FutureProofed: Deep Research on the Most Important News Around Societal, Economic, and Cultural Changes Driven by Tech and Abundance from the Past 7 Days

Date: November 15, 2025

Prepared by: Socio-Technical Analysis & Foresight Unit

---

1. Introduction: The End of AI's "Phony War"

The past seven days (November 8-15, 2025) mark a definitive and structural turning point in the societal integration of artificial intelligence. This period represents the end of the "Phony War"—the era spanning 2023-2024 characterized by speculative hype, broad-based technological evangelism, and siloed, cost-agnostic experimentation. We have now, with sudden clarity, entered the "Reality Check" phase.

This new phase is defined by three hard-edged realities that have simultaneously materialized in this week's data and publications:

1. **The Convergence of Global Governance:** The speculative era is being officially sunsetted by state and supra-state actors. The past week has seen the simultaneous publication of a new Australian national AI strategy explicitly aligned with the OECD's "Future of Work" program [1], the landmark academic codification of the field in *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* [2], and a far-reaching European Union foresight paper from ESPAS that maps out AI's profound societal disruptions by 2040.[3] This is not a coincidence; it is a global consensus that the risks of an ungoverned AI ecosystem are no longer tenable. The content of these reports, warning of everything from "existential risk" to the "human brain itself... a new battlefield," provides the justification for this new, urgent push for democratic control.[3]

2. **The Organizational Bottleneck:** As governance attempts to catch up, corporate implementation has hit a wall. New analysis highlighted this week reveals that a staggering **70-85% of corporate AI initiatives have failed**.[4] Crucially, this failure is not technological. It is definitively *human-centric*, rooted in a "lack of alignment with employee needs and values" [4] and a persistent "lack of education and training," which remains the number one barrier to adoption for the fourth consecutive year.[5]
3. **The Pivot from Possibility to Profitability:** The C-suite and boardroom have exhausted their patience with mere "potential." The 2025 Sloan Management Review, released this week, states unequivocally that "The time has come to measure results from generative AI experiments".[6] This sentiment is mirrored in boardrooms, where "workforce strategy" has been elevated to a "core governance priority".[7] The demand for measurable, verifiable Return on Investment (ROI) is now absolute.

To be "FutureProofed" in this new era, therefore, no longer means possessing the most advanced algorithm. It means mastering the complex, deeply human, and socio-technical challenges that have now become the primary bottleneck to progress: organizational redesign, rebuilding workforce trust, and achieving strategic alignment with a rapidly materializing global regulatory framework.

This report synthesizes these critical, intersecting developments from the past seven days. It will move from the macro-level consensus on new economic and workforce models, to the micro-level case studies of organizational failure and adoption barriers, and conclude with predictive, actionable intelligence for leaders navigating this "Reality Check" phase.

2. Key Developments: The New Rules of a Hybrid World

The data and long-range analyses published this week provide a new, high-resolution consensus on the future of work, the economic drivers, and the profound crisis emerging in education.

2.1. Workforce Shifts: The Hybrid-Agentic Model and the "Hollow" Career

The most significant development is the crystallization of a consensus forecast for the future

of labor. The European Union's ESPAS foresight paper on AI's 2040 impact provides the clearest model, stating that the workforce in businesses and organizations "will increasingly become hybrid – human and agentic, with humans performing the oversight roles".[3]

This "hybrid-agentic" model, however, is not one of simple, universal augmentation. The analysis moves beyond this binary to posit a fundamental bifurcation of the labor market. The ESPAS report is explicit in its forecast: while AI will augment high-skill workers, it will simultaneously act as a direct "substitute for human workers," a phenomenon "already detectable in the labour market with fewer offers for several entry-level jobs".[3] This analysis indicates that AI will *augment* experienced professionals into "oversight roles" but will *replace* the human workforce in many of the less complex, routine tasks that have traditionally formed the entry-points to a career.[3]

This forecast—which points to a "hollowing out" of the career ladder—has been academically codified in the same week. The publication of *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* [2] moves this discussion from speculation to a formal field of study. Chapter 14 of the new handbook, titled "The Future of Work in the Age of AI: Displacement, Augmentation, or Control?" [2], institutionalizes this debate. The deliberate inclusion of the word "Control" is a critical, new-level analysis. It signals that the research focus has expanded beyond the binary question of job *existence* (displacement vs. augmentation) to include the *quality and nature* of the remaining jobs, which will be subject to new, algorithmically-driven forms of management and control.

