



MINUTES

Plenary Meeting of the European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE)

Brussels, 30-31 May 2018

Wednesday, 30 May 2018

Present: Prof. Emmanuel Agius, Prof. Anne Cambon-Thomsen, Prof. Ana Sofia Carvalho, Prof. Carlos Maria Romeo Casabona, Prof. Eugenijus Gefenas, Prof. Julian Kinderlerer, Prof. Andreas Kurtz, Prof. Herman Nys, Prof. Barbara Prainsack, Dr. Siobhán O'Sullivan, Prof. Laura Palazzani, Prof. Nils-Eric Sahlin, Prof. Marcel Jeroen van den Hoven, Prof. Christiane Woopen

Excused: Prof. Jonathan Montgomery,

European Commission: Jim Dratwa, Maija Locane, Aylin Avcioglu

Nature of meeting: Non-public

11H00 - 12H00: Introduction and updates

Following an opening of the Plenary meeting by Christiane Woopen and Jim Dratwa, the Group approved the minutes of the previous Plenary meeting and of the previous Rapporteurs meeting.

Jim Dratwa informed the Group on the latest developments in the areas of the Group's remit. He also informed that the EGE Statement on AI, robotics and 'autonomous' systems was very well received even by the Finnish authorities, who are now using the EGE Statement for their strategy on AI (ethics in the focus). He underscored that the EC strategy on Cooperative, Connected and Automated Mobility (CCAM) and on AI, recently published and shared with the Group, foresees a new structural role for the EGE. He informed about the NEC forum that will take place in September in Vienna, and on the EGE Plenary meeting that will be organised there. He also drew attention to the fact that the European Academies would like to organise a joint workshop with the EGE and the Group of Chief Scientific Advisors (GCSA, ex SAM-HLG) in October.

Julian Kinderlerer indicated that there has been no reply regarding the possible publication in relation to the Statement in 'Nature' or 'Financial Times'. He agreed to get in contact with editors again.

Anne Cambon-Thomsen and Jim Dratwa recapitulated the situation for the EGE participation in ESOF and the July Plenary meeting in Toulouse. Namely, they explained the administrative details and presented the participation and panels of the EGE, including the setting of the panels.

This was followed by some reporting on the members' activities in different conferences, hearings and other events, where they, among other, represent the EGE and talk on topics relevant to the Group's work:

- Siobhán O'Sullivan provided a keynote address in a conference on human rights linked to converging and emerging technologies in Saint Petersburg.



- She also took part in the Symposium on gene editing organised by the Academy of Science of Ireland.
- Ana Sofia Carvalho organised a conference on the future of work in Portugal. Commissioner Moedas was present at the conference, and it was well received by the media.
- Carlos Maria Romeo Casabona presented the latest EGE Statement in the 25th Conference on law and human genome taking place in Spain. He briefly explained about other occasions to present the Statement (invitations by the University of Madrid, the University of Barcelona, the University of Malaga and the Senate of Spain)

More particularly on ESOF:

- Anne Cambon-Thomsen had a discussion with the president of the National Consultative Ethics Committee (CCNE) who expressed his interest to organise a meeting with the EGE during the ESOF 2019. Preferably, it would be open to public. Two potential topics were proposed: 1) European view on the recent process of consultation in France; 2) Artificial Intelligence and its ethical implications.
- A lunch will be organised with Commissioner Moedas on 9 July in Toulouse (precise timing & location tbc).
- Christiane Woopen will take part in the 2nd ALLEA workshop in Bulgaria.
- She is also invited to the opening of ESOF for the future of work.

Then the Group shortly discussed the possibility to have an EGE recognition sign/symbol such as an EGE pin or any other material.

12H00 - 13H00: Discussion on the Introduction chapter of the Opinion on the Future of Work

The Group started their discussion on the draft opinion by first tackling the introduction part. It was pointed out by several members that the current redaction of the draft text does not sufficiently emphasise an important element - that many people only work to make their living. Therefore, they might experience fear of losing the source of revenue if the number of available jobs decreases. It was agreed to update the text accordingly by also respecting the internal consistency.

Barbara Prainsack suggested including an explanation that the term 'work' in this Opinion should be understood in a broad sense. According to this interpretation, it is still possible to claim that most people will work 'in a broad sense'.

Nils-Eric Sahlin pointed out that the way how the societal transformations are presented in the Opinion is too academic.

Christiane Woopen, Barbara Prainsack and Siobhán O'Sullivan agreed to elaborate a new version of the introduction according to what has been discussed.

13H00 - 14H00: Lunch

14H00 - 14H30: Discussion on the chapter 'Concepts' of the Opinion on the Future of Work

The Group agreed to reorganise the former 'Concepts', by introducing the relevant conceptual parts in other chapters (mainly in the Introduction and in chapter 'Trends'). It was also agreed to rename the chapter 'Trends' to 'Concepts and trends'.

The group acknowledges the wide understanding of 'technologies', and in that context a focus of the Opinion is the new technologies linked to digitalisation and technologisation. Christiane Woopen suggested explaining this in the introduction part.

