

INDIA ADR WEEKDAY 1: BANGALORE

SESSION 2

Generative AI in Arbitration: Transforming International Dispute Resolution

12:30 PM To 01:30 PM IST

Moderator:

Ms. Manasa Sundarraman, Counsel, Trilegal

Ms. Deepika Kinhal, Co-Founder and CEO, CORD - Centre for Online Resolution of Disputes

Mr. Mohammed Shameer, Partner, Trilegal

Mr. Raghav Gupta, Founder & CEO, Futureense

Shantanu Mishra, Head of Projects, Lucio

TERES

1 **DUHITA:** Hello, everyone. We'll be starting with our next session in ten minutes. So, I request
 2 you to all be kindly seated. Thank you. The next session is hosted by Trilegal. The topic for the
 3 session is Generative AI in Arbitration: Transforming International Dispute Resolution. The
 4 session will be moderated by Manasa Sundarraman. The speakers include Deepika Kinhal,
 5 Mohammed Shameer, Raghav Gupta and Shantanu Mishra. I request the speakers to kindly
 6 come on stage. Thank you.

7 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Hi. Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. It's a real pleasure to
 8 welcome you all to this session of MCIA's India ADR Week. As Duhita mentioned, this session
 9 is hosted by Trilegal. I am Manasa Sundarraman. And I will be moderating today's panel on
 10 Generative AI and Arbitration and we have some very distinguished speakers, and I will just
 11 get on to who the speakers are. And first we have Deepika. Deepika Is the CEO of Centre for
 12 Online Resolution of Disputes. She has extensive experience in Online Dispute Resolution and
 13 Policy. And previously in her role at Vidhi, she was looking into Justice Delivery Systems. So
 14 we want to understand from Deepika how AI is going to transform justice delivery as a whole
 15 and in the context of arbitration in specific. And after that, there is Shameer who is a Dispute
 16 Resolution Partner at Trilegal. He's bringing in the practitioner's perspective from inside law
 17 firms today and after that is Raghav Gupta, who is the CEO of Futureense and founder of the
 18 1% Club. All of you may have seen him on LinkedIn and he today sits at the intersection of
 19 Client of entrepreneur in the AI space and also a tech consumer. Finally, we have Shantanu
 20 Mishra who is a lawyer turned Product Lead at Lucio, which all of you in this room, I'm sure
 21 has heard of, which is one of the very exciting AI startups that we have in the legal tech space
 22 today, and as part of his role, Shantanu is regularly interacting with law firms and lawyers to
 23 understand how to better develop that product. So, we have 50 minutes today and we are going
 24 to focus on like I said AI in Arbitration. So, arbitration has always been about critically
 25 thinking how to balance, how to get a fair commercial outcome and in an efficient way, and
 26 with AI, we are really reimagining arbitration as a whole and not just introducing efficiency.
 27 It's not just something like e-discovery or it's not just something like taking it online, but
 28 something that fundamentally transforms how we conduct arbitration. So, we are no longer
 29 talking about just fast or we're no longer talking about speed, but a transformational effect. So
 30 with that in mind, I think we have three buckets to today's session. First is the general bucket
 31 on the applications of AI, what is it, what could it be? And what is it going to be? And the
 32 second bucket that we have is the business side of things. I would say the people side of things.
 33 How AI really affects the practice of law, the practice of arbitration? And the third is, of course,
 34 as with any conference, as with any talk that concerns AI, we are going to be talking about the
 35 ethics, the governance and the policy considerations when it comes to introducing AI in
 36 arbitration. So, let's jump right in. For our first thing, we have like I said, it's the application

TERES

1 of AI. We are going to cut through the hype. And my first question is to both Shameer and
 2 Shantanu is how is AI currently used in practice? Like just, I'm sure the audience is a mix of
 3 practitioners and of consumers, but as on date in 2025, what is the use of AI in practice and
 4 how is it merely just summarizing things and lightweight things, or do you see actual
 5 application in the Indian context and in the international context, where is AI being applied
 6 in an arbitration?

7 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Well, I think there are two parts to your question. One was, is
 8 AI doing any of the heavy lifting as far as arbitrations is concerned or is it all lighter legal
 9 support sort of tasks? On the heavy lifting front, I think where we are seeing AI being deployed
 10 even within our own firm; is with discovery evidence management and basically managing
 11 large scale documents. So essentially, I mean, if you talk about, about a decade ago, what we
 12 as practitioners would do, is especially in large scale arbitrations where there are multifarious
 13 claims with claims under various different heads, there was no other way or no other shortcut
 14 but to sit down, read each and every document, arrange it under different buckets, and then,
 15 essentially see what is the data that I actually want to use for the purposes of the arbitration.
 16 Now, on the heavy lifting front, I think this weight has essentially been taken over by AI. The
 17 ability of AI to seamlessly shift through tons of data, categorize it under different buckets, and
 18 especially in those scenarios where in every arbitration, all of us have seen it right, the needle
 19 in the haystack problem. Which is, you know, you've read this one letter in the 20,000 letters
 20 that you've read, which is saying that one particular thing, but for the life of you are not able
 21 to find it. So, I think AI manages to do those kinds of tasks really well, where you can essentially
 22 prompt AI with a certain set of specific prompts to say this letter in generally this chronology,
 23 written from this person to this person, which is loosely saying this, and I think AI does a good
 24 job of pulling out that exact letter. So I think on the heavy lifting front, this is what AI is actually
 25 practically being used in arbitrations, even within our own firm. On the lighter side of things,
 26 of course essentially, you're arranging documents in a chronology or generating a chronology
 27 which essentially forms your foundational level sort of work. When you commence any
 28 arbitration, I think foundationally, these are the two large buckets in which AI is generally
 29 being used in arbitrations.

30 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Shantanu?

31 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** Shameer has very rightly pointed out that it's a mix of both, which
 32 is heavy lifting and lightweight stuff where AI is being used for summarization, and it has
 33 become much better in terms of those lightweight tasks. For heavyweight tasks, we as Lucio
 34 have seen, AI being used in identifying the right precedents from a humongous set of case
 35 laws. So earlier when this process was entirely manual, even one or two precedents that would

TERES

1 suit the purpose for the case would be enough. But how AI is trying to change the process of
2 the practice is, it's shifting to, let's say, 20,000 arbitration awards or Court judgments, and
3 bringing those ten most relevant judgments for you. Now, the ambit for the lawyer has become
4 even wider. Now, you can take a better call by looking at all these judgments instead of just
5 jumping onto first or the second one that you found. This is where the practice is slightly, the
6 process of the practice is slightly evolving, but I feel that AI is still not that mature in the legal
7 space right now where it can change the practice of law itself.