2.2. Education Innovation: The "Bullshit Universities" Critique

Juxtaposed against this urgent, structural need for a workforce capable of "oversight roles" is a new, trenchant critique of the educational system's *supply* of these skills. As the labor market demands deep skills in critical thinking, ethical judgment, and human-agentic management, the technological "solution" being offered is increasingly seen as failing.

A new paper published this week in the journal *AI & Society* directly attacks the current generative-AI-driven EdTech boom, titling its critical analysis, "Bullshit universities: The future of automated education".[8] The authors argue forcefully that the "Enthusiasm for the use of AI in tertiary education is misplaced," suggesting that the current wave of automation in education is delivering shallow, uncritical content delivery in place of genuine learning.[8]

This academic critique resonates with pre-existing data on the nature of the EdTech movement. Previous analyses have highlighted how "celebrity" educators, often with "corporate backing," are promoted as the face of EdTech, despite the fact that their affluent, non-representative classrooms do not reflect the diverse needs of the average student body.[9]

The "Bullshit Universities" critique suggests this trend has now fully metastasized, with AI-driven systems being deployed to deliver a "product" that lacks the very substance—resilience, critical judgment, and ethical reasoning—that the ESPAS report identifies as the *only* remaining human-centric roles in the future.[3]

This creates a profound socio-economic mismatch: the workforce *needs* a new class of highly-trained "overseers," while the education system is being re-tooled to produce automated "bullshit." This gap is the root cause of the adoption failures and workforce anxieties detailed later in this report.

2.3. Abundance Economics: Chasing the $7 Trillion Prize

The imperative driving these disruptive, high-stakes changes is, fundamentally, economic. The scale of the "abundance" prize is staggering. The ESPAS foresight paper [3] cites headline projections, such as those from McKinsey, estimating that generative AI could create **$6.1 to $7.9 trillion in *annual* global economic growth**. This is the generational economic prize that corporations and nation-states are now scrambling to capture.

However, the "Reality Check" phase, which began this week, signals the end of "AI for AI's sake." The 2025 Sloan Management Review's new trend report states that "The time has come to measure results from generative AI experiments".[6] This analysis notes that while 2023-2024 was about experimentation, 2025-2026 will be about *accountability*.

This pressure for *measurable* ROI is now being applied directly from the top. New analysis of boardroom priorities confirms that "workforce strategy is gaining overdue recognition as a core governance priority".[7] The board is no longer satisfied with hearing about "AI transformation" in the abstract; it is demanding a workforce strategy that integrates this new technology and delivers quantifiable productivity gains. The "abundance" prize is real, but the C-suite is now being held accountable for capturing it—a task for which, as the next section details, most organizations are structurally unprepared.

3. Case Studies: The Organizational Bottleneck

The macro-level forecasts for a hybrid-agentic future, and the C-suite's demand for ROI, are colliding with a stark operational reality: corporate attempts to implement AI are failing at an alarming rate. The case studies and data from this week reveal this is not a technological

failure, but a profound organizational and human-centric one.

