D9.1. Report of the executed panel discussions

The Future of Work in Europe: Ethical Horizons: A Cross-National Analysis of AI in the Future Workplace - Report on the TRANSFORM WP9 Ethical Consideration Panel Discussions

Funded by
the European Union

Document type:	Deliverable
Document preparation start date:	2025.10.27
Document end date (final version):	2025.10.31
Classification:	Public
Project Start Date:	2024-09-01
Project End Date:	2024-10-14
Deliverable Begin Date:	M11
Deliverable Due:	M14

DOCUMENT REVISION LOG

Version	Date	Description	Author
01	2025.07.01	Methodology design	Ewelina Barthel
02	2025.09.01 - 2025.10.27	Examination of the WP8 workshop	All partners (apart from NCPE Malta)
03	2025.10.01 - 2025.10.28	Workshop documentation	All partners (apart from NCPE Malta)
04	2025.10.30	Final draft D.9.1 Report	Ewelina Barthel, Katarzyna Wlusek
05	2025.10.31	Final review	Ewelina Barthel
06	2025.11.05	Final review with summaries in all languages	Ewelina Barthel and Katarzyna Wlusek

Editors: Ewelina Barthel, Katarzyna Wlusek

Contents

Ethical Horizons: A Cross-National Analysis of AI in the Future Workplace - Report on the TRANSFORM WP9 Panel Discussions

Executive Summary

This report presents a comprehensive synthesis and comparative analysis of the Work Package 9 (WP9) "Ethical Consideration Panel Discussions" conducted as part of the European Union CERV - funded TRANSFORM project. These discussions, held across eight member states - Germany, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Greece, and Belgium - brought together experts, stakeholders, and citizens to critically examine the ethical implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and automation on the future of work. The analysis of the translated transcripts of 8 panel discussions reveals a complex, nuanced, and at times contradictory European discourse on navigating this profound technological shift.

A consensus emerged that the current transformation is not merely a transition but a "huge revolution," fundamentally altering the nature of work, skills, and societal structures. Panelists consistently identified the displacement of routine tasks and the conceptual "death of mediocrity" as primary labor market changes, creating significant pressure on workers to adapt and upskill. The rapid, often opaque, development of AI was a source of widespread anxiety, with many participants describing it as a "black box" whose long-term consequences remain unpredictable.

Across all eight national discussions, a core set of foundational ethical principles for the implementation of AI in the workplace achieved consensus. These include **Transparency**, ensuring workers understand how and why AI systems are used; **Human Agency and Oversight**, guaranteeing that final authority in critical decisions rests with human beings; **Accountability**, establishing clear lines of responsibility for algorithmic outcomes; and **Fairness**, actively mitigating bias to ensure non-discrimination and equal opportunity.

The analysis highlights significant points of convergence. A palpable fear regarding the erosion of **worker privacy** through sophisticated monitoring and surveillance technologies was a universal theme. Similarly, concerns that AI could amplify existing **social and economic inequalities -** particularly affecting marginalized groups such as migrants, older workers, and those with lower qualifications - were expressed in every panel. The imperative for **lifelong learning** was unanimously identified as the single most critical adaptive strategy for both individuals and society.

The report also identifies crucial points of divergence that reflect distinct national contexts and cultural priorities. Discussions in Germany were marked by an undercurrent of anxiety about global competitiveness, framing the ethical debate within a pragmatic, policy-oriented lens. The Italian panel brought a strong focus on social justice, highlighting the exploitation of digital laborers in the global south and the specific vulnerabilities of migrants. The Polish discussion was uniquely characterized by its humanistic focus on emotions, trust, and dignity, while the Portuguese panel offered a business-centric

perspective on implementation and return on investment. Slovenia's discussion emphasized the necessity of aligning technological advancements with ethical considerations and public welfare, reflecting a commitment to balancing innovation with social responsibility. The Greek panel emphasized the need for resilience and strong leadership amidst economic challenges, highlighting the emotional toll of constant change in the context of digital transformation. The Belgian discussion critically analyzed the power dynamics of workplace surveillance, questioning whether AI is enhancing human well-being or merely reinforcing control mechanisms driven by neoliberal logic. Sweden's perspective centered on equity and inclusive design, advocating for the co-design of AI systems with marginalized communities to ensure their needs and voices are prioritized in technological development.These national nuances underscore that while the challenges are shared, the pathways to addressing them are context-dependent.

Based on these findings, this report puts forth a series of targeted recommendations for key stakeholders. For **policymakers**, it calls for the development of specific legal frameworks for AI in the workplace that go beyond existing data protection regulations, alongside massive public investment in AI literacy and "ethics-by-design" innovation. For **employers**, it recommends establishing robust internal governance structures, prioritizing transparency with employees, and investing in well-being programs with full ethical oversight. For social partners, it urges the development of deep technological expertise to effectively negotiate the terms of AI implementation and champion the rights of all workers in an increasingly automated economy. This report concludes that the successful and responsible integration of AI into the European workplace is contingent upon a sustained and inclusive ethical dialogue. The WP9 panel discussions represent a vital step in this process, affirming the need to proactively shape a future of work that aligns with the European Union's core values of human dignity, fairness, and solidarity.

Funded by
the European Union

De toekomst van werk in Europa: Ethische horizon – Een trans-nationale analyse van AI op de toekomstige werkplek – Rapport over de TRANSFORM WP9-paneldiscussies over ethische overwegingen

Samenvatting

Dit rapport biedt een uitgebreide synthese en vergelijkende analyse van de "Paneldiscussies over ethische overwegingen" binnen Werkpakket 9 (WP9), uitgevoerd als onderdeel van het door de Europese Unie, via het CERV-programma gefinancierde, TRANSFORM-project. Deze discussies vonden plaats in acht lidstaten – Duitsland, Italië, Polen, Portugal, Slovenië, Zweden, Griekenland en België – en brachten experts, belanghebbenden en burgers samen om kritisch te reflecteren op de ethische implicaties van artificiële intelligentie (AI) en automatisering voor de toekomst van werk.

Uit de geanalyseerde vertaalde transcripties van de acht paneldiscussies blijkt een complex, genuanceerd en soms tegenstrijdig Europees discours over het omgaan met deze ingrijpende technologische verschuiving. Er ontstond consensus dat de huidige transformatie geen eenvoudige overgang is, maar een "grote revolutie" die de aard van werk, vaardigheden en maatschappelijke structuren fundamenteel verandert. Panelleden wezen consequent op de verdringing van routinetaken en het conceptuele "einde van middelmatigheid" als belangrijke veranderingen op de arbeidsmarkt, wat aanzienlijke druk op werknemers legt om zich aan te passen en bij te scholen. De snelle en vaak ondoorzichtige ontwikkeling van AI veroorzaakte brede bezorgdheid; velen omschreven AI als een "black box" met onvoorspelbare langetermijngevolgen.

In alle nationale discussies werd overeenstemming bereikt over een kernset van fundamentele ethische principes voor de toepassing van AI op de werkplek. Deze omvatten transparantie (zorgen dat werknemers begrijpen hoe en waarom AI-systemen worden ingezet), menselijke controle en toezicht (garanderen dat de uiteindelijke beslissingen bij mensen liggen), verantwoordelijkheid (duidelijke toewijzing van verantwoordelijkheid voor algoritmische uitkomsten), en rechtvaardigheid (actief bestrijden van vooroordelen om discriminatie en ongelijke kansen te voorkomen).

De analyse benadrukt belangrijke punten van overeenstemming. Een voelbare angst voor het verlies van privacy door geavanceerde monitoring- en surveillancetechnologieën was een universeel thema. Evenzo werd in elk panel bezorgdheid geuit dat AI bestaande sociale en economische ongelijkheden zou kunnen versterken – vooral voor gemarginaliseerde groepen zoals migranten, oudere werknemers en mensen met lagere kwalificaties. Levenslang leren werd unaniem aangeduid als de meest cruciale aanpassingsstrategie voor zowel individuen als de samenleving.

Het rapport identificeert ook belangrijke verschillen die nationale contexten en culturele prioriteiten weerspiegelen. In Duitsland was er een onderliggende bezorgdheid over mondiale concurrentiekracht, waarbij het ethische debat werd benaderd vanuit een pragmatische, beleidsgerichte invalshoek. Het Italiaanse panel legde sterk de nadruk op

sociale rechtvaardigheid, met aandacht voor de uitbuiting van digitale arbeiders in het mondiale zuiden en de kwetsbaarheid van migranten. De Poolse discussie werd gekenmerkt door een humanistische focus op emoties, vertrouwen en waardigheid, terwijl het Portugese panel een bedrijfsmatige benadering hanteerde, gericht op implementatie en rendement op investering.

Deze nationale nuances onderstrepen dat hoewel de uitdagingen gedeeld worden, de oplossingen contextafhankelijk zijn.

Op basis van deze bevindingen doet het rapport gerichte aanbevelingen aan belangrijke belanghebbenden. Voor beleidsmakers wordt opgeroepen tot de ontwikkeling van specifieke juridische kaders voor AI op de werkplek die verder gaan dan bestaande regelgeving inzake gegevensbescherming, evenals tot grootschalige publieke investeringen in AI-geletterdheid en "ethiek-by-design"-innovatie. Voor werkgevers wordt aanbevolen om robuuste interne bestuursstructuren op te zetten, transparantie richting werknemers te bevorderen en te investeren in welzijnsprogramma's met volledige ethische controle. Voor sociale partners wordt aangedrongen op de ontwikkeling van diepgaande technologische expertise om effectief te onderhandelen over de voorwaarden van AI-implementatie en de rechten van alle werknemers te verdedigen in een steeds meer geautomatiseerde economie.

Het rapport concludeert dat succesvolle en verantwoorde integratie van AI op de Europese werkplek afhankelijk is van een voortdurende en inclusieve ethische dialoog. De WP9-paneldiscussies vormen een essentiële stap in dit proces en bevestigen de noodzaak om proactief een toekomst van werk vorm te geven die in lijn is met de kernwaarden van de Europese Unie: menselijke waardigheid, rechtvaardigheid en solidariteit.

Funded by
the European Union

Die Zukunft der Arbeit in Europa: Ethische Perspektiven. Eine länderübergreifende Analyse von KI am zukünftigen Arbeitsplatz – Ein Bericht über die TRANSFORM Paneldiskussionen zu ethischen Fragen (WP9)

Zusammenfassung

Dieser Bericht fasst die Ergebnisse von Diskussionsrunden zur Ethik der Künstlichen Intelligenz (KI) und der Zukunft der Arbeit in Europa zusammen, die als Teil des EU-geförderten Projekts TRANSFORM (WP9) in acht EU-Ländern, darunter Deutschland, Italien und Polen, stattfanden. In diesen Gesprächen trafen sich Fachleute, Bürgerinnen und Bürger sowie Vertreter verschiedener Interessengruppen, um die ethischen Folgen von KI und Automatisierung für die zukünftige Arbeitswelt zu erörtern. Die Auswertung zeigt, dass die Meinungen in Europa, wie mit diesem tiefgreifenden technologischen Wandel umzugehen ist, vielschichtig und teilweise auch widersprüchlich sind.

Alle Teilnehmenden waren sich einig, dass der aktuelle Wandel nicht nur ein kleiner Übergang, sondern eine "gewaltige Revolution" ist, die grundlegend verändert, wie wir arbeiten, welche Fähigkeiten wir morgen brauchen und wie unsere Gesellschaft funktioniert. Zwei große Veränderungen wurden dabei immer wieder genannt: der zunehmende Wegfall einfacher Routineaufgaben und der steigende Druck auf Arbeitnehmer, mehr als nur "Mittelmaß" zu leisten (bezeichnet als "Tod der Mittelmäßigkeit"). Dies setzt Arbeitnehmer unter großen Druck, sich ständig anzupassen und durch Weiterbildung neue Fähigkeiten zu erlernen. Die schnelle und oft undurchsichtige Entwicklung der KI, die von vielen als "Black Box" beschrieben wurde, löste Besorgnis über die nicht absehbaren langfristigen Folgen aus.

In allen acht Ländern stimmten die Teilnehmenden überein, dass vier ethische Grundprinzipien für den Einsatz von KI unerlässlich sind: **Transparenz** darüber, wie und warum KI-Systeme genutzt werden; die **menschliche Kontrolle**, sodass bei wichtigen Entscheidungen ein Mensch immer das letzte Wort behält; eine klare **Rechenschaftspflicht**, wer die Verantwortung bei Fehlern oder Schäden durch KI trägt; und **Gerechtigkeit**, was die aktive Prüfung auf Vorurteile zur Verhinderung von Diskriminierung und zur Sicherung der Chancengleichheit einschließt.

Die Analyse zeigt, dass bestimmte Ängste in allen Ländern geteilt werden. Dazu gehört die spürbare Sorge um den möglichen **Verlust der Privatsphäre** durch moderne Überwachungstechnologien am Arbeitsplatz sowie die Befürchtung, dass KI **bestehende soziale und wirtschaftliche Ungleichheiten** verschärfen könnte. Dies könnte besonders benachteiligte Gruppen wie Migranten, ältere Arbeitnehmer oder Menschen mit geringerer Qualifikation treffen. Alle waren sich einig, dass **lebenslanges Lernen** die absolut wichtigste Strategie ist, um sich an die neue Arbeitswelt anzupassen.

Obwohl die Herausforderungen ähnlich sind, setzen die Länder unterschiedliche Schwerpunkte, die stark von den Bedingungen vor Ort abhängen. In **Deutschland** war die Debatte von der Sorge um die weltweite Wettbewerbsfähigkeit geprägt, was zu einer

pragmatischen, politikorientierten Ethik-Diskussion führte. **Italien** fokussierte sich stark auf soziale Gerechtigkeit und die Ausbeutung "digitaler Arbeiter", während in **Polen** menschliche Aspekte wie Emotionen, Vertrauen und Würde im Vordergrund standen. **Portugal** betrachtete das Thema vorrangig aus Unternehmenssicht (Wirtschaftlichkeit), und **Slowenien** betonte die Balance zwischen technischem Fortschritt und dem Gemeinwohl. In **Griechenland** wurden angesichts wirtschaftlicher Herausforderungen Resilienz und emotionale Belastung betont, in **Belgien** die Machtverhältnisse bei der Überwachung und in **Schweden** die Gleichberechtigung, mit der Forderung, KI-Systeme gemeinsam mit benachteiligten Gruppen zu entwickeln.