8 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Thank you for that, Shantanu.

9 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** If I could just add, I think just one point. So essentially, what
10 we are seeing is AI being used in the foundational stages of arbitration, right at the beginning.
11 As you progress with the arbitration and get into more advanced stages of evidence and
12 arguments, I'm not very sure AI has much of a role to play today.

13 **DEEPIKA KINHAL:** Just adding on to what Shameer mentioned, right the context of
14 arbitration the first phase, the way I see it, is preparatory phase for the hearings and the second
15 context is the hearing itself. What we have discussed in terms of summarization, building that
16 chronology of events, finding that needle in haystack is all preparatory phase, where it is the
17 counsels that are involved and each Party is working in a silo, at that stage. But in a hearing
18 context where all the Parties need to work together along with the arbitral Tribunal. I think
19 that is where you will see the transformative effect of AI and most of the effort at least at our
20 end today is to look at what that Delta can be, which will change the experience for everyone
21 in the room. So, think of a scenario where the other counsel is presenting evidence or
22 advancing arguments, and you, in real time are able to identify what case laws will be relevant
23 for that or in real time are able to identify what the counterargument for that will be. So you
24 don't have to go back to your team and identify based on again sifting through documents or
25 through document management system that you have. It will all be done real time because you
26 have coded the words, coded the documents in a way that it will retrieve the relevant
27 information for you while the hearings are going on. So that is the transformation that will
28 come in soon.

29 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** That's quite interesting. I think what we are seeing is perhaps
30 the present day which Shantanu and Shameer and Raghav, I will also invite you to jump in on
31 because you're an entrepreneur in the tech, in the AI space. So, is there something that you
32 expect lawyers to do? Maybe which they are not currently doing, maybe you are seeing a bit of
33 scepticism from the current practitioners in terms of its limited role but Deepika has presented
34 something else. So, I was wondering what your expectation is?

TERES

1 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** So, I think right now AI is being used in silos. People are obviously using
2 it. Everyone has Chat GPT on their phone. Before meeting anyone, everyone is doing the basic
3 research. Basic summarization using AI. But is it embedded in your workflow? I would say I
4 would not find any lawyer who will tell me that it is part of their workflows. So ideally the
5 workflow definition is what is firstly very important. Once the workflows have been defined,
6 you need to build an engineering layer which can be a no code engineering layer, once that
7 workflow is defined. Because the auditability and the governance of what the output is coming
8 from AI is something that you don't have a 100% surety on, and that can only happen if there
9 is a core engineering layer on top of it. And that can only happen if you have a workflow defined
10 for it. So I believe the challenge right now is that there are no workflows defined. People are
11 using it in silos. I think for law firms, for lawyers, anyone who becomes AI native before others
12 will definitely see that their margins expand. They will definitely see the output they can
13 deliver in a shorter span and still charge in ours, billable hours for as long as they can. They
14 will still do it. So, yeah, I think workflow definition is the challenge.

15 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** I think all the lawyers here are salivating at the prospect of
16 increased margins and better billable hours, but the scepticism is not unfounded. There are
17 public instances, but even private instances where we are really laughing at what AI is
18 throwing up at us so, any examples come to mind Shameer, Shantanu, something that some
19 adverse feedback, if I must say.

20 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Well, I'd be really surprised if even within the audience, I meet
21 one person who's not seen AI throwing a judgment at them which doesn't exist. So I think
22 that's something that all of us have seen. But I think within the specific use case of what we
23 are using AI for, which is document management and your chronological events. We've also
24 had instances where, of course, I look to Shantanu and Raghav to tell me, educate me later on
25 about why this happens. But there are also instances of where AI hallucinates and creates a
26 date in an event that really doesn't exist. This is where I think I've seen the most amount of
27 errors. And, of course, we are going to speak a little more about that in terms of what is the
28 role of the current generation lawyer when faced with in terms of using AI and when you know
29 and realize that AI is capable of making these mistakes, how do you make yourself relevant in
30 that context? But I think largely these are the two areas where I've consistently seen AI make
31 some mistakes.

32 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** So, I have always found Generative AI to be a people pleaser, where,
33 if you ask it for an information that does not exist, it finds it very hard to say no and just tries
34 to make it up for you. So, from an engineering perspective, from a product perspective, it is
35 very important that we put appropriate guardrails that such situations do not occur when

TERES

1 Generative AI is being used. And as Shameer definitely said, auditability and verification by
2 every lawyer is a must given the technology where it stands right now.

3 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Yeah, I think that actually brings us quite seamlessly into our
4 next segment, which really talks about how AI is transforming practice. So every day on
5 LinkedIn, what I see is this law firm has adopted this AI tech. There's a pilot being run by this
6 law firm with this tech. So in terms of, I think what every law firm is fundamentally looking
7 for is a proof of concept, right? Does this work? Can I integrate it into my workflow? And they
8 are also looking at what are the guardrails that they would want to do. So, Deepika, because of
9 your experience in generally on-line dispute resolution and legal tech, would you say that AI
10 is unique in the sense that maybe law firms were more amenable to other types of technology
11 much faster or is AI just yet another thing? Are they onboarding AI with similar enthusiasm
12 as any other technologies, there are uniqueness to it?