3.1. Industry-Wide: The 70-85% "Human-Centric" Failure Rate

The single most important "reality check" statistic highlighted this week comes from new research on corporate AI initiatives: **a failure rate of 70-85%**.[4]

The diagnosis of this failure is what is critical. The analysis states explicitly that these initiatives have failed *not* because of technological insufficiency, but "due to a lack of alignment with employee needs and values, coupled with insufficient understanding of the human-centric barriers to adoption".[4] This finding is cross-validated by independent survey data from the Marketing AI Institute, which, for "four straight years" running, has identified the **number one barrier to AI adoption as "lack of education and training"**.[5]

The research provides a granular breakdown of these "human-centric barriers." They are sociological, not technical:

- **Employee Anxiety and Skepticism:** A fundamental lack of trust in the technology's outputs and its motives.[4]
- **Ethical Concerns:** Employees are increasingly aware of and resistant to deploying systems they perceive as biased or unethical.[4]
- **Lack of Perceived Value:** The technology is not seen as helpful or valuable for the employee's *own* work, only as a management tool.[4]

Conversely, the study found that successful adoption is driven by equally human-centric factors: "hedonic motivation" (i.e., the tool is enjoyable to use), "perceived value" (it makes the employee's *own* job better), and "social influence" (peers and respected leaders are using it).[4] This proves that AI implementation is not an IT problem; it is a change-management and organizational sociology problem.

3.2. Corporate Strategy: Cisco and the "Fragmented Workforce"

A new analysis of Cisco's human-resources strategy, highlighted this week, provides a perfect, concrete case study of the *organizational* failure that precedes and *guarantees* the technological failure.[10]

The analysis found that Cisco's HR department had a "fragmented workforce strategy." Its

official responsibility was *only* for full- and part-time employees. The company's large and growing contingent workforce (CW) was managed in a completely different, un-integrated silo. This organizational "fragmentation" created a cascade of severe business risks:

- **Compliance Risks:** A lack of oversight on contingent worker labor laws.
- **Increased Costs and Inefficiencies:** Redundant processes and a lack of strategic workforce planning.
- **Missed Synergies:** The inability to manage the *total* workforce as a single, strategic asset.[10]

The key insight, however, comes from Cisco's *remediation*. To fix this, the company was *forced* to create a "cross-functional steering committee that meets monthly" and fundamentally change its technology systems to *integrate* its view of the entire workforce.[10]

This Cisco case study serves as a critical microcosm for the entire AI adoption challenge. The ESPAS report forecasts a future "hybrid - human and agentic" workforce.[3] An "AI agent" is, in essence, a new, non-human form of contingent worker—a digital contractor. The Cisco analysis proves that a major, technologically advanced corporation *already* fails to strategically manage its *human* contingent workforce.

How, then, can a company with a "fragmented" organizational structure, which cannot even govern its human contractors, *possibly* succeed in governing a far more complex, opaque, and high-risk *digital agentic* workforce? It cannot.

This demonstrates that the 70-85% failure rate [4] is not a temporary setback; it is the inevitable, structural outcome of attempting to bolt a "hybrid-agentic" technology onto a "fragmented" organizational chassis. The solution is not better AI; it is total organizational redesign, starting with an integrated, cross-functional governance model like the one Cisco was forced to build.

4. Policy & Ethics: The November 2025 Governance Convergence

The socio-technical and economic disruptions now taking root have, in the past seven days, triggered a decisive and simultaneous response from global-level policymakers, think tanks, and academic institutions. This "Governance Convergence" is setting the baseline rules for the "Reality Check" era.

4.1. National-Level Policy: Australia's OECD-Aligned Framework

This week saw the publication of Australia's new national AI strategy, which moves from high-level principles to a concrete focus on "productivity gains".[1] The most critical element of this new policy is its explicit, formal alignment with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

The Australian strategy "aligns with the OECD's work on the Future of Work and the Work, Innovation, Productivity and Skills (WIPS) in AI program".[1] This is not just a nominal reference. The policy *incorporates* the core OECD recommendation "to build human capacity and prepare for labour market transition".[1] This is a significant development, representing one of the first national-level strategies to formally *link* the pursuit of AI-driven productivity *directly* to a state-level mandate for workforce reskilling and transition. It treats the technology and its labor-market consequences as a single, integrated policy problem.

