



## **SPECIAL COMMISSION ON FUTURES**

*(Session held on May 31, 2022).*

**MR. PRESIDENT.** -If there is a quorum, the session is open.

*(It is 2:12 p.m.)*

- We welcome the delegation of the College of Sociologists of Uruguay, The committee is made up of its president, sociologist Eduardo Bottinelli, and a member of the Board of Directors, sociologist María Julia Acosta. I would like to remind you that this group had expressed its interest in joining the work of the committee, which is very good news for us. As you know, we are just beginning the work, so we are doing trial and error and, therefore, making mistakes and omissions. Consequently, the first thing I must do is thank you and apologize for not having invited you formally and in a timely manner.

**MR. BOTTINELLI.** -First of all, I would like to thank you for welcoming us, because this is something unprecedented for the College of Sociologists, which has never had such an opportunity. Furthermore, the initial receptiveness is very important for us.

The College of Sociologists of Uruguay presented a note as a complaint – I clarify, in a good sense – and to point out the absence of sociology – especially the sociology of work – in a central aspect such as the future of work.

First of all, I want to say who we are who are present here:  
The speaker is Eduardo Bottinelli, who, in addition to presiding over the college until the end of the year, is the director of Factum and a professor and researcher in the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of the Republic, and María Julia Acosta, who is a member of the Board of Directors of the College of Sociologists and director of Social Studies of Equipos Consultores and grade 3 of Sociology of Work. This means that she also has a professional insertion. It is important to emphasize that our participation here is on behalf of the college and that it does not involve the other professional activities that we both have.

One of the elements that we consider relevant to highlight is that our note and our request are in no way questioning the professionals who currently make up the commission.

After learning about the composition of the Special Commission on Futures – through the press – especially on this specific point of the future of work and the work of the future, we began to receive some questions and comments from colleagues, who raised the issue of the absence I mentioned with respect to the sociological vision of work.

So, very briefly, we want to present some elements that we believe that they should be considered in this commission and that they have to do with the role that sociology in general and the sociology of work in particular have had, which has participated in different advisory bodies, both to unions – to the PIT-CNT itself – and mainly to the State itself, at the level of the Presidency, the OPP, the Ministry of Labor and Social Security and also international organizations. In other words, there is a relevant link between the sociology of work and work as a whole.

In addition, there are international organizations and networks that are made up of those who are dedicated to sociology, so there is international recognition of the sociology of work in Uruguay. It is part of networks such as the Latin American Council of Social Sciences and the Latin American Association for Labor Studies; it even hosted the Congress of the Latin American Association for Labor Studies. As you can see, there is a significant accumulation.

I would like to tell you that the College of Sociologists is already twenty-five years old – was founded in 1997 and is an organization that brings together sociology graduates from all over the country. We are in the process of organizing the 5th Uruguayan Congress of Sociology, in which there is a specific working group on the sociology of work. In addition, the College of Sociologists was part of the organization of the Congress of the Latin American Association of Sociology.

Among the objectives that we have as a school – established in the statutes– includes promoting the scientific development of sociology; encouraging the intervention and planning of social actions for the benefit of the community; disseminating national sociological production by encouraging multidisciplinary exchange at national and international level; promoting training and professional development by energizing the connection of professionals with the academic community, and consolidating the recognition of the profession, representing and supporting its members through the contribution of activities that give prestige to sociology. It is within this framework that we request this intervention.

In turn, we have brought copies of some productions. The first is called *The sociological profession in Uruguay in times of change –les*. We are going to leave a copy, which is the result of the IV Uruguayan Congress of Sociology and includes some works and articulations that have been made of sociology in Uruguay and the dialogue with Latin America. There is also the *Journal of Social Sciences*, in which there is a specific article that we wanted to present and that is called "Transformations in the world of work in Uruguay: management in the custom software sector", which was prepared by María Julia Acosta. We also have the book *Uruguay from the*

*sociology 18*, The article is an account of the different working groups of the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences. There are two groups of sociology of work, one of which is the one that María Julia Acosta is part of, to whom I give the floor.

**MRS. ACOSTA.** -I'm going to summarize so as not to take up any more of your time.

The Sociology of Work Area of the Department of Sociology, which is The group, made up of researchers who are also part of the National System of Researchers, has a long history. Perhaps the main reference is Marcos Supervielle, although there are also Francisco Pucci and Mariela Quiñones, among others.

I want to point out that we have done a lot of research lately. funded by the Sectoral Commission for Scientific Research of the University of the Republic, all aimed at understanding the work culture, both from the workers' and companies' perspectives. There we delved into topics related to human resource management strategies, very important aspects when looking at the future and the future of work. In particular, it is about understanding what it means to work and what it means to solve problems. We delved into these topics because we believe that they may be relevant.

Finally, I would like to point out that sociology has interpreted society through the category of work; or sea, is a founding category. The classics of sociology have analyzed the great social transformations based on work. We thought it relevant to claim a little of the historical knowledge of sociology in this instance.

**MR. BOTTINELLI.** -The idea is to make a brief presentation to quickly present some elements thinking about this work, but also about other areas of sociology. The book I mentioned summarizes the different insertions in education, health, politics, etc. There are a number of areas in which we believe that the dialogue of sociology with the political system is something important and fundamental. We believe that sociology can provide a vision of things that often escape other types of studies.