13 **DEEPIKA KINHAL:** Yes and no. So in terms of, I think the ease and speed of adoption that
14 is definitely at a much greater level with Gen AI tools, in comparison to anything else that has
15 been introduced to the legal sector specifically, be it ODR or e-discovery or even transcription.
16 It took us a lot of effort to one, educate and two, to ensure that they see value in terms of
17 efficiency and in terms of the kind of value that they can give to the Clients themselves. But
18 the reason why I think there has been an increased adoption is because I think the barrier to
19 entry itself is very low. You don't need to start using Gen AI by creating a separate platform,
20 you don't need to really revisit your workflow to start experimenting with Gen AI features. You
21 just need to be able to type in the chat box and it will give you something that you can run with.
22 I think that is where there is a key difference, and that is also where the fears and concerns
23 come from, right? Every individual lawyer with or without permission, with or without
24 guardrails can start using multiple Gen AI models that exist today. As opposed to everything
25 else that has been introduced in the legal tech sector, where we had to have a policy coming
26 from the highest levels for anyone within the firm to start using those tools. It can be e-
27 discovery, or even in the case of transcription, translation facilities, you need to have the
28 permission of the arbitral Tribunal. You need to have the permission of the Councils for that
29 to get embedded in the process of disputes. But here, each to their own. And that is where the
30 fear comes. So, yes, while the speed of adoption has been definitely greater. I think what has
31 been incredibly slow, and that is where the concern arise is creating those policies around this
32 adoption, institutionalization of Gen AI tools. That is where it has been the slowest. We don't
33 have as much as you say that law firms are announcing pilot projects, announcing
34 experimentation with different kinds of models out there, do they have an internal policy
35 which is actually getting enforced amongst their junior associates or even at the partner level
36 where you can say that, okay this is definitely in the grey area. This is something that my

TERES

1 partners will never agree to do. There is one no visibility, because as Shameer was saying, it is
2 something that everyone is already doing in their individual devices. So yeah, there is
3 increased adaptation, but slower institutionalization. And the institutions and firms definitely
4 need to catch up.

5 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** I think this leads me to my next question, because what
6 Deepika said is one thing that really stood out for me is that there is a low entry barrier and
7 that's echoed by Raghav also. He says everyone has Chat GPT on their phone. So, when we say
8 AI and arbitration, is that something that it's a category that we are creating ourselves, maybe?
9 Do you see AI being equally adopted in other forms of dispute resolution, say Criminal law,
10 Family law or is it only because the commercial bar is maybe faster at technology? I don't
11 know. So are there some underlying assumptions that we are making by making this category
12 in the first place? Shantanu, I was hoping you would...

13 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** So, I feel there is in any disputes related practice like arbitration or
14 Criminal law, there is a lot of subjectivity involved in every matter that you face, right? And
15 the preliminary steps are not that templated as you would see in other practice areas like
16 Capital markets or MNA. Hence, there is a little hesitation I feel from the lawyers and in
17 adopting towards usage of Gen AI in arbitration practice, but I feel given that it is a very
18 document heavy and document dense practice area where you are dealing with thousands of
19 correspondences in a Railway or NHAI Arbitration or multiple evidence files that have been
20 dumped by the opposing Party where you have to identify the right email as Shameer said.
21 Gen AI can be very well integrated in their workflows for at least these tasks, but again then
22 the question comes of how reliant is Gen AI? The scepticism arrives from that. And in Gen AI's
23 defence, I would say that not every time is the hallucination because of the fault of Gen AI.
24 Sometimes it is the other technologies that are used by Gen AI platforms. For instance, as an
25 example, one complaint that we had received was that in the **Ambuja Cement** CCI case, it
26 had wrongly identified the maximum penalty that was imposed. So we started off the
27 investigation as to why that happened, and we found that, yeah, the answer was wrong. As
28 consumers of AI, it is apparently written in front of us, on page let's say 120, but AI has not
29 taken it out rightly. Then we found that the OCR pipeline that was used to extract text from
30 that document had actually not extracted it well, and the faulty data was fed into the LLM,
31 which again, gave the answer wrong. And most of the situations where hallucinations happen,
32 one is without guardrails, that is a different thing to talk about, like Chat GPT.com but where
33 there are Gen AI tools where guardrails are already in place and hallucinations still happen. It
34 might be because of certain other technologies that are being used. So, I think lawyers need to
35 be educated a little more about how Gen AI is working and should be used which will drive a

TERES

1 little, which will drive the adoption even more, but right now I think due to the scepticism, the
2 adoption is not that much.

3 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** So, I like the example that you gave me, and I think we'll run
4 with it where you said that the maximum penalty in a particular case had been misidentified
5 by AI, right? So, if my junior associate did that how I would approach the problem is, say, okay,
6 where did you start with? And I would sort of go with their thought process and train of
7 thought with them and stop them where they're making the mistake where they say I access
8 this source. But so with Gen AI fundamentally if I have to train it, I probably have to come
9 back to you, right? So I think that's the adoption dilemma that we all have. So, Shameer, I want
10 to talk about your experience in terms of is it easier to train a human, because every year we
11 do have fresh grads and enthusiastic young, bubbling people who are really smart and now
12 with Gen AI, there is that whole apprehension about okay, so what are we going to do now?
13 And how do we train our lawyers now? I think that's a question that we all have.

14 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Before I answer that, whatever I'm about to say next are my
15 personal views and personal views alone. See, I think the way I see it, AI is essentially
16 becoming an associate's associate. So really, if you think about it, that is really where the use
17 case is. It is not going to make an associate obsolete. It is only going to assist an associate. And
18 by that, what do I mean, I'll go back to the example that I quoted right at the beginning which
19 is, let's say a list of dates is generated by AI. Someone needs to sit down and actually verify it.
20 Now that first level verification, obviously only an associate will be able to do. So, therefore it's
21 just about how we, as a practice, evolve in the face of AI, that is there, of course, to assist
22 lawyers now. But the only caveat I would add here is anybody who's reviewed anybody's work,
23 realizes the kind of attention to detail and attention span that is necessary to be able to sit
24 down and meaningfully review it. Now, given our short attention spans. And of course, I can
25 speak for myself, right? When I started off just a couple of months into the profession, my
26 attention span was definitely not, I mean, my attention to detail and my attention span was
27 nothing extraordinary. So to sort of expect an associate to now bring that kind of an attention
28 span and that kind of level to level of attention to detail to the practice, I think is quite a solid
29 ask, and that is really, I think, where we, as practitioners, have to step in and sort of see how
30 do we bridge the gap now. How to bridge that gap? I don't have any bright ideas. Anybody else
31 has those bright ideas, happy to brainstorm, but I think that's really where practice in of itself
32 would evolve. Associates, I think, would be expected to evolve and also us as people who
33 ultimately review somebody else's work.

34 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** So how to evolve? I think Raghav will be best placed to sort
35 of comment on it. He is at the intersection of upskilling, using AI. So, if I were today a law

TERES

1 student, what would your advice be to me? How should I upskill myself to stay relevant? If I'm
2 in the first year of law school and five years down the line in 2030, I'm looking to enter a law
3 firm. What should I do?