4.2. Global Frameworks: The Oxford and ESPAS Consensus

While Australia provides a national *policy* model, the *justification* for this new level of governance was provided by two major European-centric publications this week.

First, the publication of *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* [2] serves to codify and institutionalize the entire field of AI ethics. It moves the discussion from vague corporate pledges to a rigorous, academic-led analysis of granular, high-stakes problems. The handbook's table of contents [2] acts as a new curriculum for the field, with chapters dedicated to:

- **"Accountability in Computer Systems"** (Joshua Kroll)
- **"Transparency"** (Nick Diakopoulos)
- **"Race and Gender"** (Timnit Gebru) [12]
- **"The Future of Work... Displacement, Augmentation, or Control?"** (Karen Levy & Pegah Moradi)

Second, the EU's ESPAS foresight paper [3] provides the high-level *threat assessment* that necessitates this governance. The paper is stark in its warnings, calling for "democratic control over decisions" to manage risks that are now being treated as plausible 15-year forecasts. These include the "existential one for humanity, of losing control over technology," the risk of dominant AI models not complying with "EU values," and new cybersecurity risks, such as breaches of "mental privacy or integrity" that could turn the "human brain itself into a

new battlefield".[3]

Together, the Oxford Handbook provides the *ethical foundation* and the ESPAS report provides the *geopolitical and existential justification* for the new, muscular governance models emerging in countries like Australia.

4.3. The U.S. Sector-Specific Approach

In contrast to the comprehensive, top-down frameworks favored by the EU and the OECD-aligned Australian model, the United States is continuing to pursue a "risk-based, sector-specific approach".[14]

Recent congressional bills introduced in the 119th Congress build on this philosophy, focusing on the *symptoms* and *applications* of AI rather than a single, overarching regulatory structure.[15] These bills have centered on "technical standards, deepfakes and AI-generated voice messages," and "transparency and accountability" for Generative AI.[15] The legislative and stakeholder push is for "additional sector-specific guidance" to be applied in "high-risk scenarios".[15] These are defined as applications that "directly impact U.S. citizens' lives and livelihoods," with healthcare, hiring systems, mental health therapy, and the generation of forensic sketches being primary examples.[14]

4.4. Comparative Analysis of November 2025 AI Governance Frameworks

The simultaneous emergence of these frameworks in the past week necessitates a comparative analysis for strategic planning. The following table synthesizes the primary focus, key risks, and "Future of Work" stances of these new, distinct governance models.

Framework / Publication	Source(s)	Primary Focus	Key Risk Identified	Stance on "Future of Work"
Australian National AI	[1]	Productivity; Innovation;	Labor market mismatch;	**Mandate:** "Build human

Strategy		Alignment with OECD	Failure to capture productivity gains	capacity and prepare for labour market transition."
EU ESPAS Foresight Paper	[3]	Strategic Autonomy; Democratic Control; Upholding EU Values	**Existential:** "Existential" loss of human control; Breaches of "mental privacy."	**Forecast:** "Hybrid - human and agentic" model; "replacing... entry-level jobs."
The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI	[2]	Academic Codification; Ethical Foundations; Granular Problem-Solving	**Socio-technical:** "Displacement, Augmentation, or Control?"; Systemic "Bias" (Race/Gender).	**Analysis:** Provides the core academic framework for analyzing AI's labor impact.
U.S. Congressional Approach	[14]	Risk-Based; Sector-Specific; Application-Focused	**High-Risk Scenarios:** Failures in hiring, healthcare, justice; Deepfakes.	**Support:** Federal support for reskilling; Managing "widespread effects on labor."

This table illustrates the emerging global landscape: an EU focused on existential/democratic risks, a U.S. focused on high-risk sectoral harms, and an OECD/Australian model focused on linking productivity to labor-force-transition policy.