I simply want to reinforce what Ms. María Julia Acosta said, that the first works in sociology strongly reflected how work is structuring and how it produces changes in societies, both in terms of their organization, their hierarchies, and their values. From that perspective, we see that the inclusion of sociology can contribute.

Thank you so much.

**MRS. NANE.** -Good afternoon. Thank you very much for coming and for stepping forward when you saw that you were not included here to be able to collaborate.

I would like to ask two questions, one of them related to what Mr. Bottinelli just said.

The world of work has undergone a revolutionary change since the pandemic, both in places that were prepared for teleworking and those that were not. Personally, I am closely linked to the world of software, so it was not difficult for me to stay at home and work. However, in other areas there was a great transformation; so much so that today people continue to work from home.

Here we talked about management and other things in software companies. One of the big concerns that exists when one has dispersed teams is knowing how to transmit the company culture. Now, the topic that we could start thinking about in the committee is how this sociology of work changes when work actually becomes an individual task. It is true that one has to be much more creative when thinking about all those tools that allow the collectivization of knowledge, tasks, collaboration, etc. This is a crucial point that we must raise in this area.

The other thing that worries me is that recruitment systems are one of the categories in which they are making the most progress, both in data mining and in artificial intelligence.

So, one of the crucial elements in the topic we are analyzing about the future of work is not only about knowing how someone who has a job is going to transversalize that future, how they are going to be challenged by that future and how the future is going to challenge work, but also about who is going to access the jobs of the future, that is, how the personnel selection funnel is going to work when it goes through automation. Automation is going to be based on artificial intelligence; artificial intelligence is based on algorithms; algorithms have the same biases that the data that feeds the algorithm generally have, so it is necessary to change a little that taxonomy that often leads us to classifications.

I wanted to ask you about those two issues in case you have anything to comment on.

**MRS. ACOSTA.** -What happens is that there are quite homogenizing views that tend to think: "How good the algorithm is, it solves things!" In reality, we also claim that the actual practice of work should be studied. For example, in the case of teleworking, it is notable what has happened with respect to this kind of hybrid work installation, where organizations, from the management side, are faced with the need to generate organizational belonging, collaborative work, and they have found very innovative and interesting solutions. For example, the other day we were doing an interview in a company and they told us that they would meet on Wednesdays; the whole organization meets on Wednesdays; they have a meeting modality.

of work *full time* and *part time* But things like what is happening now are starting to happen and they need to be studied.

We all have an idea of what automation means and what could happen, but in reality we have to see how the entire human resources management and the entire work process is being implemented – on the part of the workers and also from the organizations. We all know that it is transversalized by technology, which sometimes helps in the processes, but it also makes some organizational changes difficult and requires adaptation on the part of the workers. It is very interesting because we have to see what is actually happening in the organizations.

I think the selection funnel is also going in that direction. We know which ones These are the most in-demand jobs and the most in-demand skills; however, we need to see what we have to do to have these workers with these skills and who incorporate the idea of the need to change their skills as their work progresses.

**MR. BOTTINELLI.** -I simply want to say that we should not focus only on what happens in the world of work or in this selection process, but on those who do not have access or are left out of a possible change. Also, in this process of hybridisation of work, we must see what the repercussions are on daily life, on care and on the minimum infrastructures necessary to be able to carry out work outside the traditional organisational sphere. That is why I said that, beyond thinking of work as an element in itself and the way in which it is organised, we must think about everything that these changes imply in other elements linked to people's daily lives and the ways in which they are organised, both within the company and in the impact they can have on people's daily lives, on possible demands for care, on education - both in public and private education - on activities related to the educational system. There are more elements that have been challenging societies for some time in different sectors and, without a doubt, the pandemic accelerated a series of processes.

**MR. VALDOMIR.** -I join in welcoming the initiative taken by colleagues from the College of Sociologists to be received in our committee.

I'm going to make a couple of comments.

First of all, it must be acknowledged that Uruguayan sociologists have historically been linked to foreign associations, networks, and working groups on issues related to the sociology of work. Francisco Pucci, who was secretary of the Latin American Association of Sociology of Work, was mentioned. Other works related to the pulp industry have also been widely discussed and have been useful for political discussion in different instances in Parliament.

I would like to ask the school to systematize some articles classics of the sociology of work in Uruguay in recent years and that refers it to

the secretariat of the Special Commission on Futures to have it as a thematic library linked to everything that has been developed by professionals in our country in this area.

Secondly, I would like to mention that, as you well know, the Special Commission on Futures is taking its first steps. Although its constitution has been discussed since the last legislature, we are only taking our first steps last year or this year, and that is surely why we have been missing some fundamental calls for academic and professional actors that should be consulted on a permanent basis for the work of this commission. So we will surely be able to do things together with the College of Sociologists and with the thematic groups that are linked not only to the sociology of work but also to other topics. Perhaps, during the treatment of this matter in the commission we will be able to explore some more permanent links or some kind of more specific agreement or convention.

On the other hand, we cannot forget that it is a round trip, so when the College of Sociologists or some other institution –for example, the Udelar or the Faculty of Social Sciences– organizes activities, it would be good if we were invited and invited to have a political perspective, with a prospective and forward-looking view, which is something new in terms of legislation for the national Parliament. Surely, we from this commission will be very happy if we are invited and summoned.

