously, not all of them compete, some of them in a rather unfair way, which makes it very difficult to maintain the structures.

And if we leave as they said, *shopify* And yes! You guys in Montevideo go to pick up a product, open a gate and inside there's a whole business organization! I saw it on one occasion when I went to pick up a product that I bought on Mercado Libre and I said to myself: "I went to the wrong place. It can't be here."

We have these changes in production models, but it is our duty as legislators must ensure that those who are going to compete do so legally.

MRS. SANGUINETTI (Carmen). -First of all, I would like to thank the panel of experts for their presentation; it is a pleasure to listen to them. I think there are many of us who have taken note, like crazy, of all these assignments, of the number of suggestions, inputs and so on.

Fiorella mentioned -luckily we have a teleworking law- the issue of Flexible working hours. I don't want to be self-referential, but I did think that, given that we are talking about this topic and that it was mentioned, I think it is a very suitable example to demonstrate the resistance to change that we have in Uruguay. And without getting into politicizing the issue and of course we know who opposed what has to do with the weekly calculation of the schedule - I don't want to get into the political debate - it seems to me quite symbolic what this topic implies and many of the issues that you have in your wish list and so on, have to do with an agility that today as a State is costing us.

I think that in this space of the Special Commission of Futures that precisely The Commission is dreaming of the future, we should delve deeper into these issues, which are clearly a demand of the various experts who have come. It seems to me that, if we add to this the challenges of Uruguay due to the scale, the central issue and the core issue that we have at the level of productivity and so on, there is no other option than to face this issue, which I personally, and I believe that the entire commission, assumes as a challenge for the coming months.

Thank you so much.

MR. PRESIDENT. -We would like to express our deepest gratitude to Mrs. María Inés Fariello and Mrs. Fiorella Haim, and to Mr. Leonardo Loureiro and Mr. Enrique Topolansky, to Gabriel Burdín - from England - and to Mr. Martín Inthamoussu.

Silvia Nane was going to coordinate this instance; she would have done it much better than I was there, but due to a health issue of a very close relative, I was unable to attend. We are very grateful for joining us during this time via Zoom.

As I said, everything that is exchanged here, proposed, is going to be processed and collected, as we have done before. Naturally, our commitment is to specify those things that we see that need legal regulation to help, promote, facilitate and facilitate.

We remind you that on Thursday, August 11, at 4 p.m., we will have the Third thematic axis: New capabilities for the 21st century, lifelong learning, coordinated by legislators Carmen Sanguinetti and Martín Melazzi and a group of experts who accompanied us.

The meeting is adjourned.

(It is 17:47)

Montevideo, Uruguay. Legislative Branch.