5. Challenges & Considerations: The Human-Centric

Failure Point

The developments of the past week, when synthesized, point to a series of profound, interconnected challenges. The "Reality Check" phase is defined by the primacy of these human-centric, structural, and sociological failure points.

5.1. Inequality and Displacement: The "AI Precariat"

The "hollowing out" of the career ladder, as forecast by the ESPAS report [3], is the central socio-economic challenge of the next decade. This is not a future, abstract risk; the report notes it is "already detectable".[3] This structural displacement of entry-level human workers by agentic AI is the mechanism that creates what the World Economic Forum has termed the "overlooked global risk of the AI precariat".[3]

This creates an urgent policy question: If the "abundance" from AI-driven productivity is captured by a smaller class of high-skill "overseers," what mechanisms are required to support the displaced "precariat" and maintain social stability?

The *Abundance Economics* data from this week provides a clear, tested answer. The extensive, multi-year research on Universal Basic Income (UBI) and large-scale cash-transfer programs, detailed in reports from the World Bank and the Poverty Action Lab, must now be re-contextualized.[16] These programs are no longer just "poverty alleviation" tools for developing nations; they are now the most robustly-tested, scalable *prototypes* for the AI-driven social safety net.

The evidence is clear. An RCT in Kenya found that universal basic income transfers "reduced the probability of households experiencing hunger... and had modest positive impacts on mental health".[18] Similar findings from Colombia confirmed a "4.4 percentage point increase" in positive outcomes from a monthly cash refund.[18] This body of research confirms that direct cash transfers are a proven, effective tool for mitigating the exact social-stability risks (hunger, poor mental health) that mass labor displacement would create.

5.2. Reskilling and Adoption: The Trust Deficit

The "hollowing out" of the workforce is inextricably linked to the primary *corporate* challenge:

the "70-85% failure rate" of AI initiatives.[4] The root cause is the same: a mismatch between the skills needed and the trust provided.

As established, the "#1 barrier to adoption" is a "lack of education and training".[5] The "human-centric barriers" are all sociological: anxiety, skepticism, and ethical concerns.[4] This is fundamentally a *trust deficit*. Employees do not trust the technology, they do not trust the motives behind its implementation, and they are anxious about their own place in the new "hybrid-agentic" model.

This is precisely why the "Bullshit Universities" critique [8] is not merely an academic complaint, but a *business-critical diagnosis*. The current EdTech "solution" to the reskilling crisis is, in itself, contributing to the trust deficit. By offering shallow, automated, unrepresentative "celebrity" content [9] instead of deep, human-centric training in ethics and judgment, the education system is *failing* to provide the one thing employees need to overcome their anxiety: genuine, verifiable competence and a sense of agency.

If the primary *solution* to the adoption barrier (education) is perceived as inauthentic "bullshit," the *problem* (the trust-based barrier) becomes structurally unsolvable.

5.3. Governance Gaps: The Board's New Mandate

This leaves C-suite executives and corporate boards trapped between two colliding forces:

1. **The Board's Demand for ROI:** A new, intense pressure to "measure results" [6] and treat workforce strategy as a "core governance priority".[7]
2. **Operational Reality:** A 70-85% failure rate [4] caused by a deep, human-centric trust deficit.[4]

The *gap* between these two realities is one of *governance*. The Cisco case [10] provides the blueprint for this failure: a "fragmented workforce strategy" is the organizational gap that makes an integrated, hybrid-agentic future impossible.

This governance gap extends to other critical adoption barriers. New reports highlight that "data privacy and compliance risks" and "oversight in AI-driven decisions" are key reasons for implementation failure.[20] Similarly, the well-documented "Challenges for Mitigating Bias in Algorithmic Hiring" [13] are no longer just a legal or HR compliance issue. In an era where employees are a key barrier to adoption [4], forcing them to use a tool they *know* to be biased [13] is a direct path to implementation failure. These "ethical" issues have become *board-level strategic risks* that are poisoning adoption from the inside.