Thank you so much.

**MR. PRESIDENT.** -If there are no further questions or comments, we appreciate the presence of the delegation from the College of Sociologists of Uruguay at today's session.

I think it is clear that we are very pleased to receive your justified request. We have a very busy agenda, which we will define today between now and September, and we will pass it on to you. The focus for this year is: "The future of work, the work of the future." We have some proposals there to work on five dimensions and of course to analyze some of them, how we are going to distribute the task of preparing the work on these thematic axes, we will be calling you with great pleasure, accepting your offer.

So thank you very much and we'll be seeing each other.

*(The delegation from the College of Sociologists of Uruguay leaves the room).*

– The third point on the agenda is to define the regime of work and coordination of upcoming events.

We have two or three important tasks to define today.

A draft document has been distributed to each member of the committee.

As always, we have been working here with proposals, which we then define together. But time passes, the last Monday of September is approaching, and the task ahead of us is quite important, to put it one way. So, we have been working on a proposal on how to approach this topic that we have chosen – “The future of work, the work of the future” – and we already had a triggering instance a month ago – which simply intended to start the task – with the presentations of the economists Munyo and Zunino.

The proposal now is to address five axes.

The first of them is "Transformation and emerging vectors in the world of work in the 21st century", which in some way implies a more general approach.

The second is “Transformation and emerging vectors that imply new economic practices and value production in the 21st century,” that is, how the digital, technological, etc. revolution is generating changes in production and productivity as well.

The third axis refers to new capabilities for the 21st century, that is, everything that we already know is happening with respect to the new skills that are required for the work of the future. Within this framework is the whole issue of capabilities, both for the new generations and for the current ones, and this permanent learning that must be done, even having a job that may seem stable.

The fourth axis is the issue of long-lived societies, that is, this situation known as “100+”. Of course, this does not have to be literally so, but it is undeniable that people are reaching older ages, which also generates a transformation in current employment and the creation of new jobs for these new populations. We are seeing there an emergence of new ways of working for older people.

The fifth axis is “The Governance of the Work of the Future: Regulation and Labor Policy in a Changing Era,” that is, more focused on regulatory issues. I repeat that we are always talking about proposals. We are not going to discuss any specific bill here.

So, the proposal is to define at least five three-hour sessions to work on each thematic axis between now and September 20. We should choose among ourselves which topic is our preference or which one we feel most knowledgeable about or most willing to study. We have a group of experts – more than twenty – specific to the topic of work. We also have other groups interested in working. Today the College of Sociologists was presented, but also, for

For example – and we have mentioned this – we have been asked to participate by companies and personnel selection managers. As the senator just said, there is a whole change taking place in personnel selection. In this sense, the Association of Search and Selection Companies has asked us to participate. There is also a very interesting working group of public and also private companies that meet periodically to deal with, precisely, all these transformations, which has raised the possibility of participating. Thirdly, the group of labor lawyers has naturally asked us to have their participation. As you can see, these groups identify or are linked more precisely with one of the vectors.

In turn, among the more than twenty experts specific to this topic, There are also people who are more specialized in skills and others in technological and business changes, among others.

We are fifteen members. So, I think that we should make the effort, between now and the end of the week, to express what our preferences would be in order to prepare the activity, with all that that implies. Consider that we have to go towards a more internal activity. That is what they are also asking us for and it is a learning process that we are doing. Most of the experts and groups that are asking us to participate prefer an instance of exchange work with us. In that sense, the dynamic could be fifteen or twenty minute presentations. The idea would be that three or four experts, in an hour or an hour and ten minutes, give us very synthetic presentations of their perspectives and, from there, an exchange of the entire commission would begin to generate the input that we are looking for.

Therefore, this document is a draft. So, if the deputy Lilián Galán chooses “Transformation and emerging vectors in the world of work in the 21st century” and wants to design other questions, these are of no use. I insist: it is simply a draft.

We have to choose, then, five days, with three hours, and divide these axes, unless someone else comes up. There we would begin the work of choosing the experts that we are going to bring. Not all of them have to make presentations. In fact, most of them have told us that their intention is to participate. We do not have to feel obliged to give them ten, fifteen or twenty minutes. Perhaps simply with the invitation for that day to participate in the exchange just like us, with a comment or a question.

So two or three of us would have to take charge of each thematic axis and distribute the dates. We all have the data at our disposal, and the group of advisors and I are, of course, at our service. I insist: I think it would be good to distribute the work because it is also a way of incorporating or integrating profiles. All the experts are asking us to have a closer personal relationship with the different members of the commission, which seems totally natural to me. So, this dynamic that I am suggesting would allow all of that at the same time.



**MRS. SANGUINETTI.** -I would like to ask a question and make a comment.

The question is whether the list of experts is categorized by these areas.

The comment has more to do with the modality. I think that all those who We are legislators in Uruguay today and we have an average of three to six or seven events per week. I am referring to instances where there is a platform and speakers who speak, in a communication that is mainly unidirectional. Those of us who come from other areas know that today spaces for exchange and dialogue are being generated that are much more participatory. I could name five or six methodologies, but that is not relevant. What I am saying is that I think it would be good if, from the Special Commission on Futures, we also had the audacity to start proposing exchange formats that break this linear structure, because, from my perspective, it responds to another era in which the sender was there and the receiver was passive in the information. Today we are all senders and receivers and these dialogues are generated in all spaces.