14H30 - 16H00: Discussion on the chapter 'Human rights and Governance' of the Opinion on the Future of Work



The Group focused on the newly drafted chapter by Herman Nys on human rights. A discussion arose as to whether the ‘international’ and ‘European’ approach should be changed in order, and the decision was to leave it as it is.

Emmanuel Agius pointed out that the Group should also elaborate on the challenges that the mentioned legislations have. This would be an innovative contribution from the EGE.

It was agreed to move this chapter after chapter ‘Concepts and Trends’ and before the chapter on Ethics. As well, this chapter should integrate the parts on governance.

It was suggested to format the legal articles in a box, in order to limit them from the Opinion’s text and facilitate the reading.

The Group was reminded to include the ideas on decoupling paid work from social security, e.g. in the section on the Social Pillar.

Marcel Jeroen van den Hoven suggested including a reference in the Opinion on the theory of contributive justice.

Barbara Prainsack raised a discussion on whether the current human rights approach is sufficient: just because people are out of employment, their human rights do not disappear.

Herman Nys in collaboration with Siobhán O’Sullivan and Jonathan Montgomery agreed to adjust the chapter accordingly.

A discussion raised whether to keep the ‘governance’ chapter as a separate chapter. The idea was to take the different paragraphs from this section and merge them in different relevant chapters (introduction, trends, etc.) Christiane Woopen reminded that it was explicitly mentioned in the request from the EC that this Opinion should address ‘governance’. Therefore it was decided that a dedicated chapter is necessary.

It was noted by Ana Sofia Carvalho that the different kind of justice theories are not explained well enough for the policy makers.

Nils-Eric Sahlin suggested including the explanations of the notions and references of the different theories in the footnote.

Julian Kinderlerer reminded that governance should address not only those working, but as well those outside of work. The Opinion should address how to extend the rights of those in work to those outside the classical working relationships.

Siobhán O’Sullivan reminded that it was already agreed that doing an overview of European labour systems is not feasible. Instead, European Pillar of Social rights should be used as a reference point.

Carlos Maria Romeo Casabona kindly proposed himself to help draft this paragraph.

16H00 - 16H15: Break

16H15 - 17H00: Discussion on the chapter ‘Trends’ of the Opinion on the Future of Work

After a short break, the Group dedicated its’ attention to the Chapter 3 on ‘Trends’.

Siobhán O’Sullivan agreed to include a section on gender (pay gap, future of work for women), as well as a section on data-driven workplaces. As well, she pointed out the migration as a trend is missed out in the Opinion. Following upon, Eugenijus Gefenas suggested adding a few paragraphs on EU internal migration. Siobhán O’Sullivan suggested, however, being careful on the formulation on any statements on this, as different Member States might have different views and approach on that. Potentially, this could be addressed under the demography section.

It was also suggested addressing the issue of inflation and buying power in this section.

It was also pointed out that increased wealth not necessarily leads to increased wages (purchasing power). Christiane Woopen agreed to include a section on wage stagnation.



Thursday, 31 May 2018

Present: Prof. Emmanuel Agius, Prof. Anne Cambon-Thomsen, Prof. Carlos Maria Romeo Casabona, Prof. Eugenijus Gefenas, Prof. Julian Kinderlerer, Prof. Andreas Kurtz, Prof. Herman Nys, Dr. Siobhán O'Sullivan, Prof. Laura Palazzani, Prof. Barbara Prainsack, Prof. Nils-Eric Sahlin, Prof. Christiane Woopen

Excused: Prof. Ana Sofia Carvalho, Prof. Jonathan Montgomery, Prof. Marcel Jeroen van den Hoven

European Commission: Jim Dratwa, Maija Locane, Aylin Avcioglu

Nature of meeting: Non-public

09H30 - 10H00: Opening and summary of the previous day

The meeting was re-opened by Jim Dratwa who pointed out that the Opinion should be (nearly) finalised during the next Plenary meeting taking place in Toulouse.

It was followed by a concise summary by Siobhán O'Sullivan recapitulate the main conclusions and steps forward agreed on the previous day:

- The 'Summary' part will be left for the end of the work on the Opinion;
- The Introduction will be adapted (Siobhán O'Sullivan, Christiane Woopen, Barbara Prainsack);
- The 'Concepts' part will be removed & the relevant parts will be moved to other sections;
- The 'Governance and Human Rights' chapter will be updated (Herman Nys, Jonathan Montgomery, Siobhán O'Sullivan, Carlos Maria Romeo Casabona)

10H00 - 13H00: Discussion on the chapter 'Ethics' of the Opinion on the Future of Work

Laura Palazzani explained that she has updated the 'Ethics' chapter according to the previous comments and revisions of the Group members, in cooperation with Jonathan Montgomery. She agreed to shorten this section by deleting some parts and move some parts of the philosophical debate to the footnote.

Several members suggested including cross-references all over the Opinion.

Then the group engaged in a discussion whether the Opinion should have a glossary section, and the overall decision was not to have a separate section. Instead, concepts should be explained in the introduction.