4 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** Sure. There are a couple of things that we look at. First is obviously being
5 AI native because that is something where you don't have baggage issues, unlike people who
6 are already in the profession. You don't have your workflows defined, you don't have
7 preconceived notions. The first thing where you create an edge is by being AI native. For that,
8 as I was saying, defining the workflow, running those systems. That's not as simple as it
9 sounds. So that's the first thing. Second thing is that you will see law as a profession. What I
10 am personally feeling will become more on the lines of consultants where there will be a very
11 strong domain angle to what they are doing, which is not just related to the practice area, but
12 also to the kind of business, the kind of problem statement they are dealing with. So as a junior
13 associate, you will need to also add a more strategic layer to what you bring on the table rather
14 than just doing the basic work. Third, I think, is access, because the number of lawyers that
15 would be required or any profession that would be required in knowledge based economy,
16 those numbers will not disproportionately increase as per the GDP is increasing. I would not
17 say remain stagnant, but would not increase in that proportion. So what that means is that
18 people who know the right people, people who have the right access, who are in the right
19 rooms, they will have a disproportionate advantage because the economic value would be in
20 proportion to the GDP, but the economic value will be getting distributed in lesser number of
21 people as opposed to the traditional norms. And for access, what I tell everyone is to build a
22 personal brand where content plays a big role, where thought leadership plays a big role. But
23 just to summarize, being AI native, because that's where the incumbents are at a disadvantage.
24 Second, add a layer of domain expertise, which is beyond just the area of expertise you are
25 dealing in. And third is to build a brand where you should not be known as associate of a
26 particular law firm. Long term, you should be in a position where the law firm sees that you
27 coming there at some level of credibility, some level of Clientele to it.

28 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** That's valid career advice for all of us. But to say how you
29 mentioned that even a young associate, right, is no longer doing just the grunt work because
30 grunt work has their associate, which is AI, so what should you value in a young associate?
31 Shameer, I think that's for you, and Raghav for you what do you value in a lawyer now? Say,
32 as a young lawyer, right? And how do you say pay them? So, I think this goes back to this
33 question of billable hours and things like that. So how do you assess that value that an associate
34 is pulling it?

TERES

1 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** So, I think right now, when you look at the value a lawyer or a law firm
 2 is giving you, it's very easy to just say that they have the credibility, they will do. The devil is in
 3 the detail. And when you work with better quality of lawyers or better quality of firms, there's
 4 a lot of detailing in what they do. As we go forward, detailing will become something which
 5 even mediocre law firms or lawyers will bring on the table. What will be of value is (a) their
 6 ability to articulate, how well they are in terms of articulating, how well they are in terms of
 7 speaking, in terms of arguing. Second is in some shape or form their domain/business
 8 expertise, because every business that is, your client will have a very unique problem and
 9 understanding that problem may not be something that just you can google or go on chat GPT
 10 to know about. It is more your reflex, more your gut, more your intuition about that particular
 11 business. So I think for me, the way I would value is that how much do they know about the
 12 kind of work that I am doing. Second is their articulation. And third, obviously, is the speed,
 13 because now everyone has become very impatient, where you assume that whatever you
 14 discuss today should be done in 24 hours, doesn't matter how big or small, the work is.

15 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** I think Raghav has covered it, but I think I'll just quickly make
 16 two short points. If anybody who's entering the profession, I think attention to detail is
 17 indispensable. That's really the foundation. And I think that no AI, no tool, it's something
 18 personal to you. You either have it or you don't. You either bring it to the table or you don't.
 19 So, I think if any person who's able to, at any level of seniority in the profession, bringing that
 20 attention to detail. And I think second is, of course in this profession, whatever it is, grit
 21 matters. So bring that grit to the table. So, of course, all I'm trying to say is I think there are
 22 something, there's something fundamentally very human about a profession which no AI can
 23 bring to the profession, to the table. So essentially, I think, where an associate can really bring
 24 value in addition to what Raghav said is bring those fundamentally human elements to the
 25 table that I think despite no matter what you do, these are not aspects that you can train into
 26 a person. So I think that's pretty much of it.

27 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** Just one thing to add right on the business model. If you see how
 28 insurance is underwritten. They have multiple variables in which they assess the risk, they
 29 assess the downside, the upside. And that's how they price a premium, I believe long term law
 30 firms also will start having some mathematical model, looking at the kind of business they are
 31 evaluating, the kind of problem statements they have, where they will be able to factor in that
 32 this is what my retainer would be... Now *aap humse char cheeze aur kara lo*. You make us do
 33 ten more things, doesn't matter. But this is what our retainer would be, and there will be more
 34 outcome based pricing, but I would look at insurance industry as a better comparable because
 35 there is a lot of variability to what eventually happens.

TERES

1 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** So, this outcome-based pricing is interesting because that's
 2 not something that we have in India. How are we going to... You said that we are going to
 3 perhaps look at what this advice is valued by our client, right? So, if they're doing an M&A
 4 deal, that's worth 'X' that we say percentage or something like that. Deepika, do you see that
 5 as a realistic transformation in maybe 20-30 years, will the BCI sort of change or 20-30 years
 6 too long?

7 **DEEPIKA KINHAL:** Yeah, in the era that we are living in, a decade is too long. I think almost
 8 on a monthly basis, we are seeing innovations that is likely to not disrupt but challenge the
 9 status quo for sure. So, tying in what we were discussing with respect to what our associates
 10 at various levels will be doing and how maybe the policy will have to play catch up there. I
 11 think one thing as we also discussed, is that with litigation or with any disputes context, it is
 12 the nuances that play a key role. Right? While Gen AI is fantastic with volumes, what we really
 13 bring to table as professionals is that nuance, that understanding of comparable documents,
 14 and that is the value add that any individual will bring to table going forward, and that needs
 15 to factor into the expectations that we set for the associates as well, right? Certain tasks will be
 16 taken for granted. As opposed to, say, what was there a couple of years ago, where even an
 17 associate who could create that detailed memo for the partner to refer to had their value, but
 18 today, you know that that is something that can happen at the click of a button. But based on
 19 that memo, what are the arguments that you are suggesting. I think those are the kind of skill
 20 sets that will become a lot more valuable. And when it comes to identifying what it is that the
 21 universities are going to be designed for, and what it is that the BCI will then have to identify,
 22 say, in terms of lawyers, legal degrees, what sort of courses, so on and so forth, it will have to
 23 start playing a role there. And we are already seeing that universities are adapting, thankfully,
 24 the kind of courses that we have been invited to offer, be it with online dispute resolution, or
 25 be it with identifying what sort of tools to integrate into ADR courses itself, be it data
 26 crunching, be it research, how to use the hyperlinking modules to help you get the right
 27 answers at a quicker pace. Students are being trained for these already. So my fear is actually
 28 more for the partner level lawyers because they will find that there is a huge difference in terms
 29 of the skill sets that the new generation of lawyers will bring to table. They will come in with,
 30 as Shantanu was saying, that AI native capabilities. A question that a partner will pose will no
 31 longer even seem relevant because it will take them only a few seconds to answer that. They
 32 will be added that coding. So, lawyers, we are now used to reading through the statutes,
 33 reading through the case documents, but you will have lawyers who will know coding to get
 34 you the right answers. Right? So that is the next generation that we will have to prepare
 35 ourselves for, rather than the other way around. Sorry for a little bit of time.