I think it would be a great opportunity, as a Special Commission on Futures, to start thinking about more disruptive ways to hold these meetings.

**MR. PRESIDENT.** -I totally agree. That is what we are doing with our proposal. I take responsibility for what has been done so far in that format, because we needed to start, but I think we are all demanding a different type of dynamic.

It seems to me that in order to give comprehensiveness to this topic we need to go through these There are five dimensions. After each one, you can change the title, expand on them, and refine them. Between the groups and the experts, we have these five areas well covered. Guillermo Dutra, from Inefop, for example, was not invited specifically for the new skills, but when we invited him we thought that was what he was going for, and each of the experts has a specific area. So we can easily place these groups in these thematic axes, but I would like it to be a decentralized work.

Of course, the lists are not closed. I thought it was important to call the College of Sociologists together today, which requested its participation, to give signs that this is open. Naturally, we have a line of experts – that is what we call it – meaning that those who come to work in an area in a certain dimension must have knowledge of the subject and studies on the subject.

So, if the legislators agree, we will work from now on. We discussed this draft, which is a guide, over the weekend and we distributed the different axes according to each person's preferences. Perhaps we can have a more operational, very concrete session next week to define the groups and, in any case, help us distribute the experts, if we are not sure.

**MRS. NANE.** -I think the working dynamic is fine, but I would like to make a comment.

As Senator Sanguinetti said, the truth is that we do not discuss these issues much. It is true that we have opportunities to reach agreements on many things that today or tomorrow may become, perhaps, State policies, but I think we would be somewhat lacking in honesty if at some point we did not exchange, in the form of a debate, a model of society of the future. Everything is fine with the work of the future, but in what model of society? I put it in terms of a debate. Let us take the second issue, that is, what will be the productive transformation, and I think that there we have ideological elements that run through us. It is fine, because each one of us is here representing certain ways of thinking crossed by ideologies. So, when we go to the new models of production, beyond the fact that it is in a prospective visualization, I think that we can reach coincidences in some things, but serious discrepancies in others, and it is good to put them on the table and give ourselves the possibility of having those more ideological debates.

I don't think that we can expect a parliamentary commission to not have an ideological debate. In fact, for those who come, it is good that the discussions are not always held in a completely aseptic way, as if we all thought the same about the means of production, the economy and that spillover is the same as equal distribution of wealth, because it is not, and I propose it so that we can have a debate afterwards. So, I think that at some point – in one session, in two, in three or in as many as we see necessary – we should have that discussion that will be interesting for others. We are all capable of having it. It would even be so that evidence of the discussion is generated because, otherwise, it seems to me that we would remain in the utopia that the future will be as each one of us thinks it is and it is aseptic to ideology, but it seems to me that it is not.

Thank you so much.

**MRS. SANGUINETTI.** -I wanted to respond or make a comment on what Senator Nane has just pointed out. I am reminded of the efforts that have been made to maintain balance and plurality of views.

I also think it would be valuable to incorporate this phase of debates between the We have our own experts with visions, because we debate all the time. Perhaps it would be novel to create a space for debate. I would love it. I don't know if we are going off on a tangent – Senator Nane and I are quite good at that – but I think it would be interesting to think about that. It seems to me that many of the names we have there debating on one of these five thematic axes are like renting balconies.

**MRS. NANE.** -I'll add a couple more topics. This is going to end up being crossed by an intergenerational debate at some point, by a gender debate and possibly by a debate with a childhood and adolescent perspective.

**MRS. RODRIGUEZ.** -And ethnic.

**MRS. NANE.** -Exactly, Senator Rodriguez, because the future is not going to be the same for everyone and it is not going to affect us all equally. So, I think we have to start putting our differences on the table, because they are also the basis for our construction. I just wanted to say that we should not remain so aseptic in the discussions we have and in the way we look at things.

Thank you.

**MR. PRESIDENT.** -In light of these proposals, my view would be the following. There would be a first period to generate inputs, perspectives, to make contributions –as is well said in this methodology, “emerging trends”– and to see where they are appearing, and without a doubt the experts, in their great majority, will bring us new questions. Now, after these five instances where there will be a leading role of the experts, we will have to go to the report phase –there will be a first draft report– and I believe that there would be the ideal instance or with more inputs to carry out this debate. In fact, this report does not have to be agreed upon and it will not be voted on, but the similarities and differences could be translated into this final report. The idea is that it is carried out between the end of September and March to have time and to have a more crude preliminary report, with more inputs. The last Monday of September is what the law requires us to do. In it there will be all the contributions of the experts who are very plural and speak about different aspects. In addition, we are also going to have an opportunity to exchange questions – I would like that time to be longer – and once that phase is over in September we will have to hold an event that could be more outward-looking, with presentations, that can translate some of these things. Then we would have six quiet months to think about it and we would have the help of the advisors. Without a doubt, we will have coincidences, because there are aspects of reality that, no matter how many different views we have, are pure and hard reality, and in many cases we have to approach it in a single way. If there are aspects that lead us to have different views of where we have to go towards that future, I think that it will be an opportunity for debate to be able to justify why, for example, Deputy Melazzi believes that the way is this way and Senator Sanguinetti believes that it is that way. This will also help us to reflect, because the other could bog us down from the start.