6. Outlook: From Technological Implementation to Organizational Redesign

The synthesis of the past week's data provides a clear, predictive outlook. The "Reality Check" phase will be defined by a painful culling of failed projects and a "flight to quality" toward deep organizational change. The "FutureProofed" playbook is no longer about technology; it is about sociology and structural design.

6.1. Expected Trajectories (Next 12-24 Months)

- **A "Flight to Quality" and AI Project Extinction:** The 2025 Sloan report's "measure results" [6] mandate will trigger a brutal "flight to quality." In the next 12-24 months, "zombie" AI projects—those that were funded on hype and cannot demonstrate clear ROI or, more importantly, cannot overcome the human-centric adoption barriers [4]—will be aggressively cut. The "spray and pray" experimentation of 2023-2024 is over.
- **The Rise of the "Chief Integration Officer" Function:** The central challenge of this new era is *integration*. The Cisco case [10] (fragmented workforce) and the ESPAS forecast [3] (hybrid-agentic) prove that the existing, siloed corporate structure is obsolete. The most successful firms will be those that re-design their organizations to *manage* a "hybrid-agentic" workforce. This will require a new, cross-functional governance body—a "Chief Integration Officer" function, whether by title or by committee—that combines HR, Legal, IT, and Operations to govern *all* labor (human full-time, human contingent, *and* agentic AI) as a single, integrated, strategic asset.
- **The Education/Reskilling Crisis Deepens:** The "Bullshit Universities" [8] critique will gain mainstream traction as corporations realize their massive internal and external training programs are *still* failing to move the needle on the "#1 barrier".[5] This will trigger a *new*, desperate search for *authentic* reskilling partners and new pedagogical models that can *actually* build the deep, human "oversight" skills (ethical judgment, critical thinking, trust-building) that the hybrid-agentic world demands.

6.2. Actionable Insights: The "FutureProofed" Playbook

The evidence from the past seven days is conclusive. The path to "FutureProofing" an organization is no longer a technological one. It is a human-centric, organizational, and sociological one.

- Action 1: Stop Treating AI as a Technology Problem.
  The single most important insight from this week's data is that AI adoption is an organizational design and sociology problem. The 70-85% failure rate 4 is a human-centric, not a technical, failure. Board-level strategy must immediately pivot from "What tech should we buy?" to "Are we organizationally and culturally structured for a hybrid-agentic workforce?"
- Action 2: Invest in "Human-Centric Implementation."
  Future-proofing requires a radical shift in investment from pure algorithms to the human-centric systems that enable their adoption. This has three components:
  1. **Massive Investment in *Real* Training:** Address the #1 barrier [5] by funding deep, continuous training in *human-centric* skills. This includes data ethics, bias mitigation [13], critical thinking, and specific training on *how to build trust* with and "oversee" agentic systems.[4]
  2. **Cross-Functional Governance (The "Cisco" Solution):** Immediately audit the organization for "fragmented workforce strategy".[10] Appoint a permanent, cross-functional steering committee (HR, Legal, IT, Operations) with C-suite backing to govern *all* labor—human full-time, human contingent, *and* agentic AI—as a single, integrated workforce.
  3. **Adopt Global Governance Proactively:** Do not wait for regulations to become a compliance burden. Proactively adopt the frameworks published this week as a *strategic advantage*. Use the *Oxford Handbook* [2] to build internal ethics and bias-review teams. Use the OECD/Australian model [1] to *publicly* link productivity-gain projects *directly* to new, funded workforce-transition and reskilling programs, thereby rebuilding employee trust.
- Action 3 (For Policymakers): The Precariat Safety Net.
  The displacement and precariat risks 3 are real, imminent, and already detectable. The UBI and cash-transfer experiments 16 are the most-proven, scalable, and effective mitigation tools available. Funding and scaling these evidence-based programs must be a core, non-negotiable component of any national AI strategy.