Aus diesen Ergebnissen leitet der Bericht gezielte Handlungsempfehlungen ab. **Die Politik** wird aufgefordert, spezielle Gesetze für KI am Arbeitsplatz zu schaffen, die über bisherige Datenschutzregeln hinausgehen, massiv in die Aufklärung der Bevölkerung zu investieren und Innovationen durch "Ethics-by-Design" zu fördern. **Arbeitgeber** sollen klare interne Regeln für den KI-Einsatz aufstellen, offen kommunizieren und in das Wohlbefinden der Belegschaft bei ethischer Kontrolle investieren. **Sozialpartner** wie Gewerkschaften und Arbeitgeberverbände müssen sich tiefes technisches Wissen aneignen, um die Bedingungen für den KI-Einsatz effektiv auszuhandeln und die Rechte aller Arbeitnehmer zu schützen.

Der Bericht kommt zu dem Schluss, dass eine erfolgreiche und verantwortungsvolle Einführung von KI in Europa nur gelingt, wenn ein dauerhafter und alle einbeziehender ethischer Dialog geführt wird. Die zusammengefassten Diskussionen waren ein wichtiger Schritt, um die Zukunft der Arbeit aktiv im Einklang mit den europäischen Grundwerten Menschenwürde, Gerechtigkeit und Solidarität zu gestalten.

Το Μέλλον της Εργασίας στην Ευρώπη: Ηθικοί Ορίζοντες: Διακρατική Ανάλυση της Τεχνητής Νοημοσύνης στο Μελλοντικό Εργασιακό Περιβάλλον – Έκθεση της Ομάδας Συζητήσεων για τις Ηθικές Πτυχές του Εργατικού Πακέτου 9 (WP9) του έργου TRANSFORM

Περίληψη

Η παρούσα έκθεση παρουσιάζει μια ολοκληρωμένη σύνθεση και συγκριτική ανάλυση του Εργασιακού Πακέτου 9 (WP9) «Συζητήσεις για τις Ηθικές Πτυχές» που πραγματοποιήθηκαν στο πλαίσιο του έργου TRANSFORM, χρηματοδοτούμενου από το πρόγραμμα CERV της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι συζητήσεις αυτές, που διεξήχθησαν σε οκτώ κράτη μέλη — Γερμανία, Ιταλία, Πολωνία, Πορτογαλία, Σλοβενία, Σουηδία, Ελλάδα και Βέλγιο συγκέντρωσαν ειδικούς, ενδιαφερόμενους φορείς και πολίτες με σκοπό να εξετάσουν κριτικά τις ηθικές επιπτώσεις της Τεχνητής Νοημοσύνης (AI) και του αυτοματισμού στο μέλλον της εργασίας. Η ανάλυση των μεταφρασμένων πρακτικών των οκτώ συζητήσεων αποκαλύπτει έναν σύνθετο, πολυδιάστατο και, σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις, αντιφατικό ευρωπαϊκό διάλογο σχετικά με το πώς οι κοινωνίες καλούνται να διαχειριστούν αυτή τη βαθιά τεχνολογική αλλαγή.

Αναδύθηκε μια ευρεία συναίνεση ότι η τρέχουσα μεταμόρφωση δεν αποτελεί απλώς μια μετάβαση, αλλά μια «τεράστια επανάσταση», η οποία μεταβάλλει ριζικά τη φύση της εργασίας, τις δεξιότητες και τις κοινωνικές δομές. Οι συμμετέχοντες εντόπισαν σταθερά την αντικατάσταση των επαναλαμβανόμενων εργασιών και τον εννοιολογικό «θάνατο της μετριότητας» ως κύριες αλλαγές στην αγορά εργασίας, ασκώντας σημαντική πίεση στους εργαζομένους να προσαρμοστούν και να αναβαθμίσουν τις δεξιότητές τους. Η ταχεία και συχνά αδιαφανής ανάπτυξη της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης αποτέλεσε πηγή ευρείας ανησυχίας, καθώς πολλοί τη χαρακτήρισαν ως «μαύρο κουτί», του οποίου οι μακροπρόθεσμες συνέπειες παραμένουν απρόβλεπτες.

Σε όλες τις εθνικές συζητήσεις εντοπίστηκε ένα κοινό σύνολο θεμελιωδών ηθικών αρχών για την εφαρμογή της AI στο εργασιακό περιβάλλον, για τις οποίες επιτεύχθηκε συναίνεση. Αυτές περιλαμβάνουν τη διαφάνεια, ώστε οι εργαζόμενοι να κατανοούν πώς και γιατί χρησιμοποιούνται τα συστήματα AI· την ανθρώπινη ευθύνη και εποπτεία, διασφαλίζοντας ότι η τελική λήψη κρίσιμων αποφάσεων παραμένει σε ανθρώπινα χέρια· τη λογοδοσία, με σαφείς γραμμές ευθύνης για τα αποτελέσματα των αλγορίθμων· και τη δικαιοσύνη, με ενεργές πολιτικές μετριασμού προκαταλήψεων για την εξασφάλιση ίσης μεταχείρισης και ευκαιριών.

Η ανάλυση ανέδειξε σημαντικά σημεία σύγκλισης. Ο έντονος φόβος για την απώλεια της ιδιωτικότητας των εργαζομένων μέσω εξελιγμένων τεχνολογιών παρακολούθησης ήταν καθολικό θέμα. Παράλληλα, εκφράστηκαν ανησυχίες ότι η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη θα μπορούσε να εντείνει τις κοινωνικές και οικονομικές ανισότητες, επηρεάζοντας ιδιαίτερα ευάλωτες ομάδες όπως μετανάστες, ηλικιωμένους εργαζομένους και άτομα με χαμηλότερα προσόντα. Η διά βίου μάθηση αναγνωρίστηκε ομόφωνα ως η πλέον κρίσιμη στρατηγική προσαρμογής τόσο για τα άτομα όσο και για την κοινωνία συνολικά.

Η έκθεση εντοπίζει επίσης σημαντικές αποκλίσεις που αντικατοπτρίζουν τα ιδιαίτερα εθνικά και πολιτισμικά συμφραζόμενα. Στη Γερμανία κυριάρχησε η ανησυχία για την παγκόσμια ανταγωνιστικότητα, τοποθετώντας τη συζήτηση σε ένα πραγματιστικό, πολιτικο-στρατηγικό πλαίσιο. Η ιταλική συζήτηση επικεντρώθηκε στην κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη, επισημαίνοντας την εκμετάλλευση των ψηφιακών εργαζομένων στον παγκόσμιο νότο και τις ιδιαίτερες ευαλωτότητες των μεταναστών. Η πολωνική προσέγγιση διακρίθηκε για τον ανθρωποκεντρικό χαρακτήρα της, εστιάζοντας στα συναισθήματα, την εμπιστοσύνη και την αξιοπρέπεια. Η πορτογαλική συζήτηση υιοθέτησε επιχειρηματική οπτική, επικεντρωμένη στην απόδοση επενδύσεων και την πρακτική εφαρμογή. Η Σλοβενία ανέδειξε την ανάγκη εναρμόνισης τεχνολογικής προόδου και δημοσίου συμφέροντος, με στόχο την κοινωνικά υπεύθυνη και ηθική καινοτομία. Η Ελλάδα τόνισε την ανάγκη για ανθεκτικότητα και ισχυρή ηγεσία εν μέσω οικονομικών προκλήσεων, επισημαίνοντας το συναισθηματικό βάρος της συνεχούς αλλαγής στο πλαίσιο του ψηφιακού μετασχηματισμού. Το Βέλγιο επικεντρώθηκε σε μια κριτική ανάλυση των σχέσεων εξουσίας που αναδύονται μέσω της παρακολούθησης στον χώρο εργασίας, θέτοντας το ερώτημα αν η AI ενισχύει πραγματικά την ανθρώπινη ευημερία ή απλώς ενδυναμώνει μηχανισμούς ελέγχου. Η Σουηδία προσέγγισε το θέμα υπό το πρίσμα της ισότητας και της συμπερίληψης, υποστηρίζοντας τη συν-διαμόρφωση συστημάτων AI με τις περιθωριοποιημένες κοινότητες ώστε να διασφαλιστεί ότι οι ανάγκες και οι φωνές τους θα ενσωματωθούν στην τεχνολογική ανάπτυξη. Αυτές οι εθνικές διαφοροποιήσεις υπογραμμίζουν ότι, παρότι οι προκλήσεις είναι κοινές, οι λύσεις παραμένουν συμφραζόμενες και εξαρτώμενες από το πλαίσιο κάθε χώρας.

Με βάση τα ευρήματα, η έκθεση διατυπώνει στοχευμένες συστάσεις προς τους βασικούς φορείς. Για τους πολιτικούς υπεύθυνους προτείνεται η ανάπτυξη ειδικών νομικών πλαισίων για την AI στον χώρο εργασίας, πέρα από τους υπάρχοντες κανονισμούς για την προστασία δεδομένων, καθώς και σημαντικές δημόσιες επενδύσεις στην εκπαίδευση ψηφιακής και ηθικής παιδείας («ethics-by-design»). Για τους εργοδότες προτείνεται η δημιουργία ισχυρών μηχανισμών εσωτερικής διακυβέρνησης, η διαφάνεια προς τους εργαζομένους και η επένδυση στην ψυχική ευημερία με πλήρη ηθική εποπτεία. Για τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους συνιστάται η ανάπτυξη βαθιάς τεχνολογικής κατανόησης ώστε να μπορούν να διαπραγματεύονται αποτελεσματικά τους όρους εφαρμογής της AI και να υπερασπίζονται τα δικαιώματα όλων των εργαζομένων σε μια ολοένα πιο αυτοματοποιημένη οικονομία.

Η έκθεση καταλήγει ότι η επιτυχής και υπεύθυνη ενσωμάτωση της Τεχνητής Νοημοσύνης στο ευρωπαϊκό εργασιακό περιβάλλον εξαρτάται από μια συνεχή, συμμετοχική και ηθικά προσανατολισμένη συζήτηση. Οι συζητήσεις του WP9 αποτελούν ένα καθοριστικό βήμα προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση, επιβεβαιώνοντας την ανάγκη να διαμορφωθεί ένα μέλλον της εργασίας που θα ευθυγραμμίζεται με τις θεμελιώδεις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης: την ανθρώπινη αξιοπρέπεια, τη δικαιοσύνη και την αλληλεγγύη.

Il futuro del lavoro in Europa: orizzonti etici. Un'analisi transnazionale sull'IA nei posti di lavoro del futuro - Report sulla WP9 del progetto TRANSFORM “Panel di discussione sulle riflessioni etiche”

Sintesi

Il presente report riporta una sintesi completa e un'analisi comparativa del Work Package 9 (WP9) “Panel di discussione sulle riflessioni etiche” condotte nell'ambito del progetto TRANSFORM finanziato dal Programma CERV dell'Unione europea. Le discussioni, tenutesi in otto Stati membri - Germania, Italia, Polonia, Portogallo, Slovenia, Svezia, Grecia e Belgio - hanno riunito esperti, stakeholder e cittadini per esaminare criticamente le implicazioni etiche dell'intelligenza artificiale (IA) e dell'automazione sul futuro del lavoro. L'analisi delle trascrizioni tradotte emerse dagli 8 panel rivela un discorso europeo complesso, sfumato e talvolta contraddittorio su come affrontare questo profondo cambiamento tecnologico.

È emerso un consenso sul fatto che l'attuale trasformazione non è solo una transizione, ma una “grande rivoluzione” che altera in modo fondamentale la natura del lavoro, delle competenze e delle strutture sociali. I partecipanti alla tavola rotonda hanno costantemente identificato come principali cambiamenti nel mercato del lavoro: la sostituzione delle attività di routine e la “morte della mediocrità” concettuale, condizioni che creano una pressione rilevante sui lavoratori, affinché si adattino e migliorino le loro competenze. Il rapido e spesso opaco sviluppo dell'IA è stato percepito come fonte di diffusa ansia, con molti partecipanti che lo hanno descritto come una “scatola nera”, le cui conseguenze a lungo termine rimangono imprevedibili.In tutte e otto le discussioni nazionali, è stato raggiunto un consenso su una serie di principi etici fondamentali per l'implementazione dell'IA sul posto di lavoro. Questi principi includono la **trasparenza**, che garantisce che i lavoratori comprendano come e perché vengono utilizzati i sistemi di IA; l'**agency e la supervisione umana**, a garanzia che nelle decisioni critiche la parola finale spetti agli esseri umani; la **responsabilità**, che stabilisce delle linee chiare su chi deve rispondere per i risultati egli effetti dell’algoritmo; e l'**equità**, che mitiga attivamente i pregiudizi per garantire la non discriminazione e le pari opportunità.

L'analisi evidenzia significativi punti di convergenza. Un tema ricorrente è stato il timore palpabile di un'erosione della privacy dei lavoratori attraverso sofisticate tecnologie di monitoraggio e sorveglianza. Allo stesso modo, in ogni panel sono state espresse preoccupazioni sul fatto che l'IA possa amplificare le disuguaglianze sociali ed economiche esistenti, colpendo in particolare i gruppi emarginati come i migranti, i lavoratori anziani e le persone con qualifiche inferiori. L'imperativo dell'apprendimento permanente è stato unanimemente identificato come la strategia di adattamento più critica sia per gli individui che per la società.