If you agree, we would use these five instances, rather from a perspective of inputs, with a more exchange methodology. I would take Senator Sanguinetti's proposal that each group or subgroup propose the methodology that seems best to them, because later we will continue to learn and next year we will have a more sophisticated methodology that works better. Once that is finished, we will give space to all the experts to be with us, either by presenting ten

minutes, exchanging ideas or simply being there. Then, with these inputs we will prepare a draft of reports and begin to discuss similarities, differences and foundations. In this sense, our role is to offer Parliament and society a response as to where we see these challenges and transitions; that is where the wealth lies. A regulatory proposal may appear in an obvious way – this is one of the discussions I have had – that we all see that we have to anticipate and why not include it and naturally pass it on to the corresponding commission, but that comes from here. It is much easier for an anticipatory proposal to come from here – although it may seem a little more distant – than for it to arise from the respective commission where the situation is. It seems to me that that is the function we have and that is where we are going.

So, we agreed that we will divide up the topics until the weekend. We are finishing the month of May, we have June, July, August and half of September left and, as I have been told, the accountability meeting in the middle, because it starts on July 1. Taking that into account, we should have at least one session per month: in June, July, August and September, and then we will see when we will have a fifth one. There, the first one, which is going to take us a little more time to prepare, should be around June 20. We should think about dates; I am going to throw some out, but I did not want to do it before having this methodology approved. We defined this point in this way, with the clarification that it is a working draft and will be included in the shorthand version as such.

The second point that we also wanted to share and report is related to the World Bank, which, as you may remember, offered us a job to explore public opinion. Perhaps I am not using the best term, but in a way it involves conducting a series of interviews with workers and businessmen, as well as with a group of young people and adults chosen using a certain methodology. The World Bank offered to do it with Consulting Teams and we had no objection because it was a serious company. So, they would be in a position to offer us this job, which has already begun, with a kind of *focus group*. Although I don't know if that is the correct terminology. Basically, the chosen group is totally diverse, plural and representative to explore, from the methodology of the question –and now they are going to send you what the Consulting Team gave us–, the visions and perceptions of workers on aspects of the transformations that they imagine the world of work is going through and the challenges that these impose on our society from a future perspective. The consultation is always from that perspective: imagining what is coming, what they are experiencing, what are the transformations that they see and the threats, always in terms of the future.

In addition, they offer us to participate in those *focus group*. It was a coincidence, and that is why I wondered today about the coincidence that sociologist María Julia Acosta came, who is in charge of the work, always accompanied by the advisor Lydia Garrido and the UNDP team, but I repeat that this work is being done by Consulting Teams. As I said, they offer us to participate – apparently it is something that is always done – both in the instances and in a meeting before making the report. So, beyond the fact that individually someone wants to participate in one of these instances of

I think it would be good –and if they agree, we will define it– to have that meeting before the report –because once it is done, it is done– so that they can tell us what they worked on, what they saw and also so that we can discuss with them what kind of report we want based on the inputs. Why? Because the World Bank always said that they wanted to collaborate with the Special Commission on Futures. They are not imposing a job, but rather they are always based on what we ask of them. So, based on that, I inform them on what basis Equipos Consultores is working and, if they agree, we tell them that before finishing their work they should have an opportunity with us to see the progress and also discuss on what basis to make the report.

If you agree, we move on to the third and final topic.

*(Supported).*

– Time goes by and we have at least two international events in which we are going to participate. One is the one that was already defined, the one from Finland, which is going full steam ahead. Through the embassy we are going to have, among other things that I don't remember now, cultural contributions. There will be participation from artists who are going to go from Uruguay, because they are going to start a tour in Helsinki on that same date.

Likewise, in mid-July, the first meeting of future commissions will be held in the Parlatino. We are given a very important role because from our beginnings many countries have been consulting us and creating their future commissions. I have participated in some. Last week I was virtually in the middle of the Paraguay future commission. The truth is that we consider ourselves pioneers in this in Latin America. We have also been asked to participate significantly in this first meeting of future commissions in the Parlatino, in Panama. Perhaps some of you are more experienced; I clarify that I have never participated in the Parlatino in Panama. We have to think that at least three of the members of this commission must participate in this instance, which would be around July 20 in Panama. Our representatives in the Parlatino, deputy Juan Rodríguez and Sánchez are working, and they have been the ones who have been informing us. Naturally, they will bring us details because they have some meetings this week. What we need to know is that on July 20, for at least three days, we must attend that meeting. And on June 23 at 4:00 p.m., the UNDP is organizing an event. All the representatives from each country in the Americas are going to meet here in Montevideo and they want to have a meeting with us on June 23 at 4:00 p.m. The idea is that this meeting will be short and that we will present the work we are doing. Other activities will also be generated there, such as the one you just mentioned, on June 20 approximately. It is an initiative that comes from the UNDP. Luckily, there are a few of us. Those of us who can be there on June 23 at 4:00 p.m., great; it will only be for an hour. We are going to have a nice meeting in one of the anterooms. The number two of the UNDP is coming. That program is very enthusiastic about the work it is doing with us and, naturally, wants to promote it in other countries. That is why he wants to have that meeting on June 23, at 4:00 p.m. in the anteroom and, I repeat, it is only for one hour.