TERES

1 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Very instructive and I want Shantanu to jump in here. Is the...
 2 like Deepika mentioned, perhaps a 2025 graduate has the skill set that is needed and is
 3 working with someone who's graduated in 2000 but the 2000 person is the decision maker,
 4 right? So how does that affect your business? How are you able to convince someone who is
 5 perhaps not that sold on it? And do you see a generational sort of a shift? And I also want to
 6 add, in terms of adapting; does institutional pressure from top matter or is adapting
 7 happening at the grassroots level without, say, the managing partner's involvement?

8 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** So yes, the pressure from top definitely matters because how legal
 9 AI tools are being currently sold is through a SLG model, which is sales driven model, and it's
 10 not a PLG model where anyone can download a legal AI tool and just start using it. This is also
 11 because of the confidentiality concerns that lawyers generally face. They can't put their
 12 documents on any platform without any guarantee of confidentiality. Hence, involvement of
 13 the top management is definitely involved in adoption of any kind of legal AI tool. But we have
 14 also observed that even if we sell the tool to the top management, ultimately, the end user is
 15 the junior associate who has to do the job using AI and send it for review to the seniors, right?
 16 Our power users across firms are generally junior associates or senior associates. Usage is not
 17 coming from partners or councils that much. So how we pitch this to the partners is that it is
 18 going to cut down on time deliverables and you can give out the deliverables very quickly to
 19 your clients in no time. So, your clients are already breathing down your neck for their
 20 deliverables to be given very quickly. You are maybe rejecting deals because you don't have the
 21 time. Eventually, once your entire team adopts the tool., the time variable will decrease by,
 22 let's say, 20%, 30%, 40%, depending upon your workflows. That is how we generally take it
 23 there.

24 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** You mentioned one of the concerns as being proprietary
 25 information being needed by this AI, and which is perhaps one of the reasons there is a
 26 pushback. I don't know if pushback is a too stronger word, but maybe there is some inertia. So
 27 how do you deal with it at Lucio where... What is the data on which Lucio trains? And when
 28 you said 20,000 awards. Where do you find these 20,000 awards?

29 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** So yes, there is inertia in adoption and every other Client does a
 30 detailed Infosec of our platform but we are stock to, type to compliance, GDPR compliant,
 31 which gives them some comfort. But even then there is a lot of back and forth, which is fair as
 32 a concern from lawyers. Given that we can't train the model on confidential data, I think the
 33 advice that you guys were giving that the human element that lawyers will bring in. That advice
 34 will stay for a long time because Generative AI can only become smarter in giving legal advices
 35 if it is trained on legal advice given by us, right? Right now, it is only the public data which is

TERES

1 not very significant, which has been used to put the legal aspect to AI. Hence, lawyers with
2 those personal touches or the human elements will definitely remain safe and AI is not going
3 to replace it.

4 Coming to the question that how do we deal with it? We have specific undertakings from Azure
5 and GCP, where our model has been hosted, where our platform has been hosted. These
6 undertakings help us convince the clients that no information is going out from these servers.
7 The cloud service providers have their own compliances. Moreover, if certain Client is in for
8 getting an on-prem deployment where the platform will be deployed on their own servers, like
9 for Trilegal, the platform has been deployed on their own servers, so nothing leaves Trilegal's
10 server itself, which gives more comfort in terms of adoption.

11 **DEEPIKA KINHAL:** Just adding a point there and tying in with one of the initial questions
12 you asked Manasa. Whether Gen AI for arbitration is an artificial construct? Is there
13 something very different about this context which requires us to look at different models, look
14 at what are the needs and differences in comparison to generic use of Gen AI, which happens
15 across board? I think what Shantanu mentions answers that in the affirmative. While Gen AI
16 is an easy fit into an arbitration context, given that there is volume, given the kind of
17 complexity that the cases typically have, or even the fact that in an international arbitration,
18 especially we are likely to have different languages. We are likely to have different contexts in
19 terms of regional requirements itself. So, Gen AI, you would think is a very easy fit because it
20 can be tailored to deal with each one of these complexities in an international arbitration.
21 However, given that the arbitration is centred around the principles of confidentiality, privacy
22 and at a level of say, when it comes to challenge, what could potentially be the grounds of
23 challenge; whether the process was fair, whether the process was transparent. These are the
24 questions that will play a role in identifying what are the suitable Gen AI tools that you can
25 embed in the arbitration context. You cannot take a typical off-the-shelf LLM Model and start
26 running with it. You need to really tailor it and ensure that these legal requirements set in by
27 the statutes and set in by the courts are followed to the tee. And that is where I think
28 procedures will start changing within the arbitration as AI starts getting embedded, say, for
29 instance, what is the Procedural Order going to identify? The first Procedural Order, currently
30 looks at the timeline, currently looks what the different stages of the case is going to be. It has
31 to now equally start providing for what are the AI tools that are permissible in the arbitration
32 context. What will be seen as a red line, if especially a particular tool is going to empower or
33 increase the efficiency of one side drastically in comparison to the other, right? Because that
34 is the principle of fairness that is going to get affected. So, just because one side has the means
35 to get the appropriate AI tool, which is going to increase their efficiency 100-fold, is that
36 actually a level playing field in an arbitration context? And if it is not, will that actually get

TERES

1 challenged as one of the grounds under Section 34, right? So, these are the various factors
2 which will need us to look at what sort of Gen AI model is necessary in the arbitration context.
3 So, it is a specialised field. And for that, I think entrepreneurs, innovators need to apply their
4 mind specifically in consultation with the arbitration practitioners.