Il rapporto individua inoltre alcuni punti cruciali di divergenza che riflettono i diversi contesti nazionali e le priorità culturali. Nel panel in **Germania** le discussioni sono state

caratterizzate da un sottofondo di preoccupazione per la competitività globale, inquadrando il dibattito etico in una prospettiva pragmatica e orientata alle politiche. Il panel realizzato in **Italia** ha posto grande enfasi sulla giustizia sociale, sottolineando lo sfruttamento dei lavoratori digitali nel sud del mondo e le vulnerabilità specifiche dei migranti. La discussione in **Polonia** si è caratterizzata in modo unico per la sua attenzione umanistica alle emozioni, alla fiducia e alla dignità, mentre il panel del **Portogallo** ha offerto una prospettiva incentrata sul business in termini di implementazione e ritorno sull'investimento. La discussione in **Slovenia** ha sottolineato la necessità di allineare i progressi tecnologici alle considerazioni etiche e al benessere pubblico, riflettendo l'impegno a bilanciare l'innovazione con la responsabilità sociale. Il panel della **Grecia** ha sottolineato la necessità di resilienza e di una forte leadership in un contesto di sfide economiche, evidenziando il costo emotivo del cambiamento costante nel contesto della trasformazione digitale. La prospettiva della **Svezia** si è incentrata sull'equità e sulla progettazione inclusiva, sostenendo la co-progettazione dei sistemi di IA con le comunità emarginate per garantire che le loro esigenze e le loro voci siano prioritarie nello sviluppo tecnologico. Queste sfumature nazionali sottolineano che, sebbene le sfide siano condivise, i percorsi per affrontarle dipendono dal contesto.

Sulla base di questi risultati, il rapporto formula una serie di raccomandazioni mirate agli stakeholder-chiave. Ai **decisori politici** chiede lo sviluppo di inquadramenti giuridici specifici per l'IA in ambito lavoro, che vadano oltre le normative esistenti in materia di protezione dei dati, insieme a massicci investimenti pubblici nell'alfabetizzazione all'IA e nell'innovazione basata sull' "ethics-by-design". Ai **datori di lavoro** raccomanda di istituire solide strutture di governance interna, di dare priorità alla trasparenza nei confronti dei dipendenti e di investire in programmi per il benessere dei dipendenti attraverso controlli etici. Le **parti sociali**, come i sindacati e le associazioni dei datori di lavoro, devono acquisire una profonda conoscenza tecnica per negoziare efficacemente le condizioni di utilizzo dell'IA e tutelare i diritti di tutti i lavoratori. Il rapporto giunge alla conclusione che un'introduzione efficace e responsabile dell'IA nell'Unione Europea potrà avere successo solo se si riuscirà ad instaurare un dialogo etico permanente e inclusivo. Le discussioni sintetizzate hanno rappresentato un passo importante per plasmare attivamente il futuro del lavoro in linea con i valori fondamentali europei di dignità umana, giustizia e solidarietà.

Przyszłość pracy w Europie: Horyzonty etyczne – transnarodowa analiza porównawcza dotycząca AI w przyszłym środowisku pracy – Raport z Pakietu Roboczego WP9 „Dyskusje panelowe na temat rozważań etycznych" projektu TRANSFORM.

Streszczenie

Niniejszy raport prezentuje kompleksową syntezę oraz analizę porównawczą wyników paneli dyskusyjnych z Pakietu Roboczego 9 (WP9) „Dyskusje panelowe na temat rozważań etycznych" projektu TRANSFORM, finansowanego przez UE w ramach programu CERV.. Dyskusje te, zorganizowane w ośmiu państwach członkowskich – Niemczech, Włoszech, Polsce, Portugalii, Słowenii, Szwecji, Grecji i Belgii – zgromadziły ekspertów, interesariuszy oraz obywateli, aby krytycznie przeanalizować etyczne konsekwencje zastosowania sztucznej inteligencji (AI) i automatyzacji dla przyszłości pracy. Analiza przetłumaczonych transkryptów z ośmiu dyskusji panelowych ujawnia złożony, wielowymiarowy, a momentami sprzeczny europejski dyskurs dotyczący sposobów radzenia sobie z tą głęboką transformacją technologiczną.

Uczestnicy zgodnie podkreślali, że obecne zmiany nie są jedynie procesem przejściowym, lecz „ogromną rewolucją", która fundamentalnie przekształca charakter pracy, wymagane kompetencje oraz struktury społeczne. Paneliści konsekwentnie wskazywali na wypieranie rutynowych zadań oraz koncepcyjną „śmierć przeciętności" jako główne zmiany na rynku pracy, które wywołują presję dostosowywania się i podnoszenia kompetencji u pracowników. Szybki, często nieprzejrzysty rozwój AI był powszechnym źródłem niepokoju, a wielu uczestników określało go jako „czarną skrzynkę", której długofalowe skutki pozostają nieprzewidywalne.

We wszystkich ośmiu krajowych dyskusjach osiągnięto konsensus w sprawie kluczowych, podstawowych zasad etycznych dotyczących wdrażania AI w miejscu pracy. Należą do nich: **transparentność,** zapewniająca pracownikom zrozumienie, jak i dlaczego systemy AI są wykorzystywane; **sprawczość i nadzór człowieka**, gwarantujące, że ostateczna decyzja w kluczowych kwestiach należy do ludzi; **odpowiedzialność,** ustanawiająca jasne linie odpowiedzialności za skutki działania algorytmów; oraz **sprawiedliwość,** zakładająca aktywne przeciwdziałanie uprzedzeniom i zapewnienie równości szans.

Analiza ujawnia również istotne punkty wspólne. Wyraźny lęk przed erozją prywatności pracowników poprzez zaawansowane technologie monitorowania i nadzoru był tematem obecnym we wszystkich dyskusjach. Podobnie, obawy, że AI może pogłębiać istniejące nierówności społeczne i ekonomiczne – dotykając zwłaszcza grup marginalizowanych, takich jak migranci, starsi pracownicy czy osoby o niższych kwalifikacjach – pojawiały się w każdym panelu. Konieczność uczenia się przez całe życie została jednogłośnie uznana za najważniejszą strategię adaptacyjną zarówno dla jednostek, jak i społeczeństw.

Raport identyfikuje również kluczowe różnice, odzwierciedlające odmienne konteksty

narodowe i priorytety kulturowe. W Niemczech dyskusje naznaczone były niepokojem o konkurencyjność globalną, ujmując debatę etyczną w pragmatycznym, politycznym kontekście. Włoski panel akcentował kwestie sprawiedliwości społecznej, zwracając uwagę na eksploatację pracowników cyfrowych w krajach globalnego Południa oraz na szczególną podatność migrantów na zagrożenia. Polski panel wyróżniał się humanistycznym ukierunkowaniem na emocje, zaufanie i godność, natomiast portugalska dyskusja oferowała perspektywę biznesową, koncentrującą się na wdrażaniu i zwrocie z inwestycji. W dyskusji w Słowenii podkreślono konieczność dostosowania postępu technologicznego do kwestii etycznych i dobra publicznego, odzwierciedlając zaangażowanie w równoważenie innowacji z odpowiedzialnością społeczną. Grecki panel dyskusyjny podkreślił potrzebę odporności i silnego przywództwa w obliczu wyzwań gospodarczych, zwracając uwagę na emocjonalne skutki ciągłych zmian w kontekście transformacji cyfrowej. W dyskusji w Belgii krytycznie przeanalizowano dynamikę władzy w zakresie nadzoru w miejscu pracy, kwestionując, czy sztuczna inteligencja poprawia jakość życia ludzi, czy też jedynie wzmacnia mechanizmy kontroli oparte na logice neoliberalnej. Perspektywa szwedzka skupiała się na równości i projektowaniu sprzyjającym włączeniu społecznemu, opowiadając się za wspólnym projektowaniem systemów sztucznej inteligencji z marginalizowanymi społecznościami, aby zapewnić priorytetowe traktowanie ich potrzeb i głosów w rozwoju technologicznym. Te narodowe niuanse podkreślają, że choć wyzwania są wspólne, to sposoby ich rozwiązywania zależą od kontekstu.

W oparciu o te ustalenia raport przedstawia serię rekomendacji skierowanych do kluczowych interesariuszy. **Decydentom politycznym** zaleca opracowanie szczegółowych ram prawnych dotyczących AI w miejscu pracy, wykraczających poza obecne regulacje w zakresie ochrony danych, a także do znacznych inwestycji publicznych w edukację cyfrową i innowacje oparte na zasadach etycznych („ethics-by-design"). **Dla pracodawców** rekomenduje tworzenie solidnych wewnętrznych struktur zarządzania, priorytetowe traktowanie transparentności wobec pracowników oraz inwestowanie w programy dobrostanu z pełnym nadzorem etycznym. **Dla partnerów społecznych** raport apeluje o rozwój głębokiej wiedzy technologicznej, aby skutecznie negocjować warunki wdrażania AI i bronić praw wszystkich pracowników w coraz bardziej zautomatyzowanej gospodarce.

Raport wskazuje, że skuteczna i odpowiedzialna integracja AI z europejskim środowiskiem pracy zależy od trwałego i inkluzywnego dialogu etycznego. Dyskusje panelowe WP9 stanowią istotny krok w tym kierunku, potwierdzając potrzebę proaktywnego kształtowania przyszłości pracy zgodnej z kluczowymi wartościami Unii Europejskiej: godnością człowieka, sprawiedliwością i solidarnością.

O Futuro do Trabalho na Europa: Horizontes Éticos: Uma Análise Transnacional da IA no Local de Trabalho do Futuro - Relatório sobre as Discussões do Painel de Considerações Éticas do TRANSFORM WP9

Resumo Executivo

Este relatório apresenta uma síntese abrangente e uma análise comparativa do Work Package 9 (WP9) "Painéis de Discussão sobre Considerações Éticas" realizado como parte do projeto TRANSFORM financiado pelo programa CERV da União Europeia. Estas discussões, realizadas em oito Estados-Membros - Alemanha, Itália, Polónia, Portugal, Eslovénia, Suécia, Grécia e Bélgica - reuniram especialistas, partes interessadas e cidadãos para examinar criticamente as implicações éticas da Inteligência Artificial (IA) e da automação no futuro do trabalho. A análise das transcrições traduzidas de oito painéis de discussão revela um discurso europeu complexo, matizado e, por vezes, contraditório sobre como navegar por essa profunda mudança tecnológica.

Surgiu um consenso de que a transformação atual não é apenas uma transição, mas uma "grande revolução," que altera fundamentalmente a natureza do trabalho, as competências e as estruturas sociais. Os participantes identificaram consistentemente a substituição de tarefas rotineiras e a "morte da mediocridade" conceptual como as principais mudanças no mercado de trabalho, criando uma pressão significativa sobre os trabalhadores para se adaptarem e melhorarem as suas competências. O desenvolvimento rápido e muitas vezes opaco da IA foi uma fonte de ansiedade generalizada, com muitos participantes a descrevê-la como uma "caixa negra" cujas consequências a longo prazo permanecem imprevisíveis.

Transversal às oito discussões nacionais, um conjunto básico de princípios éticos fundamentais para a implementação da IA no local de trabalho alcançou consenso. Estes incluem **Transparência**, garantindo que os trabalhadores compreendam como e porque os sistemas de IA são utilizados; **Agência Humana e Supervisão**, garantindo que a autoridade final em decisões críticas permaneça com os seres humanos; **Imputabilidade**, estabelecendo linhas claras de responsabilidade pelos resultados algorítmicos; e **Imparcialidade**, mitigando ativamente o preconceito para garantir a não discriminação e a igualdade de oportunidades.

A análise destaca pontos significativos de convergência. Um medo palpável em relação à erosão da **privacidade dos trabalhadores** por meio de tecnologias sofisticadas de monitorização e vigilância foi um tema universal. Da mesma forma, preocupações de que a IA pudesse amplificar as **desigualdades sociais e económicas** existentes - afetando particularmente grupos marginalizados, como migrantes, trabalhadores mais velhos e indivíduos com qualificações mais baixas - foram expressas em todos os painéis. A necessidade imperativa de **aprendizagem ao longo da vida** foi identificada por unanimidade como a estratégia de adaptação mais crítica para os indivíduos e para a

sociedade.

O relatório também identifica pontos cruciais de divergência que refletem contextos nacionais e prioridades culturais distintos. As discussões na Alemanha foram marcadas por uma ansiedade subjacente sobre a competitividade global, enquadrando o debate ético numa perspetiva pragmática e orientada para as políticas. O painel em Itália deu grande ênfase à justiça social, destacando a exploração dos trabalhadores digitais no sul global e as vulnerabilidades específicas dos migrantes. A discussão na Polónia foi caracterizada de forma única pelo seu foco humanístico nas emoções, confiança e dignidade, enquanto o painel de Portugal ofereceu uma perspetiva centrada nos negócios sobre a implementação e o retorno do investimento. A discussão da Eslovénia enfatizou a necessidade de alinhar os avanços tecnológicos com considerações éticas e bem-estar público, refletindo um compromisso com o equilíbrio entre inovação e responsabilidade social. O painel da Grécia enfatizou a necessidade de resiliência e liderança forte no seio de desafios económicos, destacando o custo emocional da mudança constante no contexto da transformação digital. A discussão na Bélgica analisou criticamente a dinâmica de poder da vigilância no local de trabalho, questionando se a IA está a melhorar o bem-estar humano ou apenas a reforçar mecanismos de controlo impulsionados pela lógica neoliberal. A perspetiva da Suécia centrou-se na equidade e no design inclusivo, defendendo o co-design de sistemas de IA com comunidades marginalizadas para garantir que as suas necessidades e vozes sejam priorizadas no desenvolvimento tecnológico. Estas nuances nacionais sublinham que, embora os desafios sejam comuns, os caminhos para os enfrentar dependem do contexto.

Com base nessas conclusões, este relatório apresenta uma série de recomendações específicas para as principais partes interessadas. Para os decisores políticos, apela ao desenvolvimento de marcos jurídicos específicos para a IA no local de trabalho que vão para além das regulamentações existentes de proteção de dados, juntamente com um investimento público maciço em literacia em IA e inovação com "ética desde a conceção." Para os empregadores, recomenda o estabelecimento de estruturas de governança interna robustas, priorizando a transparência com os funcionários e investindo em programas de bem-estar com supervisão ética completa. Para os parceiros sociais, insta ao desenvolvimento de conhecimentos tecnológicos aprofundados para negociar eficazmente os termos da implementação da IA e defender os direitos de todos os trabalhadores numa economia cada vez mais automatizada. Este relatório conclui que a integração bem-sucedida e responsável da IA no local de trabalho europeu depende de um diálogo ético sustentado e inclusivo. Os painéis de discussão do WP9 representam um passo vital neste processo, afirmando a necessidade de moldar proativamente um futuro do trabalho que esteja alinhado com os valores fundamentais da União Europeia de dignidade humana, justiça e solidariedade.