I don't know if we have any other topics. If not, we'll stick to those assignments and see each other.

You will now receive the work of Consulting Teams by email.

Thank you so much.

The meeting is adjourned.

*(It is 3:09 p.m.)*

*(Document that was decided to be included in the shorthand version).*

## **«Special Commission of Futures: lines of work 2022**

### **The Future of Work and The Work of the Future**

#### **Document draft of job**

Lydia Garrido

Futures Methodological Advisor.

UNESCO Chair in Anticipation and Resilience

Bruno Gili

Coordinator of the Group of Experts

Support

UNDP Technical Secretariat

The Special Commission of Futuros is tasked with preparing a "Report on the Future" within the period of each legislative term on topics of strategic relevance for the country. During the current legislature, the challenge is the construction of shared meaning that

allows generating inputs and to delve into the challenges that involves The Future of Work and the Work of the Future. Specifically, he aims at the preparation of a document to Starting from a process of collective intelligence, which nourishes a proactive view of various political spheres of decision, as well as to society as a whole. A progress report will be presented in September of 2022 and a final report in March 2023.

We live in times where we have to learn to pay more attention to what is new, different, to the unknown as a point of support to "make sense" of what is being and becoming. A series of intertwined phenomena (vectors of change) are creating an environment that is not only changing but disruptive. This requires other capabilities and skills to manage in it. In this sense, the pandemic has been—and it is being—a kind of learning classroom to train us in the acquisition of greater ability to orient ourselves when everything that is usual and known changes. Among

learnings, brought about having to let go of linear logics of forecasting and planning, and forced us to have to learn skills on a third form of anticipation, which is the one that, in an environment of novelty, surprise, uncertainty in the face of the unknown, still manages to find direction.

We can no longer plan linearly from A to B, assuming that we have plenty of time (years) and that the rest of the environment will remain the same and without influence. Today we are in dynamics of change that are not only accelerated, but multiple and intertwined, which makes it difficult to achieve the goals that we have. *change changes*.

And among the things that have changed is the axis of support to understand the change. It has become obsolete relying exclusively on what is known, on what is being

from the past, but it becomes essential to give entry to the future, to what is not yet but is being and becoming. We need *ambidexterity* double: on the one hand, for

to simultaneously articulate the here and now (the present) with the medium and long term; and to distinguish and articulate what is known and comes from the past, with what is new, different, that the future brings and that is also in the present (although it is not yet obvious, because it cannot be "seen" at a glance, because it is still being configured). And it is precisely this specificity of the nature of the future (which is not yet...) that allows us to have the possibility of influencing, of transforming the future. *before it is* (before it is a "fait accompli") and thus create other futures. This poses a difficulty

and

particular complexity to the topics and problems that arise in the “futures key”, requiring logic and methodological frameworks different from those we generally use.

The purpose of addressing the problems related to “Work” is not to predict what will happen in the future in the world of work, but to explore alternatives by reflecting on future aspects and interrelations linked to this issue. In this way we will be able to better capture “emerging”, “vectors of change”, complex interactions and interdependencies that lead us to rethink and reconsider the “known”, giving space to the new and different that has been entering other systemic parameters to explore the novelty. In other words, using other approaches that are not based on a “more of the same”, known, past, but thought “outside the box” of the usual; reframing the problems to rethink them. In this way, we seek to generate information of higher quality and relevance to expand the alternatives and options that we have at present. These inputs can be useful for decision making from

a

anticipation that transforms the future into the present (in other words, *a anticipation that creates futures*).

With the aim of preparing a report on the Future of Work in terms of anticipation, the following five thematic axes are proposed: 1. Vectors of transformation and emerging that involve *arethink* the world of work as we know it in the last century: permanences and differences, what challenges does it pose to us?

2. Transformation and emerging vectors that imply *arethink* 3. New skills for the 21st century: Lifelong learning (“Learning-intensive societies”); 4. Long-lived societies (100+): Transitions towards a future of longevity. Their impact on the world of work; 5. The governance of the work of the future: regulation and labour policy for a change of era. These will be worked on in five working meetings with the participation of members of the CEF group of experts and legislators. In addition, seminars will be held (some public) and other inmates in sessions of the CEF) where members of the group of experts will present

their work. In addition, interviews will be conducted with members of the group of experts, which will be recorded and available for dissemination through a cycle of *podcasts*. The inputs will be systematized and analyzed within a methodological framework in terms of futures in order to have an initial matrix that allows identifying challenges to work on: vectors of systemic transformation, signs of change, emerging, identification of threats, opportunities, inhibitors and enablers of change. Various methodologies of futures studies will be articulated for the production, systematization and knowledge analysis. (See Methodological Plan).



Below are the five thematic axes that will guide this stage of the agenda:

CEF work during the year 2022, which are based on the process generated to date (with contributions to date from more than thirty experts). Some questions and dynamics are indicated to be addressed collectively.

## 1. Transformation vectors and emerging in the world of work in the 21st century

The world of work is undergoing radical change, where there is probably more that we don't know than we do know. One thing we do know is that the condition of permanent creation of novelty brings with it "perpetual disruption." And *in and for* In this context, we should assume that we must start working immediately. There are vectors and signs of change that have already been identified, for example, automation, the development of robots and artificial intelligence, digital platforms, collaborative economy modes, to mention some of the best known and which already have a direct impact on the workforce, the content of work and labour relations.