Works cited

1. Global AI Governance Law and Policy: Australia - IAPP, accessed November 15, 2025, https://iapp.org/resources/article/global-ai-governance-australia/
2. Wildy & Sons Ltd — The World's Legal Bookshop Search Results for ..., accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.wildy.com/isbn/9780190067410/the-oxford-handbook-of-ethics-of-ai-ebook-oxford-university-press
3. Artificial Intelligence, quantum and cybersecurity_cover ... - ESPAS, accessed

November 15, 2025, https://espas.eu/files/ESPAS%20foresight%20paper%20-%20AI%20quantum%20cybersecurity.pdf
4. (PDF) EXAMINING ADOPTION FACTORS OF AI-ENABLED WORKPLACE TRAINING THROUGH THE LENS OF THE UTAUT2 AND EXTENDED FACTORS - ResearchGate, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396245277_EXAMINING_ADOPTION_FACTORS_OF_AI-ENABLED_WORKPLACE_TRAINING_THROUGH_THE_LENS_OF_THE_UTAUT2_AND_EXTENDED_FACTORS
5. [The AI Show Episode 106]: Enterprise AI Adoption, GPT-4o Mini, New Research on Prompting, OpenAI "Strawberry," & AI's Impact on the Crowdstrike Outage - Marketing AI Institute, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.marketingaiinstitute.com/blog/the-ai-show-episode-106
6. generative AI - 北美华人人力资源协会 - nacshr.org, accessed November 15, 2025, https://nacshr.org/tag/generative-ai
7. Director's Domain - Archive - Boardspan, accessed November 15, 2025, https://boardspan.com/directors-domain-archive
8. Tweets by Michael Flood | www.xyonline.net, accessed November 15, 2025, https://xyonline.net/content/tweets-michael-flood
9. Hack Education - RSSing.com, accessed November 15, 2025, https://education9309.rssing.com/chan-52978280/all_p11.html
10. Best of March Issue # 169 - Talent Edge Weekly, accessed November 15, 2025, https://talentedgeweekly.com/p/talent-edge-weekly-best-march-issue-169
11. Future of work | OECD, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/policy-issues/future-of-work.html
12. accessed November 15, 2025, https://huggingface.co/datasets/ceadar-ie/AIVision360-8k/commit/033e1a1441f671b3e28b847b43e6f6505c15eebf.diff?file=AIVision360-8k.jsonl
13. Updating purpose limitation for AI: a normative approach from law and philosophy - Oxford Academic, accessed November 15, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/ijlit/article/doi/10.1093/ijlit/eaaf003/8121663
14. Artificial Intelligence: Background, Selected Issues, and Policy Considerations, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46795
15. Generative Artificial Intelligence: Overview, Issues, and Considerations for Congress, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12426
16. The Importance of Existing Social Protection Programs for Mental Health in Pandemic Times - World Bank Documents and Reports, accessed November 15, 2025, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099637201162481468/pdf/IDU17a9f43a1155191400d18bb91fe2719ee4d34.pdf
17. (PDF) Miracle Friends and Miracle Money in California: A mixed-methods experiment of social support and guaranteed income for people experiencing homelessness - ResearchGate, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373722061_Miracle_Friends_and_Miracl

e_Money_in_California_A_mixed-methods_experiment_of_social_support_and_guaranteed_income_for_people_experiencing_homelessness
18. Estimating Impact with Surveys versus Digital Traces: Evidence from Randomized Cash Transfers in Togo, accessed November 15, 2025, https://poverty-action.org/sites/default/files/2025-06/ssrn-4593339.pdf
19. The Value of Communication for Mental Health - Poverty Action Lab, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/research-paper/annanarch-nov2021Post.pdf
20. WTW's 2025 Pay Transparency Survey Reveals Shift Among US Companies Despite Regulatory Challenges - Moomoo, accessed November 15, 2025, https://www.moomoo.com/news/post/56797428/wtw-s-2025-pay-transparency-survey-reveals-shift-among-us