Prihodnost dela v Evropi: Etični horizonti Čeznacionalna analiza umetne inteligence na prihodnjem delovnem mestu – Poročilo o panelnih razpravah o etičnih vidikih v okviru WP9 projekta TRANSFORM

Povzetek

Poročilo predstavlja celovit povzetek in primerjalno analizo delovnega paketa 9 (WP9) *"Ethical Consideration Panel Discussions"*, izvedenega v okviru projekta TRANSFORM, ki ga financira Evropska unija v okviru programa CERV. Razprave, izvedene v osmih državah članicah – Nemčiji, Italiji, Poljski, Portugalski, Sloveniji, Švedski, Grčiji in Belgiji – so združile strokovnjake, deležnike in državljane, da bi kritično preučili etične posledice umetne inteligence (UI) in avtomatizacije za prihodnost dela. Analiza prevedenih zapisov osmih panelnih razprav razkriva kompleksen, niansiran in včasih protisloven evropski diskurz o tem, kako se spopasti s to tehnološko spremembo.

Doseglo se je soglasje o tem, da trenutna preobrazba ni zgolj prehod, temveč "velika revolucija", ki temeljito spreminja naravo dela, spretnosti in družbene strukture. Panelisti so dosledno prepoznavali izpodrivanje rutinskih nalog in konceptualno "smrt povprečnosti" kot glavne spremembe na trgu dela, kar ustvarja velik pritisk na delavce, da se prilagodijo in nadgradijo svoje spretnosti. Hiter razvoj umetne inteligence je bil vir široko razširjene tesnobe, mnogi udeleženci pa so ga opisali kot "črno skrinjico", katere dolgoročne posledice ostajajo nepredvidljive.

V vseh osmih nacionalnih razpravah je bil dosežen konsenz o naboru temeljnih etičnih načel za uporabo umetne inteligence na delovnem mestu. Ta vključujejo: **transparentnost** ki zagotavlja, da delavci razumejo, kako in zakaj se uporabljajo sistemi umetne inteligence; **človeško avtonomijo in nadzor**, ki zagotavljata, da končna avtoriteta pri ključnih odločitvah ostaja v rokah ljudi; **odgovornost,** ki vzpostavlja jasne linije odgovornosti za izide, ki jih povzročajo algoritmi; ter **pravičnost**, ki aktivno zmanjšuje pristranskost, da bi zagotovila nediskriminacijo in enake možnosti.

Analiza poudarja pomembne točke konvergence. Občuten strah glede erozije zasebnosti delavcev zaradi sofisticiranih tehnologij nadzora in spremljanja je bil univerzalna tema. Podobno so bile, v vseh panelih razpravah, izražene skrbi, da bi umetna inteligenca lahko povečala obstoječe socialne in ekonomske neenakosti – zlasti za marginalizirane skupine, kot so migranti, starejši delavci in tisti z nižjimi kvalifikacijami. Potreba po vseživljenjskem učenju je bila soglasno prepoznana kot najpomembnejša strategija prilagajanja tako posameznikov, kot družbe.

Poročilo prav tako prepoznava ključne razlike, ki odražajo različne nacionalne kontekste in kulturne prioritete. Razprave v Nemčiji je zaznamoval podton tesnobe glede globalne konkurenčnosti, pri čemer je bil etični razmislek umeščen v pragmatičen, na politiko usmerjen okvir. Italijanski panel je izpostavil vprašanje družbene pravičnosti in poudaril izkoriščanje digitalnih delavcev v globalnem jugu ter specifično ranljivost migrantov. Poljska

razprava je bila edinstveno zaznamovana s svojim humanističnim poudarkom na čustvih, zaupanju in dostojanstvu, medtem ko je portugalski panel ponudil poslovno usmerjeno perspektivo glede implementacije in donosnosti naložb. Slovenska razprava je poudarila potrebo po usklajevanju tehnološkega napredka z etičnimi vidiki in družbeno blaginjo ter tako izrazila zavezanost k uravnoteženju inovacij z družbeno odgovornostjo. Grški panel je izpostavil pomen odpornosti in močnega voditeljstva sredi gospodarskih izzivov ter opozoril na čustveno obremenitev, ki jo prinaša stalna sprememba v kontekstu digitalne preobrazbe. Belgijska razprava je kritično analizirala razmerja moči v okviru nadzora na delovnem mestu ter se vprašala, ali umetna inteligenca dejansko prispeva k večjemu blagostanju ljudi ali pa zgolj krepi nadzorne mehanizme, ki izhajajo iz neoliberalne logike. Švedska perspektiva se je osredotočila na pravičnost in vključujoče oblikovanje, pri čemer je zagovarjala sooblikovanje sistemov umetne inteligence z marginaliziranimi skupnostmi, da bi se zagotovilo, da so njihove potrebe in glasovi upoštevani v tehnološkem razvoju.Te nacionalne niansiranosti kažejo, da so izzivi skupni, vendar so poti za njihovo reševanje odvisne od konteksta.

Na podlagi teh ugotovitev poročilo predlaga niz ciljno usmerjenih priporočil za ključne deležnike. Za **odločevalce** poziva k razvoju posebnih pravnih okvirov za umetno inteligenco na delovnem mestu, ki presegajo obstoječo zakonodajo o varstvu podatkov, skupaj z obsežnimi javnimi naložbami v pismenost o umetni inteligenci in inovacijah po načelu »etike po zasnovi« (*ethics-by-design*). Za **delodajalce** priporoča vzpostavitev robustnih notranjih struktur upravljanja, dajanje prednosti transparentnosti do zaposlenih ter vlaganje v programe dobrega počutja z etičnim nadzorom. Za **socialne partnerje** poziva k razvoju poglobljenega tehnološkega znanja, da bi lahko učinkovito pogajali pogoje implementacije umetne inteligence in zagovarjali pravice vseh delavcev v vse bolj avtomatiziranem gospodarstvu.

Poročilo zaključuje, da je uspešna in odgovorna integracija umetne inteligence v evropsko delovno okolje odvisna od stalnega in vključujočega etičnega dialoga. Panelne razprave WP9 predstavljajo ključen korak v tem procesu in potrjujejo potrebo po proaktivnem oblikovanju prihodnosti dela, ki je usklajena z osnovnimi vrednotami Evropske unije: **človeškim dostojanstvom, pravičnostjo in solidarnostjo.**

Arbetets framtid i Europa: Etiska horisonter – En tvärnationell analys av AI på framtidens arbetsplats. Rapport om TRANSFORM WP9-paneldiskussionerna om etiska överväganden

Sammanfattning

Denna rapport presenterar en omfattande syntes och jämförande analys av arbetspaket 9 (WP9) *"Ethical Consideration Panel Discussions"* som genomfördes inom ramen för EU:s CERV-finansierade TRANSFORM-projekt. Diskussionerna, som hölls i åtta medlemsländer – Tyskland, Italien, Polen, Portugal, Slovenien, Sverige, Grekland och Belgien – samlade experter, intressenter och medborgare för att kritiskt undersöka de etiska implikationerna av artificiell intelligens (AI) och automation för framtidens arbete. Analysen av de översatta utskrifterna från de åtta paneldiskussionerna avslöjar en komplex, nyanserad och ibland motsägelsefull europeisk diskurs kring hur man ska navigera i denna djupgående teknologiska förändring.

En samsyn växte fram kring att den pågående omvandlingen inte bara är en övergång utan en ”stor revolution” som fundamentalt förändrar arbetets natur, färdigheter och samhällsstrukturer.

Paneldeltagarna identifierade konsekvent att ersättningen av rutinuppgifter och det konceptuella ”slutet för medelmåttighet” utgör centrala förändringar på arbetsmarknaden, vilket skapar ett betydande tryck på arbetstagare att anpassa sig och vidareutbilda sig. Den snabba och ofta otransparenta utvecklingen av AI var en källa till utbredd oro, där många deltagare beskrev den som en ”svart låda” vars långsiktiga konsekvenser är oförutsägbara.

I samtliga åtta nationella diskussioner uppnåddes enighet kring en kärna av grundläggande etiska principer för implementeringen av AI på arbetsplatsen. Dessa omfattar Transparens, som säkerställer att arbetstagare förstår hur och varför AI-system används; Mänsklig handlingskraft och tillsyn, som garanterar att det slutliga beslutsfattandet i kritiska frågor alltid ligger hos människor; Ansvarstagande, som etablerar tydliga ansvarsområden för algoritmiska resultat; samt Rättvisa, som innebär ett aktivt arbete för att motverka bias och säkerställa icke-diskriminering och lika möjligheter.

Analysen belyser betydande gemensamma nämnare. En påtaglig rädsla för att arbetstagares integritet urholkas genom avancerad övervakningsteknologi var ett universellt tema. Likaså uttrycktes oro över att AI kan förstärka befintliga sociala och ekonomiska ojämlikheter – särskilt för marginaliserade grupper som migranter, äldre arbetstagare och personer med lägre kvalifikationer. Vikten av livslångt lärande identifierades enhälligt som den mest avgörande anpassningsstrategin för både individer och samhällen.

Rapporten identifierar även centrala skiljaktigheter som speglar olika nationella kontexter och kulturella prioriteringar. Diskussionerna i Tyskland präglades av oro för global

konkurrenskraft, vilket gav den etiska debatten en pragmatisk och policyinriktad ton. Den italienska panelen fokuserade starkt på social rättvisa och lyfte fram exploateringen av digitala arbetare i det globala syd samt migranters särskilda sårbarhet. Diskussionen i Polen hade ett unikt humanistiskt fokus på känslor, tillit och värdighet, medan den portugisiska panelen presenterade ett mer företagsinriktat perspektiv på implementering och avkastning på investeringar. Sloveniens diskussion betonade behovet av att samordna teknologiska framsteg med etiska överväganden och allmän välfärd, vilket speglar ett engagemang för att balansera innovation med socialt ansvar. Den grekiska panelen framhöll behovet av resiliens och starkt ledarskap i tider av ekonomiska utmaningar, samt belyste den emotionella belastningen av ständig förändring i den digitala transformationens kontext. Den belgiska diskussionen analyserade kritiskt maktdynamiken i arbetsplatsövervakning och ifrågasatte om AI verkligen stärker mänskligt välbefinnande eller enbart förstärker kontrollmekanismer drivna av nyliberal logik. Sveriges perspektiv fokuserade på jämlikhet och inkluderande design, med en stark rekommendation att AI-system ska samskapas med marginaliserade grupper för att säkerställa att deras behov och röster prioriteras i teknologisk utveckling. Dessa nationella nyanser understryker att även om utmaningarna är gemensamma, är lösningarna beroende av kontext.

Utifrån dessa resultat lägger rapporten fram en rad riktade rekommendationer till centrala aktörer.

För beslutsfattare efterlyses utvecklingen av specifika rättsliga ramverk för AI på arbetsplatsen som går bortom befintliga dataskyddsregler, tillsammans med omfattande offentliga investeringar i AI-kompetens och innovation enligt principen ”etik genom design”.

För arbetsgivare rekommenderas etablering av robusta interna styrningsstrukturer, prioritering av transparens gentemot anställda och investering i välbefinnandeprogram med full etisk tillsyn.

För arbetsmarknadens parter uppmanas till utveckling av djup teknologisk expertis för att effektivt kunna förhandla villkoren för AI-implementering och försvara alla arbetstagares rättigheter i en alltmer automatiserad ekonomi.

Rapporten drar slutsatsen att en framgångsrik och ansvarsfull integrering av AI på den europeiska arbetsmarknaden är beroende av en kontinuerlig och inkluderande etisk dialog. WP9-paneldiskussionerna utgör ett avgörande steg i denna process och bekräftar behovet av att proaktivt forma en framtid för arbete som ligger i linje med Europeiska unionens kärnvärden: mänsklig värdighet, rättvisa och solidaritet.

Introduction: Framing the Dialogue on AI and Workplace Ethics

Purpose and Context of the Report

This document constitutes a primary analytical deliverable of Work Package 9 (WP9), "Ethical Consideration Panel Discussion of the Future Workforce Challenges," within the broader framework of the TRANSFORM project (The Future of Human Workforce: Embracing Change, Challenges, and Opportunities). Co-funded by the European Union's Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values (CERV) program, the TRANSFORM project is designed to foster democratic engagement and citizen participation in shaping the future of the European labor market.

The primary objective of this report is to synthesize, analyze, and compare the outcomes of eight panel discussions held in situ across the participating partner countries: Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, and Sweden. The purpose of these events was to critically examine and debate the multifaceted ethical implications arising from rapid technological advancements, particularly automation and Artificial Intelligence (AI), in core areas such as privacy, fairness, and worker well-being.

The significance of this dialogue extends beyond academic inquiry. It is intrinsically linked to the strategic priorities of the European Union, which include strengthening citizens' awareness of their rights and EU policies, facilitating the exchange of best practices to address labor market challenges, and ensuring the global competitiveness of the EU workforce. By creating a structured platform for experts, stakeholders, and the public to engage with these complex issues, WP9 contributes directly to the CERV program's goal of enabling citizens to participate in the policy-making process and co-create Europe's future. This report serves as the definitive record and analysis of that vital, pan-European conversation.

Illustration 1: Panel discussion CRN, Berlin, Germany

The European Labor Market at a Crossroads: A Needs Analysis

The ethical deliberations initiated by the TRANSFORM project do not take place in isolation from broader societal and scientific contexts.They are situated within a European labor market already undergoing a period of profound and accelerating transformation, driven by a confluence of powerful "megatrends". A comprehensive needs analysis conducted at the outset of the project identified the primary forces reshaping the world of work: disruptive technological innovations, including automation, AI, and robotics; significant demographic shifts, most notably an aging population across the continent; and the pervasive digitalization of nearly every economic sector.