The problem is that these changes are part of much broader phenomena such as the powerful technological platform that interconnects nanotechnology, biotechnology, computational and cognitive sciences that are permanently creating new materials, new products, new processes and modes of production and organization of knowledge and work. This is intertwined with other dimensions and phenomena such as the stress on planetary boundaries, which urgently requires us to change modes of production and consumption. And to mention just one more that adds novelty and also complexity (opens up the possibility of changing the way we live). odds and also new gaps) the active elongation of human life, long-lived societies and people who change needs and aspirations, with a direct relationship to the world of work, production and the economy in general.

All this is defining new conditions for the topic of the "future of work" as a highly complex problem. It is in this context and nature of the problem that Uruguay faces the challenge of how to raise and re-raise this issue in a way that articulates our needs and aspirations, supporting the *change in the terms of the change*. One of the main challenges is to achieve capacities in the political system that allow anticipatory governance.

Suggestions for discussion:

– Identify main vectors and phenomena of change in the greater context in the which we are inserted. Distinguish some of its interweavings (cross impacts). Technology is a main vector, but there are also others that equally imprint

potential for disruptive changes. It is important to see the interrelations with other dimensions and vectors of transformation.

– SWOT matrix: identify threats, opportunities, strengths (enablers of change), weaknesses (inhibitors/obstacles). Based on the above, suggest challenges that are main focuses to deepen and generate information for decision-making and definition of actions.

## **2. Vectors of transformation and emerging that imply new economic and value production practices in the 21st century.**

The trends underlying the process of transformation of work have impacts substantial changes in traditional productivity-generating pathways. The digital and biotechnological revolution, demographic and behavioural changes, the knowledge economy, as well as the stress on planetary boundaries imply profound changes in the models of competition of companies and in the organisation of markets and consumption. This new paradigm is characterised by a new form of global integration, where globalisation and hyperlocalisation together (interdependent autonomies), the rise of the network economy that enables the global, local and globalandsingular at the same time, new business models based on platforms of products, services and audiovisual content, virtual reality and immersive reality, parallel digital worlds (metaverse), explosion of the diversity and uniqueness of products and services, articulated decentralization (economy of *blockchain*), changes in the ways of competing and collaborating (at the same time), obsolescence of industries and industrial sectors, changes in trade in goods and services, strong global integration (and also simultaneous decentralization) of goods and services.

All of this has a direct impact on industries and productive sectors of the economy, business models, in business organization and even in the roles occupied by the State. Uruguay has the challenge of imagining diverse alternatives and opportunities in terms of futures (potentials in the present that create futures) that allow us to identify which sectors, areas, systems, models, processes, products are threatened by the process of transformation of work. and, at the same time, detect which are the key sectors to boost productivity in the future. At the same time, the digital world – and in particular the changes associated with digital platforms and automation – are modifying how labor relations are established. This poses organizational challenges for companies that must restructure themselves to accompany and enhance these changes that require organizational agility, labor flexibility, digital leadership, continuous training and education, technology transfer, automation and task reassignment, among others. Thus, when thinking about the future of work, it is necessary to distinguish between novelty and change (in their potential), in their multiplicity and diversity of alternatives, threats and opportunities to move from a logic of survival (reactive, after the changes have already occurred) to a creative adaptation (anticipatory) oriented towards prosperity.

sustainable from the logic of an innovative ecosystem that permeates business organizations and their role in a context of transformation of the world of work.

Guiding suggestions for exchange are:

- Identify main vectors and phenomena of change in the larger context in which companies are inserted.
- Restatement:
  - (Yo) Rethinking from an ecosystemic logic: what are the dimensions and actors involved;
  - (ii) Rethinking as organizations that play a key role in value creation: what threats are foreseen? What opportunities and potentials are imagined? What strengths are identified (enablers/enhancers of change)? What weaknesses are identified (inhibitors/obstacles to change)?
- Some concrete aspects: What will be the role of companies in the various scenarios of the future of work? What organizational transformation actions are necessary?

### 3. New skills for the 21st century: Lifelong learning

The series of transformations in which we are immersed, this condition of permanent creation of novelty (and one of its manifestations, the “permanent disturbance” of what is known) reconfigures the context of capacities, competencies and skills to manage in the conditions that are prefiguring the 21st century: the need for lifelong intensive learning. This becomes a condition and characterization of  
era: learning-intensive societies. This, among other things, also questions the

Traditional segmentation that understands work, skills and work capacity as separate spheres, as it requires people to be constantly learning (in addition to constantly updating their knowledge).

One of the implications is that training (and the attitude to learning) must be actively available throughout a person's life and to the whole of society. This requires that training be a constitutive element of work and also that work be understood as a learning opportunity.

Besides  
of specific knowledge in the world of work (which increasingly demands *expertise* although not only in one disciplinary area, but inter- and transdisciplinary),

Specifically, other needs arise, for example those associated with so-called non-cognitive skills or meta-skills (mental flexibility, ability to learn and relearn, self-management, critical thinking, creativity, interaction skills, empathy, resilience, collaboration).andinterconnection) that allow browsingtheuncertainty of a constantly and rapidly changing labour market and take advantage of the opportunities that this also implies.