5 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Fully agree with you there Deepika. I think I would actually
6 invite Raghav to chime in here because all four of you used a phrase, "human element." So, to
7 what degree is that relevant to you as a consumer of, say, arbitration, right? Would it matter
8 to you if the Arbitrator was assisted by AI, or largely assisted by AI, and was drafting almost,
9 even the reasoning portion of the award with AI? And to just top that question up, this is a
10 commercial dispute. Would that change, or in any way be amplified if this matter was, say, a
11 criminal matter?

12 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** Sure. So, I think, as you know, Garbage In- Garbage-Out. The biggest
13 worry with, whatever happens is the bases of the data sets. So if I am on one side, my biggest
14 worry would be I want to understand what is the core data set that has gone into training,
15 whatever model is giving the output. And around that you would require some level of
16 transparency, some level of auditability, and then a human in the loop kind of checklist, where
17 at different-different stages, there are checklist where humans verify whether it makes sense
18 or not. Obviously, with respect to the costs, it will take the cost down. So, as a consumer, as a
19 Client, I would like that. But as a Client, I would also want to ensure that it should not benefit
20 the other Party more and from that angle, the core data sources, where they are coming from,
21 and the problem there would be that the other Party also would have a say in that. So, how do
22 we come to a common conclusion about what kind of data sources, case laws, jurisdictions and
23 God knows what all, should we factor in? So, I think, I believe that logically, it will take the
24 cost down. It will reduce the time. So, as a consumer, as a Client, I'm for it. But practically, I
25 believe when there are two opposing Parties, they both will start having a fight over what is
26 the base data length.

27 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** So, if we were to frame these guidelines or to avoid the
28 Garbage In- Garbage Out situation, what would these guidelines look like? I think I want to
29 ask everyone at the table for this. What their views would be on if I, today, if MCIA were to
30 have AI ethical considerations or something like that, what should feature in those
31 considerations?

32 **DEEPIKA KINHAL:** I think we are seeing a few referral guidelines at least coming out from
33 different parts of the world, right? Courts to certain International arbitration institutions are
34 taking their first cracks at coming out with their AI policy. At least the ones that I have seen

TERES

appears to be too basic. This is, because I'm also seeing the kind of drastic developments that are happening on the innovation front, which these policies do not account for yet. However, some of the most foundational requirements of any AI usage policy would be to ensure that the concern regarding confidentiality is taken care of. It should definitely state very categorically that neither of the Parties or the counsels are going to be using publicly available AI models for any activities concerning that particular arbitration. So, there are two layers of checks that are necessary, right? One at the institutional level, and second, within the context of that arbitration. At the institutional level, there can be general guidelines to state that even on the case management side, where it is, maybe the Tribunal Secretary individually, or the Registry within the institution is not losing generic AI tools to help them with their administrative tasks. And this is where institutionalization of AI tools become important. So, one is the commitment that the institutions say, such as MCIA shows that they are going to embed any AI tool within their workflow, and they are going to be transparent about it. And second, once that tool is embedded, once the platform is tailored to use multiple tools maybe, it needs to be an undertaking which is extremely categorical that nothing beyond this will be allowed for usage. And once you go into specific arbitration context, there needs to be an increased effort by the institution to sort of train the Arbitral Tribunal, to state that they are going to receive commitments from both the Parties that these are the list of AI tools that will be used for this particular arbitration and nothing else. Because that, as I said go features into not just the requirement of confidentiality but also the parity between Parties. And if these are baked into guidelines, I think it will give a lot more comfort to Clients and it will also take care of subsequent consequences in terms of challenges to awards because of lack of procedural integrity.

MANASA SUNDARRAMAN: So, Deepika, you spoke about both sides using and the institution using. I think the one big question is, what about the Arbitrators using? And you had hinted at public policy and due process considerations. So, Shameer, where do you think Indian Courts are going to draw the line in terms of AI-assisted Arbitrators?

MOHAMMED SHAMEER: See, I think assisted is fine. I don't think anybody has a problem with AI being an assistant to anybody. And I think if you just see the way AI is being adopted, pretty much by every major firm, I think there's no resistance to adoption of AI as well. So if you talk about it till the extent of AI being an assistant, I don't think there's any problem at all, be it in an arbitration context or any other context. I think the challenges start coming up only when you, sort of, start using AI to replace reasoning. And essentially, I think, moment you have, let us say, a completely AI-generated award, which gets into not just considering arguments of counter-Parties, but also reasoning out the award and ultimately arriving at an end conclusion, I think you fundamentally have a problem. That I think Deepika already

TERES

1 touched upon those aspects. If you have that kind of an award, I think it's fairly a no-brainer
 2 to sort of say that it's definitely in the teeth of a couple of provisions under this, under Section
 3 34 and therefore, requires to be set aside. But I think just in terms of, I mean, even awards, do
 4 we have awards that are being set aside which are not AI-assisted? Yes. So if, let us say, an
 5 Arbitrator were to use AI to generate an award end-to-end, but really apply his mind to that
 6 award and say, okay, I agree with this reasoning. And I think the reasoning is sound. Do you
 7 still have a problem with that? Again, this is, I think, a very subjective view, but I think as long
 8 as that human element is involved, in terms of human oversight, to say that this conclusion is
 9 sound, and I think this is something Raghav was also mentioning. As long as I think we are
 10 sure that the conclusion is sound. There has been human oversight over reaching that
 11 conclusion. I don't think there's any problem even in terms of challenge to an award.

12 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** So, we've seen awards being set aside because of cut-copy-
 13 paste. Would you say that the same judge would perhaps be okay with AI assisted arbitrations
 14 because I would imagine that if I could Ctrl-C, Ctrl- V from first award to second award, and
 15 that award is getting set aside, then perhaps I agree with my brother AI is perhaps not going
 16 to cut it.

17 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** That's actually briefly what I was trying to refer to, and I said,
 18 have we seen awards written entirely by humans being set aside without really getting into
 19 copy paste. But as I said, I think, see again, the reason why you fall to copy, paste is because
 20 there's no application of mind to it. There's no human oversight in it. There's no application
 21 of mind to the conclusions in it. And that's basically just in terms of how, and I think Shantanu
 22 will, of course, have a lot of ideas on this. And I'll borrow what Raghav also said Garbage-In
 23 Garbage-Out. If you interact with AI in a very summary fashion where you say, where you
 24 don't give it enough context, enough information, enough input, it is obviously going to give
 25 you a very vague sort of unthought of answer. But just imagining it from my point of view. If
 26 I'm able to tell AI that I've gone through all the documents. This is what I see these are some
 27 of the conclusions I want to reach and I want to use this foundationally, these documents and
 28 these principles to be able to reach that conclusion, can you generate an award? What's wrong
 29 with that? So I think there's absolutely nothing wrong with AI. It's again, something I said,
 30 right at the beginning. I don't think fundamentally anything wrong with AI assisting
 31 Arbitrators in writing awards as long as that human oversight and human intervention exists.

32 **DEEPIKA KINHAI:** Doubling down on the point that I made previously, I think the
 33 question is where is the Arbitrator uploading these documents to give him that first cut of
 34 awards? That to me, is a critical question to ask in the arbitration context. Using generally
 35 available public models is what has become the norm now. And you don't know when it will

TERES

1 come back to bite you, right? Maybe nobody is currently asking ChatGPT for specific disputes
 2 using specific names. "Tell me if there is any information on these Parties available in your
 3 database." Right? But if that question were to be posed, and some associates or even an
 4 arbitrator, has given that data to your publicly available LLMs, then it'll get thrown up as one
 5 of the answers, along with a source also, if it is a paid model that you're using. And that is my
 6 fear. So, while, yes, assisted summarization, assisted award writing is the most practical usage
 7 of what AI can provide you in the dispute's context, how are you ensuring that these AI tools
 8 are definitely not going to be using that database to train, or you are providing that database
 9 for public consumption at large? And that is why you need to ensure that there is a policy that
 10 is driving the usage of AI in arbitration context.

11 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** I absolutely agree. I think what I said essentially meant while
 12 you keep the foundational principles of arbitration intact, which is confidentiality, Party
 13 autonomy. And if AI in keeping those foundational principles intact is assisting arbitrators and
 14 practitioners, there's obviously no issue, but moment we breach that, I think we definitely have
 15 quite a bit of an issue.

16 **SHANTANU MISHRA:** I think the concerns with confidentiality for a consumer grade AI
 17 platform like ChatGPT are very well founded, but I feel they are slightly overstated when it
 18 comes for Enterprise AI models. So, for instance, you are using Microsoft Word and trusting
 19 it for all your confidential data, you are exchanging emails on Outlook and exchanging all sorts
 20 of confidential data, these are also stored on Microsoft's cloud, right? So, if there is Microsoft
 21 Azure, Open AI that processes your data, you can be very well assured that it is maintaining
 22 your confidentiality because of the compliances there are. So, hence I feel when it comes to
 23 Enterprise AI, Enterprise Model AI, I think confidentiality concerns are slightly overstated.

24 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** I wanted to open the floor up for any Q and A. Any questions?

25 **AUDIENCE 1:** How much time do you think, say, the associate is gaining by using AI tool
 26 or... just happy to hear, maybe Shantanu and Shameer. Your perspective specifically, do you
 27 feel it being used more extensively than, say, in some of the other sectors? I'm just happy to
 28 learn on that front.

29 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Yeah, I can speak of usage within our own. 97% of the associates
 30 are using it. So, at the associate level, I think this is also something Shantanu also mentioned.
 31 At the associate level, the usage is extremely high because I think just giving, again, a very
 32 personal example. Back in the day when in 2012, I'd have to physically read the document, put
 33 my finger on a keyboard and painfully type out 100 pager list of dates. Now AI can just generate

TERES

1 it for me. And from an Associate's point of view, then the job essentially becomes sitting down
 2 and verifying whether what it is saying is accurate, whether the descriptions are accurate and
 3 making some tweaks here and there. But as you go up the ladder, I think the usage levels drop.
 4 For a very obvious reason, which is, as you move up the ladder, you are doing a more
 5 supervisory function as against a function that AI is, as of now, at least in terms of a product
 6 offering is providing for. So, I think just in terms of usage statistics itself, at the Associate level,
 7 it's above 90- 95%. See, that's debatable. So, as I said, see, there are several layers to this, in
 8 terms of when it actually saves time. If you are a person who's generally seasoned in interacting
 9 with AI, you know how to structure your prompts. Because, see, even at the Firm level, there
 10 was some level of training and material that was circulated on how do you interact with AI?
 11 How do you structure your prompts when interacting with AI so that it gives you the most
 12 accurate output. So, the first level of, I think time saving happens if you as a person are able to
 13 appropriately interact with AI, key in the right kind of input, key in the right kind of prompts.
 14 Now, the moment that doesn't happen, you don't get the kind of output that you wanted. And
 15 I think it's actually to sort of then sit down and fix the mistakes that the output has made, you
 16 land up spending a lot more time. But again, I think this is, again, very personal. Simpler briefs,
 17 for example, which are not very voluminous. And I'm stepping into and this is personally
 18 where I find AI to be very useful, and I'm stepping into a meeting, and I have no more than
 19 half an hour to prep for that meeting, and I want a quick summary of what the Client is trying
 20 to say and what are some of the potential problems that the Client might be facing. There, I
 21 think the mileage is immense, because what that is acting as is essentially a launch pad for the
 22 purpose of having that meeting. But again, anything deeper, in terms of actually arriving at
 23 conclusion, strategizing, taking a particular direction in terms of conducting a matter versus
 24 the other, I think as you move up the ladder, the use case is not that high.

25 **AUDIENCE 2:** Just wanted to understand the threat of over-reliance on AI as to the capacity
 26 of application of mind in itself. The panellists were focused on how the application of mind is
 27 necessary after the AI is able to bring out the necessary summarisation of the file in itself, but
 28 over a long period of time due to over reliance, would it lead to a concept of there is no
 29 application of mind from the associates' end in itself?