Illustration 2: Panel discussion FFI Lublin, Poland

The scale of this technological shift is immense. Projections from leading global institutions indicate a future of significant labor displacement and role creation. A 2017 McKinsey report estimated that approximately 50% of current work activities are technically automatable, while the World Economic Forum projected in 2021 that 85 million jobs may be displaced by 2025, even as 97 million new roles emerge. This dynamic creates a dual challenge: managing the social consequences of job displacement while simultaneously equipping the workforce with the new skills and competencies required for the jobs of tomorrow.

These global trends manifest with unique intensity and character within each member state, creating a diverse and complex landscape of pre-existing challenges that form the backdrop for the introduction of AI. The project's initial analysis revealed a tapestry of national-level pressures :

- **Slovenia** faces a chronic labor shortage, exacerbated by an aging population, alongside low productivity relative to the EU average.
- **Germany**, while a major economy, confronts significant skills shortages in STEM fields, a declining working-age population, and a high risk of automation for up to 25% of existing jobs.
- **Italy** is characterized by a significant gender digital divide, an aging labor force, and a "mismatch" between the skills possessed by workers and those demanded by emerging green and ICT sectors.
- **Poland** must navigate the rapid adoption of automation to maintain its economic competitiveness while addressing regional gender disparities in employment.
- **Portugal** contends with inequalities in remote work access, a notable gap in digital skills among the adult population, and the new challenge of integrating a growing "digital nomad" community.
- **Sweden** exhibits a stable overall unemployment rate but faces persistent challenges in youth unemployment and a significant gender pay gap.
- **Greece** struggles with attracting and retaining top talent, with high employee turnover driven by unrealistic wage expectations and a search for better career opportunities.
- **Belgium** is focused on activating underrepresented groups, such as low-educated women from migrant backgrounds, to meet its goal of an 80% employment rate.

Illustration 3: Panel discussion FOS, Nove Mesto, Slovenia

These pre-existing vulnerabilities are not merely contextual details; they are the fault lines along which the ethical challenges of AI will most acutely manifest. The introduction of

AI-driven technologies acts as both an accelerant and an amplifier of these long-standing issues. For instance, the risk of algorithmic bias in hiring systems becomes far more perilous in a labor market already struggling with the integration of migrant populations or persistent gender inequality. The pressure for continuous upskilling and adaptation is felt most intensely by older workers in economies grappling with demographic decline. Therefore, the ethical debate surrounding AI in the workplace cannot be understood as a novel problem arising from a new technology. Rather, it must be framed as a new, technologically-supercharged dimension of enduring social and economic challenges that Europe has been contending with for decades. The panel discussions, in essence, capture the collision of a futuristic technology with the complex realities of the present-day European labor market.

Methodology: Structuring a Pan-European Dialogue

To ensure a rigorous and comparable analysis of ethical considerations across diverse national contexts, the WP9 panel discussions were conducted according to a standardized and systematic methodology. This approach was designed to balance expert-led insights with public engagement, reflecting the core objectives of the TRANSFORM project and the CERV program.

Panel Discussion Format

The core of the methodology was a structured, two-phase panel discussion held in person in each of the eight partner countries. Each event was designed as a moderated conversation with a planned duration of 90 to 120 minutes, intended to foster dynamic interaction and a deep exploration of the subject matter. The format was divided as follows:

1. **Phase 1: Expert Dialogue (60–75 minutes):** This initial phase was dedicated to presentations by the selected panelists. Each expert was invited to share their perspective on the ethical implications of automation and AI. This phase was structured to allow for a comparison of views and the identification of key thematic areas for deeper discussion.

2. **Phase 2: Audience Interaction (up to 60 minutes):** Following the expert presentations, the floor was opened to the audience. This interactive phase allowed attendees to pose questions directly to the panelists, seek clarification on points made, and contribute their own perspectives. This element was crucial for creating a lively and participatory dialogue, ensuring that the discussion was not confined to the expert panel but enriched by the experiences and concerns of the broader community.

Illustration 4: Panel discussion CRN, Berlin, Germany

Participant Selection

The selection of participants, both for the expert panel and the audience, was guided by the principle of ensuring a multiplicity of perspectives.

- **Panelists:** Each national panel was composed of two to six experts. The selection criteria emphasized a multi-disciplinary background, with the aim of gathering insights from professionals in technology, ethics, law, sociology, human and labor rights advocacy, academia, and public policy. This diversity was intended to ensure a holistic examination of the issues, moving beyond a purely technical discussion to encompass social, legal, and philosophical dimensions. A total of 29 panelists participated in the various events. Many panelists hold significant academic roles and bring their expertise in diverse fields such as sociology, philosophy, cultural anthropology, and labor law. Professionals from public service, HR, and NGO sectors offer practical insights into the application of AI and ethical considerations in their fields. The panels include a balance of genders and a variety of national backgrounds, enhancing the discussions on ethical considerations in workforce challenges.

- **Audience:** The target audience for the events was broadly defined to include citizens and residents, experts from various fields, and key stakeholders from the labor market. A total of 8 Ethical Consideration Panel Discussions of the Future Workforce Challenges were held in eight countries between 19 September and 23 October 2025. These events were attended by 243 participants from 12 countries meeting the requirements for participation in CERV programme events. There were residents of Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxemburg, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden. Of these, 143 were women, 89 were men, 9 did not specify their gender, and 2 were non-binary. Participant profiles from the events show a diverse attendance, including students, social workers, HR professionals, employees, and employers, confirming that the discussions captured a wide cross-section of societal viewpoints.

Thematic Framework and Guiding Questions

To ensure consistency and enable robust cross-national comparison, all eight panel discussions were structured around a common set of five guiding questions. These questions were carefully selected to cover the key ethical themes identified in the project's preparatory phase: transparency, privacy, fairness, and worker well-being. The standardized questions were:

1. **Introductory Question:** What labor market changes were noted during the panel discussions? What challenges does AI pose?
2. **General Question:** What ethical principles should guide the implementation of AI in the workplace?

3. **Privacy:** How do new technologies affect worker privacy in the workplace?
4. **Fairness:** How can we ensure that everyone has equal access to job opportunities in an automated world?
5. **Worker Well-being:** How does the use of AI affect employees' workload and work-life balance?

Illustration 5: Panel discussion Innovation Hive, Larissa, Greece

Data Collection and Analysis

A systematic procedure was established for data collection and subsequent analysis. Each panel discussion was audio-recorded, and a full verbatim transcript of the proceedings was produced. These transcripts were then professionally translated into English to create a unified dataset for comparative analysis. The analytical method employed for this report is a qualitative, cross-case thematic analysis. This approach involves systematically coding the transcripts to identify recurrent themes, patterns, and arguments related to the guiding questions. The analysis focuses on identifying both common themes that transcend national boundaries (points of convergence) and unique perspectives or arguments that are specific to a particular national context (points of divergence). This methodology allows for a deep and nuanced synthesis of the rich qualitative data generated by the panel discussions.

Thematic Analysis of Panel Discussions

The analysis of the eight national panel discussions reveals a rich and complex tapestry of perspectives on the ethical challenges posed by AI in the workplace. While the specific nuances varied by country, the discussions consistently revolved around a core set of transformative impacts and moral imperatives. This chapter synthesizes the findings thematically, organized according to the five guiding questions that structured each panel.

Description of panels in each country

The German panel was a dynamic discussion that framed AI as a "huge revolution" and one of society's most significant challenges. The debate was characterized by the tension between AI as an abstract "*black box*" that "*more than 95% of people don't understand*" and a practical "*tool*". **Panelist Perspectives:** Prof. Goran Bandov: As a Professor of International Relations, Bandov framed AI as the "most important challenge" because, unlike climate change (where "*science 50 years ago knows what we are going through*"), AI is new. He stressed the need for transparency for "*decision makers*" and data protection. He directly challenged the corporate view on monitoring, arguing that relaxation time, even for "OnlyFans," might function like a "coffee" break and ultimately boost productivity. Karoline Karl: An expert in organizational development, Karl argued that AI is simply a "*tool*" and *"it's on us, whether it's dangerous or whether it's used for a better future*". She provided a concrete ethical framework by introducing the European Commission's seven principles for trustworthy AI, including "human agency and oversight, technical robustness and accountability". Piotr Kowenzowski: Speaking from a management perspective, Kowenzowski provided the panel's most direct corporate viewpoint. He argued that "*privacy at work doesn't exist*" because companies "have to" monitor employees for security reasons (e.g., "*Russians trying to get your data*") and to prevent illegal activities like downloading "*torrents*". Elias Kouloures: Kouloures argued that AI is one of four "transformational waves" (alongside biotechnology, robotics, and quantum computers) and that it "*will kill with most certainty... mediocrity*". He offered a concrete list of eight parameters for implementation, including "*human dignity and agency, fairness and non-discrimination and privacy and data minimization*". He criticized Europe for its inaction: "W*e're always talking, but we're not doing*". **Audience Interaction:** The audience engaged on the themes of personal overwhelm, accountability, and geopolitical reality. One participant expressed feeling "*totally overwhelmed*" by the "*specialist knowledge*" and asked for "*one proposition from each of you, how to aim the challenges*". Another audience member stressed accountability, stating that AI "*has been here*" for a long time and *"we need to hold our decision makers responsible*". A third participant posed a geopolitical challenge: "*Is it really worth it to talk about [safety concerns] when the main powers in AI... are the China and USA*" and "*Europe is much, much behind?*". The

panel responded that a "*global common solution*" is necessary and that "*we can't give up*".

The Italian panel focused on the urgent need for practical regulation and new professional roles to manage AI's "*exponential growth, exemplified by the "€1.2 billion*" market in Italy in 2024 alone. The discussion highlighted the human cost of AI, from exploited "*click workers*" to the stress of digital control. **Panelist Perspectives:** Dr. Morena Mauro viewed AI as a "*dual issue*," contrasting its positive (innovation in medicine) with its negative (agents becoming "*no longer easily manageable*"). Her key proposal was the creation of a new professional role, an "ethical agent" within companies, similar to a "*safety officer*," who would be "*responsible for the ethical principles applied to artificial intelligence*". Dr. Claudia Ogriseg argued against creating a new role, suggesting instead to "*extend the duties of the DPO (Data Protection Officer)*". She provided a key insight into AI's impact on stress: "*Digitalisation brings with it control*". She used the example of waiters with tablets, where employers can now "*monitor how many orders are taken, how quickly, whether they are correct or incorrect,*" which "*generates stress*". Dr. Ruben Cadau focused on "*education*" and the need for "*shared ethical principles*". He warned about algorithmic bias: "*if, for example, I feed xenophobic content to artificial intelligence, artificial intelligence will become efficient on this issue*". His primary focus was on migrants as the "*new workforce*," advocating for "*dual literacy training: in the world of work and in digitalisation*". Dr. Laura Sguassero was skeptical of AI's current use, comparing it to using Microsoft Word "*exactly like a typewriter*". She warned against trusting AI's outputs, noting that when she asks it to cite sources, she finds "*that about 50% of them do not exist*". Her most powerful contribution was highlighting the hidden human cost: the exploited "*click workers from the southern hemisphere spending all day watching hundreds of videos of violence, blended kittens and severed heads*". **Audience Interaction:** The Italian audience was highly engaged, contributing substantive points on ethics, privacy, and policy. On ethics, participants raised the "f*undamental question: who do we entrust with the responsibility of applying ethics?*" and asked "*where are ethics transmitted? Within the family? Through international politics?*". On privacy, one participant brought an SME perspective, noting that while official IT managers "*block everything*," in reality, "*the technical office representative uses their Chat GPT account, throws the design in*," creating shadow risks. On equal access, another participant reinforced Dr. Cadau's point, stating that 95% of the "*new workforce (migrants) in their area are illiterate in their native language*," requiring foundational training. On policy, a participant argued that if AI is left "*to the free market*," citizens "*must take action through politics*". Another stressed the need for "*participation*," noting with concern that in the last election, only "*20% of the population voted*".

The Polish panel approached AI from a deeply humanistic and emotional perspective. The discussion framed the technology as a "*contradiction*" that forces a re-evaluation of the human's role. The panel also highlighted a significant "*readiness gap*" in the Polish workforce. **Panelist Perspectives:** Agata Dziubińska-Gawlik - as a sociologist and psychotherapist, she approached AI from an "*emotional point of view*". She argued that

principles must be based on "*trust*" and "respect for emotions". Her central argument was that AI lacks true human feeling: "*AI can recognize mood, but it will never feel it. We have mixed emotions, and AI never does it*". Dr. Marcin Garbowski provided an analytical view, separating generative AI from industrial automation. He offered an optimistic perspective on inclusion, noting that robotics could allow people with disabilities to work remotely as "*operator[s]*" of drones and that AI translation apps help migrants "*find their way to this country*". As Director of the Regional Labor Office, Tomasz Pitucha posed the central ethical question: "*how this card will serve the human being, and vice versa, how the human being will serve the card*". He was skeptical of AI's current utility, finding his "*emotional experience*" with bots "*unresponsive*". He introduced the concept of "*Life Long Learning*" as essential. Dr. Domini Kubas provided stark data on AI readiness in Poland, citing that "*almost 70% of people working in Poland never received any indication*" on how to use AI, and "*only 10% feel comfortable*" with it. He highlighted the stress from remote monitoring, where apps track "h*ow often they click on the keyboard causes a lot of mental stress for employees*". **Audience Interaction:** The audience in Poland raised two major philosophical and systemic questions. "*Is artificial intelligence a new species?*". This participant noted that "*emotional artificial systems*" already exist, citing "*a very commercial toy made by Sony, a dog that interacts with people*". Panelists responded that AI is not a species because it cannot "*replicate themselves without human participation*" and lacks "*physiological processes related to our hormones*". "*Does one feel that the country will control how or in what way to set up artificial intelligence?*". Tomasz responded by discussing the concept of a *"minimum guaranteed income*" as a potential state-level solution to mass automation, though he conceded it remains a "*sad forecast*".