Julian Kinderlerer suggested developing an argument around the concept of 'working for others' and agreed to draft a short section on that. Siobhán O'Sullivan suggested introducing it in the introduction part (on the issue of the exploitation).

Barbara Prainsack proposed to read over this chapter 'for tone' and introduce cross-references with the introduction.

Nils-Eric Sahlin agreed to help refine the parts of this chapter on pages 26-34.

Emmanuel Agius suggested making this paragraph more person-oriented. E.g. by including the word 'persons' in the title of 5.3.

Barbara Prainsack pointed out to a link between technologies and the human dignity: technologies have made work more dignified, less humiliating. It was decided that a few paragraphs should be added on this.

Siobhán O'Sullivan suggested making a reference to the latest EGE Statement.

Then the members engaged in a debate over the relations between the terms 'privacy', 'right to be left alone', 'monitoring', 'autonomy' and 'surveillance'. Siobhán O'Sullivan agreed to write 1-2 paragraphs on privacy and its problematics.

Eugenijus Gefenas then raised some concerns on the existing logic of this chapter, particularly, in terms of the consistence between more theoretical and more practical parts of the chapter. It was



agreed to reduce the part of the chapter drafted by Marcel Jeroen van den Hoven and move it to the beginning of the chapter.

Relations between ‘solidarity’ and ‘justice’ were also explored, and the conclusion was to subordinate solidarity under justice, as the main focus of the Opinion is on the latter one.

Furthermore, a debate over the terms ‘inequality’, ‘inequity’ and ‘equality of opportunities’ was held. It was agreed that all of them should be mentioned; yet the focus should be on ‘inequities’.

Barbara Prainsack suggested that the main thesis of this chapter should be the idea that every one needs to have dignified life regardless if they work or not. Yet this idea was contested by some other Group members who pointed out that it should be more specific to work. The Group then engaged in a discussion on the main messages and the scope of the Opinion. The individual versus collective responsibilities were then discussed.

It was then summarised that the main elements that this chapter should include are:

- Different kind of (in)equalities
- Insight in the theories of justice
- Societal up-skilling
- Justice & solidarity
- Different kind of practices (namely, collaborative, redistributive justice)

The Group then discussed on having a rapporteurs meeting in June. It was agreed to instead organise several skype conferences (by smaller working groups) at the latest on the week of 18-22 June.

13H00 - 14H00: Lunch

14H00 - 16H30: Discussion on potential recommendations of the Opinion on the Future of Work

The Group started to draw recommendations based on the ‘connections’ described in the introduction part. Regarding the connection between paid work and personal identity, it was pointed out that the core idea is that a paradigmatic change is necessary for a wider understanding of the notion ‘work’. According to this new paradigm, unemployed could still contribute for the society and be appreciated.

The Group discussed and agreed to structure the recommendations along the approach already discussed: starting from general and conceptual recommendations (such as rethinking the concepts), to more specific and targeted recommendations.

Anne Cambon-Thomsen proposed to recommend that inclusiveness approach should be applied from the early stages of the education.

Generational aspects should be addressed in the recommendations, e.g., reducing number of available jobs due to increased retirement age, availability of grandparents for the children. A potential recommendation could invite Member States to explore the mechanisms in their respective labour markets.

The Group then elaborated on the cooperatives as a potential solution - it should be addressed in the governance chapter.

Regarding the cooperation between public authorities and the stakeholders and interest groups, it was noted that the European Union already has several forms of constructive dialogue, and they ought to be maintained, but further new forms should be created.

On the debate on up-skilling, the shared responsibility between the state, companies and the individual was highlighted.

Then the members addressed the issue of decoupling social security from the paid work. Some members raised concerns that a recommendation on this should be very carefully formulated in the light of potential misinterpretations.

The Group concluded the discussion on the Opinion with a debate on data ownership and use, the link with autonomy and the problematics of the surveillance.



16H30: End of the meeting

Action Points (*already immediately sent by email to the Group*)

Action point	Responsible	Deadline
Adapt the introduction according to the discussions.	CW, BP, SO	08/06
Complete the disaggregation of the chapter "Concepts and notions" by moving the relevant ideas to other chapters.	All rapporteurs	15/06
Share the flash report on labour market trends	SO	-
Adapt the chapter on Governance; combine it with the chapter on human rights	HN, SO, JM, CMR	08/06
Draft the gender part and the data part, in the Trends Chapter	SO	15/06
Draft 1-2 paragraphs on privacy and its problematics	SO	15/06
Draft 1-2 sentences on the need on specific sociological research	ACT	08/06
Rephrase sentences on p.27	BP	08/06
Write a sentence on "working for others" in section 5.1.	JK	08/06
Adapt the chapter on Ethics according to what has been discussed	N-ES, BP, SO, EG, to send to LP	08/06
Schedule a date(s) for Skype conference(s) – for each working group. For the week 25 (18-22 June) at the latest.	1)HN, SO, JM, CC 2)LP, N-ES, BP, SO, EG	ASAP