In this context, Uruguay faces the challenge of imagining what are the capacities, competencies and skills that the future of work (that future that is in the present today) is already demanding of us to think and act in education.andcapacity building. Similarly, the integration of training and work requires rethinking the organisation of the educational system and its articulation with the world of work (work as a space for learning and integral development of people and societies, beyond a “market” logic).

Suggestions to guide the dynamics of exchanges:

- Rethinking the “meaning of work” and learning for a world in a context of permanent novelty and change.
- What are the main challenges facing Uruguay in keeping up with the changing context and requirements for performing (individuals, groups, companies) in the world of the future of work?
- What systemsandeducational models do we need to implement for continuous learning?

#### **4. Long-lived Societies (100+): Transitions towards a future of longevity**

What demographic transformation brings us as new is not all negative. There is an aspect that has remained minimized and implies great news: the increase in The potential for active life (in good health) is extending beyond the linear demographic trend projections.

While there is a “potentiality” factor here that is subject to technologies applied to health and medicine, as well as changes in habits, customs and cultural behaviors (food, sports, preventive practices, etc.) it seems to be very auspicious. Today, the need is being considered to rethink and reconsider institutions that were designed for societies with an average life span of just over 50-60 years at the beginning and middle of the 20th century) for societies close to 100 years and older (long-lived societies 100 +). Obviously this implies addressing the threat of new gaps (which will be added to those we already have, such as guaranteeing access to that extension of human life on equal terms).

As regards work in concrete terms, today it is necessary to rethink all institutions and conditions in order to also extend guarantees of access: in terms of health, education, job opportunities, etc.

Seen in this way, the problem of the current social security system is only one of the problems, and it can also be rethought taking into account a rethinking of the main issue, which is the extension of human life.

Technology opens up multiple alternatives to also make multiple solutions viable. s in Each of the aspects of this topic also becomes a “complex problem”, not necessarily negative, but its complexity is due to the interweaving with other diverse ones.

problems and their character. of potentiality that opens up positive and also negative possibilities. Take advantage and enhancing the positive from transformative anticipation seems to be a key challenge that we have with respect to thinking about work in terms of futures.

Suggestions for exchange are:

- Reframe the problem by rethinking the issue of longevity.
- What do we need to improve guarantees of access to work for older people and societies? How could we rethink the institutions and inclusive and sustainable access? Matrix of alternatives.
- Consider how to stimulate intergenerational cooperation.
- Do we need a new social contract? What are some of the guidelines we could move forward on?

## **5. The governance of work in the future: Regulation and labour policy in a change of era**

HE In the face of the transformation process of the world of work, the governance of work faces the challenge of building anticipatory institutions that facilitate certain processes and channel others towards paths that lead to desirable future scenarios. Part of the challenge involves not only innovation in governance mechanisms and institutional regulatory instruments at the national level, but also in international coordination and cooperation with a global labor market in mind.

On the other hand, the futureoftheWork governance is also given by the future of labor relationsandhesocial dialogue. Workers' organizations and the Workers' unions face challenges not only of an economic nature but also

organizational. The future of work in Uruguay may be very different from what we currently know where governments, workers and employees negotiate of manner tripartite working conditions. Thinking about future work scenarios also involves reflect on how the institutionality that regulates work will be established and through mechanisms the actors involved will participate in the process of developing labor policy.<sup>about what</sup>

Some guiding questions for the exchange are:

- What institutional mechanisms and regulatory could be necessary to facilitate certain processes for the opening of alternatives and possibilities?
- ?How possible/probable do we imagine the construction of this institutionality to be?
- Where are the main obstacles/inhibitors to change? And what could be the enhancers/enablers of change?
- What role(s) will workers' and employees' organizations (unions) play in creating alternative futures for work?

## References

Abreu, Ramiro (Ed.). (2021). *Cracking the future of work. Automation and labor platforms in the Global South*. Available in: <https://fowigs.net/publication/crackine-the-future-of-work-automation-and-labor-platforms-in-the-global-south>

Albrieu, Ramiro and Gonzalo Zunino (2022). *Latin America. The future of work in the garden of forking paths*. Available in: <https://fowies.net/pub1ication/latin-ainerica-regional-views-future-of-work/>

Gokce, T., Draskovic, D., Drinic, A., Kylymnyk, I., Seyidzade, L., and Tilavov, M. (2021). *The changing nature of work: 30 signs to look out for for a sustainable future*. UNDP Acceleration Labs.

ILO (2017) *Initial Report for the Global Commission on the Future of Work*. International Labour Office – Geneva.

ILO (2019) *Working for a brighter future – World Commission on the Future of Work*. International Labour Office–Geneva.

Oksanen, Kaisa (2017) *Government Report on the Future: A Shared Understanding of the Transformation of Work*. Publications of the Office of the Prime Minister of Finland.

World Economic Forum (2020) *Report on the future of employment*. Available in: <https://www.weforum.org/1a1atforins/centre-for-the-new-economy-and-society>

World Economic Forum (2021) *Rebuilding more broadly: policy pathways for*

*a transformation* economic. Centre for the New Economy and Society, Community document».

---

Montevideo, Uruguay. Legislative Branch.