The Portuguese panel was a dynamic debate between corporate practicality and academic skepticism. A key theme was the unreliability of AI and the necessity of human verification. Panelists agreed that AI functions as an amplifier of existing human traits: "*AI, in companies where there is already a lack of ethics, will only amplify this lack of ethics*". **Panelist Perspectives:** Dr. Inês Vaz Pereira was speaking as a partner at Deloitte and provided the corporate view. She explained her "*big four*" firm initially "*prohibited access to Chat GPT*" due to "*protection of the accuracy of the data*". She was optimistic about AI's effect on well-being, arguing it automates "*lower value-added work*" (e.g., "*placing stickers on bicycles*") and can even be used "*to detect stress in their employees*". Prof. Ana Patrícia Duarte directly challenged Dr. Pereira's optimism. She argued that AI can unbalance quality of life, leading to "*techno-invasion*" and the "*feeling of always being connected*". She found the idea of AI "*to detect a person's stress level*" to be "*ethically dubious*," questioning if consent was truly voluntary or "*a prerequisite for working at the company*". HR Director, Dr. Hélder Figueiredo's core principle was skepticism: "*I don't trust*". He gave the memorable example of asking AI for a regional soup recipe, only for it to fail: "*It said it had carrots, but I guarantee it doesn't contain carrots*". He advocated for "*middle management*" to be human-centric, treating employees like "*adults*" and described his "*butterfly in my stomach*" test for data privacy. Prof. Ana Maria da Almeida explained why AI is unreliable. The "*hallucinations*" (like the carrots) are not a "*mistake*" but

a "*successful development of a generational mechanism*". The AI's goal is to "*create discourse*," not just report facts. She argued that ethical development must "*start with us*" (academics and developers). **Audience Interaction:** The audience in Portugal drove a significant part of the discussion, focusing on accountability, ethics, and the reality of AI in HR. One participant asked the key question of accountability: "*Shouldn't the companies that create these systems also be ethical?*". They noted that "*Chat GPT steals from books*" and "*Siri is always listening*". Another participant asked about AI in decision-making: "*what if it tells us, look, I think you should fire three or four people that I'm going to point out?*" A third participant asked Dr. Pereira directly: "*do you think the use of Artificial Intelligence in recruitment is widespread or definitive?*" She confirmed, "*In recruitment, clearly*," but for "*Performance evaluation, I think we are still a long way off*".

The Slovenian panel was a deep, philosophical, and anthropological discussion on the nature of humanity, work, and ethics. The unifying theme was that AI, as a non-conscious entity, is incapable of ethics; therefore, all responsibility remains human. **Panelist Perspectives:** As an anthropologist and educator, Dr. Nadia Molek (Moderator) framed the discussion, highlighting the "*global inequality in the development of artificial intelligence*". She noted that students often lack the skills to use AI as "*support rather than as a substitute*" and observed a "*social restraint*" or "*taboo*" around admitting its use. Dr. Rajko Muršič was the panel optimist. He argued that "*Artificial intelligence does not, and never will, have any understanding of ethics*" and that responsibility lies "*entirely with the person who uses the tool*". He saw AI as a "*historical moment of opportunity*" to achieve a "*three-hour workday*", after which humans would "*socialize, tell stories, create, and enjoy themselves*". Dr. Karolina Babič provided the philosophical grounding, stating AI cannot be an "*ethical subject*" because it lacks "*free will*". She warned against delegating our humanity, citing an anecdote of a wealthy poet whose "servants now do the feeling for me as well". She connected the future of work to a "*universal basic income*", arguing AI's productivity should be a "*common good*". Dr. Aljoša Polajžar contrasted the "*European legal sphere*," which values "*human dignity and privacy*," with China, where "*economic development*" is prioritized. He called the protected European work environment the "*European bubble*" and noted the paradox that technology "*intensifies labor*" when it should be helping us "*work less*". Dr. Kristina Toplak, focused on migrants, including those in "*3D jobs — dirty, dangerous, and difficult*". She provided a positive use case: AI-powered translation tools helping migrant care workers from Nepal "*overcome language barriers*" and "*communicate effectively with residents*" in a Ljubljana retirement home. **Audience Interaction:** There were no questions raised from the audience; the discussion remained among the panelists.

The Swedish panel was a highly interactive discussion that contrasted the nonprofit and for-profit approaches to AI. It began with an audience member, a "*future analyst*" predicting that "*we will actually not have any workplaces at all. We will all be unemployed*" and will survive as "*day traders, investing in autonomous AIs*". Another audience member from customer service disagreed, saying, "*I don't see it replacing us*". **Panelist**

Perspectives: Representing a tech school for marginalized women, her core principles were "*human-centered AI, critical questioning and equity and access in design*". She described her team's decision not to use numerical AI literacy assessments to avoid "*ranking employees*" or creating "*a new layer of inequality*", opting instead for a "*culture of curiosity*". This second panelist argued that existing ethical principles are sufficient. He noted the "*irony*" that companies "*respect our customers' data far more than we respect our own internal... employee data*". He challenged the idea that AI saves time, arguing it multiplies work: "*I'm now running ten different projects at once*". He described this as "*having ten tabs open in your brain*". His guiding principle was: "*don't bury your head in the sand*". **Audience Interaction:** The audience was integral to the panel's flow. The moderator shared a personal story of being rejected for a job at Joe & The Juice because the AI hiring system "*couldn't call international numbers*" a systemic bias that "*automatically excluded*" many immigrants. A participant noted their daughter, an IT recruiter, saw her "*business has dropped dramatically*" as companies "*are now using AI*". Participants discussed "*sentiment analysis on Slack*," which one called "*absolutely bananas*" and "*surveillance disguised as feedback*". A teacher in the audience cited a study showing teachers "*lose time rather than save it*" because they "*spent an hour and a half fixing the AI's output*".

The Belgian panel delivered a sharp social critique of AI's role in amplifying neoliberal labor market dynamics. The discussion focused on the "*panopticon*" effect of workplace surveillance, the "*one-sided flexibility*" demanded of workers, and the need for human control. **Panelist Perspectives:** Siegmund Leducq took a technical and legalistic view, arguing that employee privacy "*is reasonably well preserved*" and *"safeguarded by all kinds of rules and also by the rise of the GDPR fever*" He concluded that employees are "*one of the least risky groups*". Job De Meyere argued for transparency and human-AI dialogue: "*I am afraid of a world in which only techies would know*". He introduced Foucault's "*panopticon*" to explain how surveillance becomes internalized. He advocated for a "*right to absence*" - the right "*not to be visible, not to be found, and to work in peace*". Bleri Lleshi Gjonpala provided the panel's strongest social critique. He argued that algorithms "*discriminate*" and must be under "*human control and supervision*". He directly countered Siegmund Leducq, stating that "*employees are complaining more and more about being controlled*" and gave the example of remote workers monitored "*through cameras - wherever they are*". His main point was the critique of "*one-sided flexibility*", using the "*concrete example*" of a single mother in Brussels who was denied flexibility for childcare but was expected to "*take the laptop home, be available by phone, work extra when needed*". **Audience Interaction:** The audience in Belgium focused on accountability, the human impact of automation, and the historical precedent for technological harm. One participant, a social work student, lamented the loss of human connection: "*If I have a problem tomorrow and want to contact the bank, I usually end up with a chatbot.. I can hardly reach a real person anymore*". Another participant highlighted the core accountability gap: "*AI itself doesn't really know why it makes certain decisions. You can never hurt a computer decision. You can never call them to account*". A third audience

member drew a stark historical parallel: *"Almost every human invention has eventually been used for harm. Dynamite enabled construction but also warfare; nuclear energy... created nuclear weapons; the internet fuels cybercrime*".

The Greek panel focused on "*adaptation*" as the essential skill for the future, emphasizing that the primary challenge is not the technology, but the "*leadership ethics and emotional intelligence*" required to manage it. **Panelist Perspectives:** Fenia Kalantzi framed the discussion, noting that in her own organization, AI "*created more pressure*" and necessitated a new "*quality control*" role. She argued for "*lifelong learning and inclusion*" to ensure "*groups that are usually left behind*," such as "*women returning to work, older workers, or people in rural areas*," are not forgotten. Aggeliki Tsiameti stressed that "*ethical leadership matters most*". When discussing surveillance cameras, she argued the key ethical test for a manager is to ask: "*Does this system make my employees feel safer, or more anxious?*". She argued that privacy is "*emotional and when you feel trusted, you do your job better*". Maria Chondrogianni focused on the skills AI cannot replicate: "*creativity, empathy, and emotional intelligence*". She argued these are the "*uniquely human qualities that define good teamwork and innovation*". Her conclusion was that "*Ethical AI is not about controlling machines, it's about nurturing the people who use them*". **Audience Interaction:** The Greek audience provided personal, grounded examples that centered the discussion on trust and human bias. One participant noted that in their company, "*it felt like we were being constantly watched. No one really explained what data was being collected or why, so people got anxious*". Another audience member asked a critical question: "*How realistic is it to expect small companies to apply these principles?*". The most powerful contribution came from a participant who shared her experience returning from maternity leave. She was repeatedly asked by employers, "*are you sure you can handle it with a baby at home?*". She concluded with a key insight for the entire project: "*Automation and AI don't scare me, what scares me is bias*".

The AI Revolution: Perceptions of Labor Market Transformation

Across the panels, there was a strong consensus that the changes being wrought by AI are not incremental but revolutionary. Panelists rejected the notion of a simple "transition," instead framing the current moment as a fundamental paradigm shift. As Piotr Kowenzowski, an engineer and manager, stated in the German panel, "*I would compare it to revolution more than transition. I would compare it more to, like the creation of the internet... it's a huge revolution*". This sentiment was echoed in discussions about the sheer scale and speed of change, which many found disorienting and difficult to comprehend.

This revolutionary force was often described in dualistic terms. On one hand, AI was characterized as a "black box," a source of unpredictable and often opaque change. Karoline Karl, an expert in organizational development, noted in the German panel that AI "*transforms very, very, very quickly and sometimes unpredictable. So it's not clear what it's going to do or can do*". This unpredictability was a source of significant anxiety, as many

participants felt that society was grappling with a technology whose full implications were not yet understood. On the other hand, panelists frequently described AI as a powerful "tool," likening it to a hammer that could be used for either construction or destruction. As Karoline Karl articulated, "*We can use it to build positive things and we can use it to tear something down. So it's on us, whether it's dangerous or whether it's used for a better future*". This framing placed a heavy emphasis on human choice, governance, and ethical responsibility in steering the technology's impact.

Illustration 6: Panel discussion ISCTE Lisbon, Portugal

A central theme in the transformation of the labor market was the concept of the "death of mediocrity." In the German panel, Elias Kouloures argued forcefully that "*what AI will kill with most certainty is mediocrity*". He reasoned that just as industrial machines automated physical power, AI is automating logical and computational problem-solving, thereby rendering routine cognitive tasks obsolete. This has immediate and severe consequences for job security, particularly for entry-level or junior roles. Piotr Kowenzowski confirmed this observation from a practical standpoint, stating, *"especially for junior roles it's hard to get a job*" in fields like programming that were once considered secure. This creates immense pressure on the workforce to move up the value chain, focusing on skills that AI cannot easily replicate, such as creativity, critical thinking, and emotional intelligence.
Finally, several discussions broadened the scope of transformation beyond the immediate workplace to fundamental societal structures. Panelists in Germany noted that AI is converging with other "transformational waves" such as biotechnology, robotics, and quantum computing. This convergence, they argued, could lead to profound shifts, including radical extensions of the human lifespan. Goran Bandov and Elias Kouloures explored the societal implications of people living for hundreds of years, a change that

would fundamentally challenge existing models of careers, retirement, and social support systems. This perspective reframes the AI revolution not just as a change in how we work, but as a catalyst for rethinking the entire human life cycle and the structure of society itself.

A Moral Compass for Automation: Foundational Ethical Principles

When asked what ethical principles should guide the implementation of AI, a remarkable degree of consensus emerged across the eight national panels. Despite differing cultural and professional starting points, the discussions consistently converged on a set of foundational principles essential for building a trustworthy and human-centric automated workplace. The most frequently cited principles were **Transparency, Fairness, Accountability, and Human Agency/Oversight**.

The German panel provided one of the most structured articulations of these principles, with panelist Karoline Karl explicitly referencing the **European Commission's seven principles for trustworthy AI**: (1) Human agency and oversight, (2) Technical robustness and safety, (3) Privacy and data governance, (4) Transparency, (5) Diversity, non-discrimination and fairness, (6) Societal and environmental well-being, and (7) Accountability. This framework served as a valuable reference point, demonstrating an alignment between the expert discourse and established EU guidelines. The principle of "human agency and oversight," or the "human in the loop," was particularly emphasized, with panelists arguing that AI should augment human capabilities, not supplant human decision-making in critical contexts.

While some panels approached the question through formal frameworks, others adopted a more humanistic or governance-oriented lens. The Polish panel, for instance, placed a strong emphasis on the emotional and relational dimensions of work. Panelist Agata Dziubińska-Gawlik argued that the foundational principles must be **trust, respect for human emotions, and human dignity**. This perspective suggests that ethical AI is not merely a matter of technical compliance but of preserving the humanistic core of the workplace. Meanwhile, the Italian panel proposed concrete governance mechanisms to operationalize these principles. Panelists there suggested the creation of a new professional role, an "ethical agent" within companies, or the expansion of the Data Protection Officer's (DPO) mandate to include oversight of AI systems. This pragmatic proposal sought to translate abstract principles into tangible organizational practice.