30 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Yeah, I wouldn't blame the associate for that. I'll tell you why.
 31 In our own practices, I think, we sort of dictate when AI should be used and when you should
 32 adopt the rustic way of doing it, because there is definitely some benefit that I think. Call me
 33 old school that way, but the old school way of doing it, reading a brief and preparing for a
 34 hearing. There is definitely some benefit to it, and I think that is really where I personally have
 35 developed my own abilities in terms of application of mind and critical thinking. So, I think
 36 that the buck stops at us, not so much at an associate. I think we have to have sort of that

TERES

1 responsibility to intervene at an appropriate moment and say, these are the briefs that you're
2 not going to use AI for. You're going to do this the hard way. So, I think that's one solution I've
3 been able to find. I'm not saying that this is the only solution to address this problem, of course.
4 And I think the panel also touched upon this during the discussion, right? You will have a
5 generation of lawyers who are so attuned to using AI, who may be able to produce better
6 outcomes than the old fashioned of doing things. So, I think, for now, this is the solution I've
7 been able to find. Will AI lead to a situation where you'll have a generation of lawyers who
8 don't have critical thinking? I don't think so. I don't think that's possible. Again, views are
9 personal.

10 **AUDIENCE 2:** Thank you.

11 **AUDIENCE 3:** Since we are aware that job market has been affected by using AI, I wanted to
12 know how much role it will play in affecting the role for lawyers as you said, that 98% of the
13 associates are using AI. So, will it reduce the volume of recruitment in your law firm for the
14 associates?

15 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** I think it's been more than a year since Lucio was implemented
16 within the firm. We have not seen a drop in numbers. We have only seen an increase in
17 numbers. And as I said, AI is essentially, the way I see it is an associate's associate. It will, at
18 best help an associate figure out some answers quicker, generate some summaries faster but
19 are we, today, as you and I are speaking, are we at a place where AI is going to completely
20 replace an associate? I don't think so, because I would still need an associate for that
21 oversight. I think it goes back to the earlier question in terms of does AI save time? There
22 have been some instances. I'm not going to make a generalized statement here. There have
23 been some instances where the job of verification actually took longer than doing it the old
24 fashioned way. So, I don't think we are, at least as we speak today, at a point where AI is going
25 to significantly bring down numbers in any law firm. Generally speaking, to fellow
26 practitioners, I don't think anybody has this thought in their heads at this point of time. I don't
27 think anybody thinks humans are, associates are dispensable and you can essentially make do
28 with AI. I don't think so. I don't think it's going to, at least in the near future, result in a
29 substantial drop in numbers.

30 **DEEPIKA KINHALL:** Sorry, I just wanted to quickly add to the point that Shameer was
31 making a response to, both those questions. I believe the disruption in terms of workforce is
32 sort of overstated. As I said, the legal profession itself is built on your ability to identify
33 nuances. Therefore, while mechanical, repetitive tasks will be something that you will readily
34 delegate to an AI Agent, anything above that will require humans at every level of seniority.

TERES

1 And that, I think, is the blessing of legal profession that we are all a part of. So, there is no
 2 replacing lawyers, not just anytime soon. I think this is an irreplaceable profession. I know this
 3 is getting transcribed and recorded. I hope I'm not proven wrong. But also, the blessing with
 4 AI is that it will allow us to do more within the same span of time. Associates, especially, will
 5 be able to actually maybe work more on strategizing than the grunt work that was readily
 6 delegated to them. I remember my first year as an associate in a large firm, I spent hours and
 7 hours doing due diligence, Hours and hours creating those chronology of events, but maybe
 8 now a percentage of my time will be spent with my seniors' understanding the case strategizing
 9 with them. So, I think my learning curve as a junior associate will be much steeper than what
 10 it was with the previous generation.

11 **RAGHAV GUPTA:** I have a counter-take on this, right? I am not from this profession, so
 12 excuse my ignorance, but what you are seeing in coding right now, in the Software Engineering
 13 market, what is happening is that workflows are being redefined and the people at top are able
 14 to see inefficiencies. Right now in the law profession, my belief is that workflows have not been
 15 redefined yet, might take ten years for all you know. But they will happen one day where
 16 workflows would be redefined. They would become a little bit more AI native, and then the
 17 people at top, your managing partners or anyone who's managing a P&L, for them it will start
 18 looking like a cost structure where they can look at their margin optimization. So, that's what
 19 I believe that the lawyers will obviously be required. Now, number of them, at what stage,
 20 logically I'm just comparing it to what's happening in the software market. This will take longer
 21 here. That's a good thing about this profession, but someday or the other, it should happen.
 22 But I want to go back alive. So, I don't know.

23 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** Sorry, just one last question. The lady here.

24 **AZIZ:** Hi. My name is Aziz. So, over the years, we have seen that initially when we had to
 25 research first, we had to go through volumes of books, then we had SCC online, and then we
 26 had liquid text and so on and so forth. Do you think there'll come a time where we will be so
 27 tuned with the AI that we would forget that the fact that you have to go back to the roots? And
 28 because currently, I sometimes feel that SCC Online is not sufficient and you have to go to the
 29 manuals, hard copies and all of that, but the new generation that are coming, they don't know
 30 about manual copies, the SCC Online is everything and the generations coming next would
 31 even not have that idea that you have to search beyond your AI structures. If that situation
 32 comes, don't you think that will create a chaos for the whole structure of litigation?

33 **MOHAMMED SHAMEER:** Good question. I'm not going to comment so much on actual
 34 reading of journals versus SCC. I think they both serve pretty much the same purpose, but I

TERES

1 think what I want to touch upon to answer your question is when we used to sit down and use
2 those old methods of keywords and read random judgements, there used to be a lot of random
3 reading that used to happen. There was a lot of random data knowledge transfer. I think with,
4 and this, I think, is going to be a significant disadvantage. With more use of AI, which can
5 throw up maybe very accurate results for what you're looking for. I think that general sense of
6 reading and general awareness, we will definitely miss out on. So, I think that is definitely one
7 place where I personally feel we'll see some impact.

8 **MANASA SUNDARRAMAN:** I think we've run out of time, so we have to conclude our
9 session now. I would like to thank our panellists. I think we've all arrived. I think all of us here
10 are enthusiastic adopters of AI. And while there is a bit of caution, I think most of us see this
11 as being inevitable and are looking forward, I should say, to embrace a future with AI. So thank
12 you, Shameer. Thank you, Deepika, Raghav and Shantanu for all your insights and for being
13 part of this conversation. We can take the further questions in our networking outside. Thank
14 you.

15 **DUHITA:** We'll be having a lunch break till 02:30, and we'll start our next session at 02:30.

16

17 ~~~END OF SESSION 2~~~

18

19