Illustrations 7, 8: Panel discussion IRES, Udine, Italy

Beneath this surface-level consensus on principles, however, the discussions revealed a deeper, more complex tension at the heart of the European approach to AI governance. This tension manifests as a strategic dilemma: how can the EU uphold its commitment to a human-centric, values-based regulatory model without sacrificing its global competitiveness in a field dominated by the more market-driven approaches of the United States and China? This undercurrent of geopolitical anxiety was palpable. While panelists in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere called for robust regulation and strong ethical guardrails, this call was often met with a sense of urgency and fear of falling behind. An audience member in the German panel bluntly questioned the utility of the debate, asking, "*Is it really worth it to talk about those concerns when the main powers in AI are China and the USA. No, Europe is much. Much behind*". This sentiment was echoed by another panelist, who warned that Europe is "*always talking, but we're not doing*," and that by the time a consensus is reached, it may be "*too late*". This is not a simple disagreement on the merits of regulation; it is a reflection of a fundamental identity crisis for Europe in the digital age. The collective discourse across the eight panels suggests that the EU is grappling with how to codify its social and ethical values into technology governance without inadvertently ceding technological and economic leadership. This high-stakes question forms the implicit backdrop to the entire ethical debate, making the search for a "European way" in AI both a moral quest and a strategic imperative.

The Digital Panopticon: Worker Privacy in an Era of Algorithmic Management

The issue of worker privacy emerged as one of the most immediate and visceral concerns across all eight panel discussions. The introduction of new technologies has enabled forms of workplace monitoring that are unprecedented in their scope and granularity, leading to what many participants described as a "digital panopticon." There was a widespread perception that traditional notions of privacy are being fundamentally eroded by algorithmic management.

Panelists provided concrete examples of this heightened surveillance. In the Polish panel, Dr. Dominik Kubas noted that large corporations, particularly those with remote or hybrid work models, use "*different tools that monitor how employees behave in front of the computer, how often they click on the keyboard, how much this mouse moves, what application spends how much time*". This sentiment was expressed even more starkly in the German panel, where Piotr Kowenzowski, drawing on his experience implementing security standards, declared that *"privacy at work doesn't exist*". He argued that companies are compelled to monitor employee activity for security reasons, to prevent data breaches or illegal activities on company devices. This pragmatic perspective, while unsettling to many, framed surveillance not as a malicious choice but as a perceived operational necessity in a high-risk digital environment.

Beyond the technical reality of monitoring, the discussions delved into its profound psychological impact on workers. Karoline Karl, in the German panel, articulated the fear of being "*constantly monitored and then evaluated*", a state that undermines trust, erodes autonomy, and leads to significant mental stress. This creates a work environment where

employees may feel pressured to perform a certain kind of "busyness" for the algorithm, rather than focusing on meaningful work. The constant potential for observation can stifle creativity and risk-taking, fostering a culture of compliance and anxiety.

Illustration 9, 10: Panel discussion CRN, Berlin, Germany

The legal dimension of this issue was also a central topic. While regulations like the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provide a foundational framework for data protection, panelists argued that these laws are being stretched to their limits by new technologies. The Italian panel offered a particularly detailed analysis of the legal complexities. Dr. Claudia Ogriseg described Italy's "*multi-level regulatory system*," where a worker's privacy issue could simultaneously fall under the jurisdiction of the Labour Court, the Data Protection Authority, and the Civil Court, creating a confusing and fragmented legal landscape. Furthermore, she highlighted the blurring lines between personal and company data, especially with the use of personal devices for work (BYOD policies) and the monitoring of work-related applications on smartphones. This legal ambiguity, combined with the rapid pace of technological change, leaves both workers and employers in a state of uncertainty about their rights and obligations, making the protection of privacy a continuous and evolving challenge.

Algorithmic Justice: Striving for Fairness and Equal Opportunity

The principle of fairness was a cornerstone of the discussions, with a particular focus on how to ensure equal access to job opportunities in an increasingly automated world. A dominant concern was the risk of algorithmic bias, where AI systems used in recruitment and promotion processes could perpetuate or even amplify existing societal prejudices. The case of Amazon, which famously had to scrap a recruiting AI after it was found to be discriminatory against female candidates, was cited in the Portuguese panel by Dr. Inês

Vaz Pereira as a cautionary tale of how easily bias can be encoded into automated systems. This example served as a powerful illustration of the need for rigorous auditing and human oversight to ensure that AI tools promote fairness rather than undermine it.

In response to these risks, the concept of "lifelong learning" emerged as a universal and emphatic theme across all panels. Participants from every country identified continuous education, upskilling, and reskilling as the most critical strategy for ensuring that the workforce can adapt to the changing demands of the labor market. The discussions highlighted the danger of a new digital divide, which could create a two-tiered workforce composed of those who can work with AI and those who are displaced by it. To prevent this, panelists called for massive investment in accessible and inclusive training programs, particularly for those most at risk of being left behind.

The panels brought sharp focus to the specific challenges faced by marginalized groups. The Italian panel's discussion on migration was particularly poignant. Panelist Ruben Cadau argued for the necessity of a "*dual literacy*" for migrants - proficiency not only in digital tools but also in the norms and rights of the local labor market. Without this dual competence, he warned, there is a significant risk that migrant workers will be relegated to a permanent underclass of low-skilled, precarious labor, unable to access the opportunities of the automated economy. This perspective underscored that ensuring fairness requires targeted interventions that address the unique barriers faced by different vulnerable populations.

However, the discourse on fairness was not entirely pessimistic. Several panelists, particularly in the Swedish discussion, presented a more optimistic view, suggesting that AI, if designed and implemented correctly, could be a powerful tool for *reducing* human bias in hiring. The argument was that a well-designed algorithm, focused solely on skills and qualifications, could be more objective than a human recruiter who might be influenced by unconscious biases related to gender, race, or background. This perspective frames technology not as an inherent threat to fairness but as a potential instrument for achieving it. The Swedish panel, with its focus on equity and co-design, championed the idea that AI hiring systems could "democratize access to work" by creating a more level playing field for all candidates. This illustrates the dual potential of AI: it can either entrench existing inequalities or, with conscious and ethical design, become a force for greater algorithmic justice.

Illustration 11: Panel discussion UCLL, Leuven, Belgium

The Human Core: AI's Impact on Worker Well-being and Work-Life Balance

The final thematic area of discussion centered on the impact of AI on the lived experience of workers, specifically their workload, stress levels, and the delicate balance between professional and personal life. Here, the panels uncovered a fundamental paradox at the heart of workplace automation. On one hand, AI holds the promise of liberating workers from monotonous and repetitive tasks, freeing them up for more creative and meaningful work. As one panelist in Italy noted, AI can be used to speed up the "tedious parts" of a job. On the other hand, this very efficiency often leads to an escalation of expectations and an intensification of work. This concern was succinctly captured by Bleri Lleshi Gjonpalaj in the Belgian panel, who asked, "*If we can work twice as fast, will we be expected to produce twice as much*?".

This intensification of labor, coupled with the "always-on" culture facilitated by digital technologies, was identified as a primary driver of "digital burnout." Panelists, such as Dr. Kristina Toplak in the Slovenian discussion, linked this phenomenon directly to the blurring of boundaries between work and private life. Remote work, while offering flexibility, has also extended the workplace into the home, making it harder for employees to disconnect. The constant stream of notifications and the expectation of immediate availability contribute to a state of chronic stress and mental fatigue. In response, the concept of a legally enshrined "right to disconnect," which was raised in the Italian panel, was seen as a crucial policy measure to protect worker well-being in the digital age.

The discussions also explored positive use cases where AI is being deployed to actively enhance well-being. Dr. Inês Vaz Pereira in the Portuguese panel shared an example of companies using AI algorithms to analyze anonymized communication patterns to detect early signs of stress and burnout within teams. This data could then be used to inform targeted well-being interventions, such as adjusting workloads or providing mental health support. However, this application immediately sparked an ethical debate. Her fellow

panelist, Dr. Ana Patrícia Duarte, raised sharp questions about consent and privacy, arguing that such monitoring, even if well-intentioned, could be perceived as intrusive and could create a coercive environment where employees feel pressured to consent for fear of negative repercussions. This exchange perfectly encapsulated the fine line between using AI for beneficial support and crossing into unethical surveillance.

The discussions on well-being consistently returned to the theme of human-centricity. The consensus was that technology should be a tool to enhance human work, not to dictate its pace and intensity. Achieving a healthy work-life balance in an automated environment requires a conscious effort from organizations to prioritize the human core of their operations—fostering a culture of trust, respecting boundaries, and ensuring that the efficiencies gained through AI translate into a better quality of life for employees, not just a higher output.

Comparative Synthesis: A Cross-National Perspective

The analysis of the eight national panel discussions provides a unique opportunity to map the emerging European discourse on the ethics of AI in the workplace. While each discussion was colored by its specific local context, a clear pattern of shared concerns, common principles, and distinct national priorities can be discerned. This chapter synthesizes these findings, first by identifying the common ground that unites the European perspective, then by highlighting the divergent views that reveal national nuances, and finally by presenting a comparative table for a clear, at-a-glance overview.


Illustrations 12 and 13: Panel discussion of Well-Beeing Lab, Malmo, Sweden

Common Ground: Shared Concerns and Universal Principles

Despite the geographical and cultural diversity of the participating countries, the discussions revealed a striking degree of convergence on the fundamental challenges and ethical imperatives of AI. This suggests the formation of a common "European discourse"

rooted in shared values and anxieties.

Shared Concerns:

- **Fear of Job Displacement and De-skilling:** A primary anxiety expressed in every panel was the potential for mass job displacement due to automation, particularly for roles involving routine cognitive and manual tasks. The concept of the "death of mediocrity" resonated widely, fueling concerns about a polarized labor market and the fate of workers unable to transition to higher-skilled roles.
- **Erosion of Privacy through Surveillance:** The threat to worker privacy was a universal and deeply felt concern. From Germany to Greece, participants voiced alarm over the rise of sophisticated monitoring technologies that track employee activity, creating a "digital panopticon" that undermines trust and autonomy.
- **Amplification of Social Inequalities:** There was a strong consensus that AI, if left unregulated, poses a significant risk of exacerbating existing social and economic disparities. Panelists consistently worried that algorithmic bias and unequal access to technology would further marginalize vulnerable groups, including older workers, migrants, and women.
- **Increased Work-Related Stress and Burnout:** The paradox of technology—that efficiency tools often lead to work intensification—was a common theme. The blurring of work-life boundaries and the pressure of an "always-on" culture were identified as major contributors to digital burnout across all national contexts.

Shared Principles: In response to these concerns, the panels collectively articulated a set of core ethical principles that should govern AI in the workplace:

- **Transparency:** A unanimous demand was that the use of AI must be transparent. Workers have a right to know when an algorithmic system is being used, what data it is processing, and how it influences decisions that affect them.
- **Human Oversight:** The "human-in-the-loop" or "human-in-command" principle was universally endorsed. Panelists insisted that final authority and moral responsibility for critical decisions—such as hiring, firing, or disciplinary action—must remain with a human being.
- **Accountability:** A clear and robust framework for accountability was deemed essential. When an AI system causes harm or makes a flawed decision, there must be clear mechanisms to identify who is responsible and provide recourse for those affected.

Shared Solution: Across all eight countries, **lifelong learning** was unequivocally hailed as the primary adaptive strategy. Panelists and audience members alike emphasized that continuous education, upskilling, and the cultivation of AI literacy are not just beneficial but absolutely necessary for individuals to remain relevant and for societies to navigate the transition successfully. This was the most consistent and emphatic conclusion of the entire

Illustration 14: Panel discussion CRN, Berlin, Germany

Divergent Views: National Nuances and Contextual Differences

While the common ground was significant, each national discussion had a distinct character, shaped by its unique economic conditions, social priorities, and cultural orientations, often reflecting the specific challenges identified in the project's initial needs analysis.

- **Germany:** The German discussion was highly structured, pragmatic, and policy-oriented, frequently referencing formal EU frameworks like the principles for trustworthy AI. However, this structured debate was underpinned by a palpable anxiety about maintaining Germany's industrial leadership and global competitiveness in the face of rapid advances from the US and China.

- **Italy:** The Italian panel was distinguished by its strong focus on social justice and solidarity. The discussion gave a significant voice to the plight of the most vulnerable, from the exploitation of "click workers" in the Global South to the specific integration challenges faced by migrants. This reflects Italy's position on the frontline of Mediterranean migration and its strong tradition of trade unionism and social advocacy.

- **Poland:** The Polish discussion took on a notably humanistic and philosophical tone. The debate was frequently framed in terms of "human dignity," "trust," and the irreplaceable role of "human emotions." This approach prioritized the psychological

and existential experience of the worker over purely technical or economic considerations.

- **Portugal:** The Portuguese panel offered a strong business and Human Resources-centric perspective. The conversation was grounded in the practical realities of corporate implementation, with discussions on return on investment, business cases for AI, and the role of HR in managing the transition. This was balanced by a critical academic perspective on the ethical limits of workplace monitoring.

- **Slovenia:** The Slovenian discussion was perhaps the most deeply philosophical and anthropological. Panelists engaged in fundamental questions about the nature of work, consciousness, and what it means to be human in relation to intelligent machines. The debate moved beyond policy to explore the existential implications of a world co-habited by non-biological intelligence.

- **Sweden:** The Swedish panel's perspective was uniquely shaped by the leading voice of a non-profit organization working with marginalized communities. Consequently, the discussion was framed around principles of equity, inclusive design, and bottom-up empowerment, emphasizing the need to co-design AI systems with the communities they will affect.

- **Greece:** The Greek discussion placed a significant emphasis on adaptation and leadership. Against a backdrop of economic challenges, the panelists focused on the need for resilience, the emotional strain of constant change, and the crucial role of good leadership in building trust and guiding organizations through the digital transformation.

- **Belgium:** The Belgian panel adopted a critical, philosophical lens, drawing on thinkers like Foucault to analyze the power dynamics of workplace surveillance. The discussion was framed as a critique of the neoliberal logic driving technology adoption, questioning whether AI serves human well-being or simply enhances mechanisms of control and efficiency.

Comparative Analysis of Panel Findings

The following table provides a structured summary of the key findings from each national panel discussion, organized by the five guiding questions. This format allows for a direct comparison of the different perspectives and highlights both the common themes and the unique national contributions to the discourse.

Table 1: Summary of the key findings

Thematic Question	Germany	Italy	Poland	Portugal	Slovenia	Sweden	Greece	Belgium
0) Introductory Question: Labor Market Changes & AI Challenges	AI as a "revolution," not a transition. "Death of mediocrity" and pressure on junior roles. Convergence of AI with biotech, robotics, raising societal questions (e.g., life extension).	AI as a dual issue: innovation driver vs. unmanageable agent. Exponential market growth. Concern over generative AI, fake news, and exploitation of "click workers."	AI's impact on human emotions. Rapid pace of change compared to previous tech shifts (e.g., Nokia to smartphone). Need to balance AI tasks with human emotional intelligence.	Initial corporate skepticism (e.g., blocking ChatGPT) due to data accuracy and protection concerns. Shift to common practice. Emphasis on the business case for AI.	Historical-anthropological view: fears of tech replacement are recurrent but often lead to new work forms. AI is a cultural phenomenon transforming thought and creativity.	AI will lead to a future with no traditional workplaces, where individuals act as investors in autonomous AIs. The job market will balance out with new roles emerging.	AI requires constant adaptation, leading to mental strain and new roles (e.g., quality control). Need for leaders to manage the human impact of rapid change.	Technology is driven by a neoliberal logic of control and efficiency. AI amplifies existing power dynamics, creating a "digital panopticon" (Foucault).
General Question: Ethical Principles for AI	Structured discussion referencing **EU's 7 principles** for trustworthy AI. Emphasis on human agency, transparency, and accountability. Strong undercurrent of	Call for regulation and creation of an "ethical agent" role in companies, or expanding the DPO's duties. Emphasis on shared, common ethics, critical judgment, and	Primacy of **trust, respect for human emotions, and human dignity**. Ethics grounded in the human experience, not just technical rules. Transparency is key for employee	Ethics framed by business needs: protecting data accuracy, ensuring truthful decision-making, and building trust to generate value. Principles include responsibility and non-discrimination.	Philosophical debate on AI as a "tool" vs. an "ethical subject." AI lacks consciousness and cannot be morally responsible. Ethics remains a human domain. Human-centered	Principles developed from a non-profit perspective: **Community-led, transparency, demystification, human connection, and equity in design**. AI should amplify impact, not	Key principles must be **transparency, accountability, and fairness**. Need for explainable algorithms and keeping humans in the loop. Ethics is about empowerment	Principles must be correct and consistent. Human oversight and dialogue with AI are essential. Algorithms must be transparent to ensure accountability and prevent discrimination.

Thematic Question	Germany	Italy	Poland	Portugal	Slovenia	Sweden	Greece	Belgium
	concern about global competitiveness.	human rights in AI training.	trust.		digital transition is key.	replace human connection.	and building trust.	
Privacy: Impact of New Technologies	"*Privacy at work doesn't exist*" due to security monitoring needs. Psychological impact of constant surveillance and evaluation. Fear of being controlled.	A complex multi-level legal system (Labor Court, DPA) creates ambiguity. Blurring of personal/work data on devices. Maniacal control via apps. Stress from potential control.	Focus on the psychological impact of monitoring on trust and human dignity. Employees should know why and how they are monitored. Concern over loss of personal autonomy.	Privacy is the most difficult aspect. Requires a combination of good ethics, leadership, clear policies, and active employee participation. Need for more corporate training beyond simple consent checkboxes.	Privacy is a philosophical and legal issue tied to dignity. Blurring of work/private life boundaries. Data sovereignty is a key issue. Need to regulate and protect the right to disconnect.	Privacy concerns are paramount. Default end-to-end encryption and role-based access. No external training on employee data. Need for annual third-party privacy audits.	Surveillance (cameras, apps) creates a climate of mistrust and anxiety. Transparency is everything: workers must know what data is collected and why. Respect for privacy is a moral requirement.	Privacy is well-protected by law (GDPR) in theory, but in practice, monitoring and control are increasing. Younger generations are less tolerant of surveillance. Society has a paradoxical desire for both privacy and surveillance.
Fairness: Equal Access to Opportunities	Widespread need for upskilling and lifelong learning. Concern that the digital divide will create a two-tiered workforce.	Focus on vulnerable groups, especially migrants needing "dual literacy" (digital and labor market) to avoid exploitation. Algorithmic bias is a major risk.	Justice requires creating opportunities for those in difficult situations (e.g., older workers). Need for education and adaptation to rapid changes.	AI in recruitment can be biased (e.g., Amazon case) but can also be used to *increase* inclusion and fairness by removing human prejudice if designed correctly.	Automation risks creating a group of "unadaptable" people. Need for broad education and flexibility. Social inequalities can be amplified by unequal access to technology.	AI hiring systems can be biased but also have the potential to democratize access to work if programmed correctly. The challenge is ensuring equitable access to training and opportunities.	Lifelong learning and inclusion are key. Need for accessible training for marginalized groups (women, older workers, rural populations) to prevent the digital divide from widening.	Algorithms rely on data that can contain inequalities, leading to discrimination. Human supervision and control are essential to ensure fairness.

Thematic Question	Germany	Italy	Poland	Portugal	Slovenia	Sweden	Greece	Belgium
Worker Well-being: Workload & Work-Life Balance	AI can automate tedious tasks but also increases expectations and workload. Risk of "digital burnout" from blurred work-life boundaries.	AI can increase flexibility but also makes work-life boundaries more fragile. The "right to disconnect" is a key policy response. Awareness is crucial to govern the technology.	Remote work and constant online meetings cause psychological strain and emotional disconnection. The rapid pace of change is a major stressor for less adaptable workers.	AI can reduce workload and improve mental health (e.g., stress detection), but this raises ethical concerns about monitoring and consent. Flexibility and "micro-shifting" are key.	AI can increase efficiency but also accelerates the work pace, leading to burnout. Blurring of work-life boundaries erodes free time and mental health.	AI multiplies what one can do, leading to fragmentation of work into micro-tasks and constant project juggling. This can decrease a sense of agency and increase stress.	AI should reduce stress but often does the opposite by increasing emails, notifications, and data processing. It amplifies existing patterns of overwork and hyper-connectivity.	AI can automate repetitive tasks, but the key question is whether this will lead to more demands. There is a risk of increased stress and a normalization of overload. Younger generations are pushing back against burnout culture.

Actionable Pathways: Recommendations for Stakeholders

The insights gathered from the eight national panel discussions provide a robust foundation for developing actionable strategies to navigate the ethical landscape of AI in the workplace. The findings point to a clear need for a multi-stakeholder approach, where policymakers, employers, and worker representatives collaborate to build a future of work that is innovative, productive, and aligned with core European values. This chapter translates the analytical findings of the report into a set of concrete recommendations for these key groups.

For EU and National Policymakers

The discussions consistently highlighted the limitations of existing legal frameworks and the urgent need for proactive and specific governance.

- **Recommendation 1: Develop Specific "AI in the Workplace" Legislation.** Current regulations, such as the GDPR, provide a crucial foundation but are insufficient to address the unique challenges posed by algorithmic management, automated decision-making in HR, and workplace surveillance. Policymakers should create targeted legislation that mandates:
    - **Algorithmic Transparency:** Requiring employers to disclose the use of AI systems in decision-making processes that affect workers (e.g., hiring, performance evaluation, task allocation).
    - **The Right to Explanation:** Granting workers the right to a meaningful explanation of decisions made or assisted by an AI system.
    - **Accountability and Redress:** Establishing clear liability frameworks for harms caused by workplace AI systems and creating accessible channels for workers to contest algorithmic decisions.

- **Recommendation 2: Massively Invest in Public AI Literacy and Lifelong Learning.** The unanimous call for lifelong learning must be met with substantial public investment. This includes:
    - Integrating digital and AI literacy into national education curricula from an early stage.
    - Funding accessible and high-quality vocational training and reskilling programs, with a specific focus on the vulnerable groups identified in the panels: older workers, individuals with low qualifications, migrants, and those in jobs at high risk of automation.
    - Launching public awareness campaigns to demystify AI and educate citizens about their rights in an automated society.

- **Recommendation 3: Foster a "Third Way" for European AI through Strategic Funding.** To address the tension between regulation and competitiveness, the EU

should strategically invest in an innovation ecosystem that prioritizes "Trustworthy AI." This involves:

- Funding research and development that explicitly embeds ethical principles from the outset ("ethics-by-design").
- Creating regulatory "sandboxes" where companies can innovate responsibly under regulatory supervision.
- Promoting European "Trustworthy AI" as a global standard, turning a values-based approach into a competitive advantage.
-

For Employers, Business Leaders, and HR Professionals

Employers are on the front line of AI implementation and bear a primary responsibility for its ethical deployment.

- **Recommendation 1: Establish Robust Internal AI Governance Structures.** Companies should move beyond ad-hoc adoption of AI tools and create formal governance frameworks. This includes:
  - Developing a clear and public company policy on the ethical use of AI.
  - Creating internal ethics committees or appointing/training dedicated roles, such as the "ethical agent" proposed in the Italian panel, to oversee AI implementation.
  - Conducting regular and independent audits of AI systems for bias, fairness, and privacy impact.

- **Recommendation 2: Prioritize Radical Transparency and Employee Co-Creation.** Trust is the cornerstone of a successful digital transformation. Employers must:
  - Communicate openly, clearly, and proactively with employees about which AI tools are being used, for what purposes, and what data is being collected.
  - Involve employees and their representatives in the selection, design, and implementation process of new AI systems. This co-creation approach, emphasized by the Swedish panel, fosters ownership and reduces fear and resistance.

- **Recommendation 3: Proactively Invest in Worker Well-being and Protect Work-Life Boundaries.** The efficiencies gained from AI should benefit employees, not just the bottom line. This requires:
  - Using AI analytics to identify workplace stressors and inform well-being initiatives, but only with the full, transparent, and uncoerced consent of

employees, and with strict ethical oversight to prevent misuse.

- Implementing and enforcing clear policies that protect the "right to disconnect," setting explicit boundaries on work-related communication outside of established hours.
- Ensuring that productivity gains from automation are partially reinvested into the workforce, for example, through reduced working hours, enhanced training opportunities, or improved working conditions.

Illustration 15: Panel discussion CRN Berlin, Germany

For Trade Unions and Worker Representatives

Social partners have a critical role to play in defending workers' rights and shaping a just transition in the age of AI.

- **Recommendation 1: Build Deep Technological Capacity and Expertise.** To be effective negotiating partners, trade unions and works councils must develop a sophisticated understanding of AI technologies and their implications. This involves:
    - Investing in training for union leaders and representatives on AI, data science, and algorithmic management.
    - Collaborating with academic experts and technologists to build an independent knowledge base.
    - Establishing dedicated tech policy committees within their organizations.

- **Recommendation 2: Champion "Human-in-Command" Principles in Collective Bargaining.**
  Negotiations over the introduction of new technologies should prioritize the protection of worker autonomy and dignity. Key demands should include:
    - Guarantees of human oversight and final decision-making power in all critical HR processes.
    - Joint employer-union governance and auditing of workplace AI systems.
    - Clear limits on data collection and workplace surveillance.

- **Recommendation 3: Advocate for the Rights of All Workers in the Digital Economy.**
  The protections of collective agreements must be extended to the most vulnerable workers. This requires:
    - Developing new strategies for organizing and representing non-standard workers, such as platform and gig economy workers.
    - Fighting for the rights and fair treatment of workers in the global data supply chain, such as the "click workers" highlighted by the Italian panel.
    - Ensuring that the benefits of automation are shared equitably and that robust social safety nets are in place for those displaced by technology.

Conclusion: The Imperative of Sustained Ethical Dialogue

The comprehensive analysis of the eight national panel discussions held under Work Package 9 of the TRANSFORM project yields an unequivocal conclusion: the integration of Artificial Intelligence into the workplace is not a purely technical or economic matter, but a profound socio-ethical challenge that strikes at the core of European values. The rich and varied discourse captured in these events underscores that the path forward is not predetermined by the technology itself, but will be forged by the choices made by societies, policymakers, organizations, and individuals.

This report has illuminated a landscape of shared anxieties and common principles. Across Europe, there is a palpable concern that without deliberate and careful governance, AI

could exacerbate inequalities, erode privacy, and intensify work-related stress, leading to a future of work that is less, not more, humane. In response, a clear consensus has emerged around the foundational ethical imperatives of transparency, fairness, accountability, and human agency. These principles form the bedrock of a distinctly "European way" of approaching AI—one that seeks to harness innovation while steadfastly protecting human dignity.

Yet, the findings also reveal that this journey is fraught with complexity and tension. The divergence in national perspectives—from Germany's focus on competitiveness to Italy's on social justice and Slovenia's on philosophical inquiry—demonstrates that a one-size-fits-all approach to AI governance is insufficient. Furthermore, the underlying tension between upholding high ethical standards and the fear of falling behind in a global technological race presents a formidable strategic dilemma for the European Union.

Ultimately, the most powerful message to emerge from the TRANSFORM panel discussions is the imperative of dialogue itself. The future of work is not something to be passively received but actively co-created. The technology presents both formidable challenges and unprecedented opportunities: the opportunity to automate drudgery, to reduce human bias, to create more flexible and supportive work environments, and to free human potential for more creative and meaningful endeavors. Realizing this positive vision, however, is contingent upon our collective ability to govern this powerful tool with wisdom, foresight, and a steadfast commitment to our shared values.

The WP9 panel discussions are not an end point in this process, but a vital contribution to an ongoing, essential conversation. They reaffirm the central mission of the TRANSFORM project: that by fostering informed, inclusive, and democratic dialogue, we can collectively shape a future of work that is not only technologically advanced but also ethically grounded, socially just, and fundamentally human. The work must continue.

References:

1. TRANSFORM: The Future of Human Workforce: Embracing Change ..., https://transform-euproject.eu/homepage/

2. Transform ENG - Fundacja "Fundusz Inicjatyw", https://ffi.org.pl/en/transform-eng/

3. Transform - the future of human workforce - UCLL Research & Expertise, https://research-expertise.ucll.be/en/projects/transform-future-human-workforce

4. workforce-of-the-future-the-competing-forces-shaping-2030 ... - PwC, https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/people-organisation/workforce-of-the-future/workforce-of-the-future-the-competing-forces-shaping-2030-pwc.pdf

List of tables:

List of illustrations: