SAXIA

WHITE PAPER · TECHNICAL DOCUMENT FOR DECISION-MAKERS

ALGORITHMIC SOVEREIGNTY

The incorporation of AI-Automated Companies and its impact on Argentine Corporate Law

PREPARED FOR: Legislators, legislative advisors, and opinion leaders
VERSION: 1.0
DATE: June 2026
CLASSIFICATION: Analysis document — public distribution
PREPARED BY: SAXIA — Legal and operational infrastructure for AI-driven companies

About this document

This White Paper was prepared by SAXIA as a technical-legal analysis document aimed at legislators, legislative advisors, and opinion leaders, in the context of the debate over the proposed General Companies Law that incorporates AI-Automated Companies (SA-IA, Sociedades Automatizadas por Inteligencia Artificial) into Argentina's corporate legal framework.

The content presented here is for informational purposes and intended to contribute to public debate. It does not constitute binding legal advice, nor does it represent the official position of any Argentine State agency or any third party mentioned in this document.

About SAXIA

SAXIA is a legal, operational, and technological infrastructure partner for companies operating with artificial intelligence agents. We support founders, investment firms, and international teams in designing legal structure, governance, agent implementation, and the documentation required to form and operate automated companies based in Argentina.

Our work combines company formation, intellectual property, regulatory compliance, and ongoing management on a single operational foundation, designed to withstand the scrutiny of banks, partners, investors, professionals, and public agencies.

Website: https://saxia.com.ar

Headquarters: Buenos Aires, Argentina

Institutional contact: *[to be completed]*

© 2026 SAXIA. Document for public distribution. Circulation and citation with attribution to the source are authorized.

Table of Contents

SECTION I. Executive Summary

SECTION II. Global Context and the Cost of Inaction

SECTION III. Legal Anatomy of the SA-IA under Argentine Law

SECTION IV. Dismantling the Myths: Answers to Collective Objections

SECTION V. Socioeconomic Impact for Argentina

SECTION VI. Some Proposed Best Practices

SECTION VII. Honorable Legislators: Approve Automated Companies and Let Us Lead the World

SECTION VIII. Glossary

SECTION IX. Regulatory References

SECTION I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The debate over incorporating **AI-Automated Companies (SA-IA, Sociedades Automatizadas por Inteligencia Artificial)** and Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) into Argentina's corporate legal framework marks a historic turning point. This strategic document is not presented as a blind apology for technology, but as an institutional roadmap for legislators, advisors, and opinion leaders. The goal is to demystify the fears that innovation naturally raises and to demonstrate that the legal framework of the Argentine Republic already has the tools necessary to lead the 21st-century digital economy.

1.1. A historic opportunity.

Argentina stands at a decisive regulatory crossroads. We possess one of the most valued and dynamic ecosystems of technological talent, software development, and knowledge-based ventures in all of Latin America. However, our analog commercial laws, designed for the mercantile traffic of the last century, act as a bottleneck choking the expansion of these industries. While global capital migrates toward agile, digital corporate models, local regulatory conservatism drives talent and projects toward foreign jurisdictions that have understood the rules of this new international game. Approving this reform is not a risky capitalist experiment; it is an act of strict economic and algorithmic sovereignty aimed at retaining wealth and attracting Foreign Direct Investment (FDI).

1.2. What SA-IAs are (and are not).

Automated Companies do not entail the birth of uncontrolled entities operating in a legal vacuum. They are limited-liability legal entities whose ordinary business operations, internal administration, and contract execution are delegated to algorithms and Artificial Intelligence through **Smart Contracts** that can be settled on the immutable technology of the **blockchain**.

It is essential to understand that human will does not disappear in these companies: it concentrates strategically in the **human founding act** and in the **programming of the origin rules** of the code.

Software has no metaphysical free will; it executes, mathematically and with ultra-efficiency, the instructions, parameters, and limits that its human creators set for it.

1.3. The law resolved these objections decades ago.

Faced with the usual criticisms that associate this model with financial opacity or a liability vacuum, this White Paper demonstrates how existing Argentine law — such as the Corporate Criminal Liability Law (Ley 27.401), the doctrine of disregard of legal personality (Art. 54 of the current Commercial Companies Law, LSC), and strict liability (Art. 1757 of the Civil and Commercial Code, CCCN) — dismantles every objection.

1.4. Best practices for institutional security.

There are practically countless institutions and technological mechanisms that can be used as highly precise institutional safeguards, which could be built into the regulations governing Automated Companies. A few examples include:

- An emergency stop protocol (**Kill Switch**) for the algorithm, controlled by a human administrator.
- A mandatory **Annual Code Audit** to verify the software's behavior.
- A strict **Cryptographic Identity Certification** registry for founders, eliminating anonymity.
- The mandatory role of a **Human Procedural Liaison Agent**, a licensed attorney whose office serves as the unified physical legal domicile for any notification from the State or third parties.

1.5. Whoever opposes technology, loses. Always.

The cost of rejecting technology is paralysis. The technology ecosystem will keep operating at a global scale — just outside Argentina's borders.

Legislating in favor of Automated Companies means deciding whether our country will be the architect of tomorrow's commercial regulation, or merely a colonial spectator of tomorrow's capital flows.

History has shown, time and again, that whoever resists and opposes technology, loses. Always. And Automated Companies will be no exception.

SECTION II GLOBAL CONTEXT AND THE COST OF INACTION

The debate over modernizing our commercial laws cannot take place in a laboratory bubble, disconnected from the map of global competitiveness. In the 21st century, capital, investment, and technological talent are absolutely mobile: they do not stay where they are tied down by bureaucracy, but rather go where they find legal certainty and the fewest frictions to operate at the speed of light.

The real danger for Argentina is not regulating innovation, but the devastating cost of remaining paralyzed, watching from the sidelines as the world moves forward.

2.1. The new digital corporate ecosystem: From traditional corporations to DAOs and autonomous AI agents.

The global knowledge economy is undergoing an irreversible transition: we are moving from traditional corporations (with their vertical structures, physical offices, and paper-based bureaucracies) to purely digital, decentralized, and automated organizational models.

Today we find two key figures already operating in the global market:

1°) DAOs (Decentralized Autonomous Organizations): These are communities of investors and developers from around the world who associate over the internet without ever meeting in person. They have no president or traditional board; they are governed by **Smart Contracts**, self-executing lines of code on a blockchain. If the majority votes in favor of an investment, the code itself transfers the funds automatically, with no intermediaries, notaries, or manual signatures.

2°) Autonomous AI Agents: These are Artificial Intelligence systems programmed to carry out specific commercial missions — for example, an algorithm designed for financial arbitrage, logistics inventory management, or digital asset trading. These agents evaluate market data in milliseconds and make contracting decisions autonomously, operating 24 hours a day.

Expecting these new business models to fit within the rigidities of the traditional Sociedad Anónima (Corporation) under Law 19,550 — with its physically typed minutes, handwritten signatures, notarized shareholder meetings, and registration timelines that take months — is like forcing a Formula 1 car to drive down a dirt road.

Contemporary commercial traffic demands structures capable of interacting at the speed of software.

Blocking legal personality for SA-IAs will not stop them from existing (believing the earth is flat does not make it flat). Nothing will prevent them from existing. Blocking legal personality for automated companies will simply force them to operate informally or to seek a smarter regulatory home outside our country.

2.2. International benchmarking: The case of Wyoming (USA) and European regulatory sandbox models.

The notion that regulating automated companies is a "reckless experiment" or legislative irresponsibility collides head-on with the reality of the world's most pragmatic and competitive jurisdictions, which have already understood where wealth is heading:

The State of Wyoming (United States): Historically, Wyoming has been at the forefront of global corporate law (it created the modern Limited Liability Company, the famous LLC, in 1977). In March 2021, it made history again by passing a law granting explicit legal recognition and legal personality to DAOs. The impact was immediate: thousands of technology-based companies from around the world relocated there within months, injecting a massive flow of capital and registration fees that energized the local economy.

The European Union and its Regulatory *Sandboxes*: Europe has opted for a "testing bank" or *sandbox* strategy. These are controlled experimentation spaces where the State allows technology companies to test AI agents with autonomous contracting capabilities under the regulator's direct supervision. This allows them to fix software errors in safe environments before launching to the general market. In addition, the recent European Artificial Intelligence Regulation (the *AI Act*) already sets out the rules of the game for governing these systems, showing that Western institutions have already absorbed this shift.

Argentina is not jumping into the void or reinventing the wheel; it is simply deciding whether to get on board the global regulatory vanguard or stay on the sidelines watching, losing a historic opportunity for regional leadership.

2.3. Brain drain and capital flight: How the current legal framework drives away Argentine developers and entrepreneurs.

Argentina possesses an invaluable asset: its people. We have one of the most robust, creative, and recognized ecosystems of technological talent, software developers, and crypto entrepreneurs in all of Latin America. However, the obsolescence and conservatism of our current corporate legislation acts as a perfect machine for expelling value and wealth.

What actually happens today? When a team of young programmers from Córdoba, Mendoza, or Buenos Aires designs a brilliant AI protocol or an innovative decentralized platform, international investment funds (from Silicon Valley or Europe) impose an unavoidable condition before putting up capital: **"I'll fund you, but don't incorporate the company in Argentina."** Investors fear the legal uncertainty of an old commercial law that does not understand algorithms, and the endless timelines of our analog registries.

As a direct consequence, local entrepreneurs end up handing over the legal personality of their projects to jurisdictions such as Delaware (USA) or Estonia (through its digital residency program), among other options smarter than our own country.

The cost of this legislative inaction for our country is devastating on a daily basis:

- **Loss of real tax revenue:** The profits and dividends of these cutting-edge companies are taxed and bring in foreign currency abroad, not into Argentina's public coffers.
- **Asset invisibility:** By operating outside our jurisdiction, the Argentine State loses all capacity to oversee, audit, and trace those capital flows.
- **Loss of strategic assets:** Patents, intellectual property developments, technology of incalculable value, and brand value end up registered under foreign sovereignty.

Approving Automated Companies is not a corporate whim; it is an urgent and sovereign State policy to achieve the **legal repatriation of capital** and to keep Argentine talent on our own soil.

SECTION III. LEGAL ANATOMY OF THE SA-IA UNDER ARGENTINE LAW

The viability of Automated Companies does not require us to burn our legal textbooks or refound the pillars of private law.

There is a deeply entrenched myth in the more conservative sectors holding that, in order to open the door to Artificial Intelligence, the entire legal system must be blown up.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Argentina's legal system (especially after the unification of the Civil and Commercial Code, CCCN) is an extremely flexible and capable framework, with the dogmatic flexibility needed to absorb this technological evolution without a single fracture in its structure.

3.1. Delegated human will: The founding act and algorithm design as an expression of Art. 958 of the CCCN.

The main mental barrier for those who oppose this project is the idea that, if there is no human signing each document in real time, there is no "legal will." This claim seriously confuses the *organ that executes* an action with the *original human source* that gave it life.

Article 958 of the CCCN enshrines a principle that is the cornerstone of our private law: **freedom of contract**. This article gives citizens the freedom to enter into contracts and determine their content as they see fit, as long as they do not violate public order, morals, or accepted custom.

In an SA-IA, human will does not disappear; it concentrates strategically at two key moments:

1. **The Founding Act:** This is the company's formation agreement. Here, flesh-and-blood human beings decide to associate, contribute capital, define what the company will do (its corporate purpose), and set the rules of the game.
2. **Programming the Algorithm:** In writing the lines of code, the programmer (acting on the founders' instructions) pours their judgment, intent, and freedom into establishing the exact operational limits of the AI. The software is told: *"You may purchase supplies up to this amount," "You may sell assets if the market falls below this line,"* or *"You are prohibited from carrying out this transaction without authorization."*

Artificial Intelligence does not operate by spontaneous generation, nor does it have free will in any metaphysical sense.

It executes a **pre-programmed algorithmic mandate**. Therefore, every decision the software makes day to day is nothing more than the mathematical, instantaneous execution of an original human order. The brain remains human, the will remains human; the executor is digital.

3.2. The Organ Theory and AI: How software fits in as an executor of pre-programmed corporate mandates.

To understand how an AI can manage a company in the eyes of Argentine law, one need only revisit the **Organ Theory**, originally formulated by Otto von Gierke, which underlies Article 58 and related provisions of our current Commercial Companies Law (LSC 19,550).

This theory explains that legal entities (commercial companies) do not act through "external representatives" as if they were minors, but rather through their own **organs** (the Board of Directors in a corporation, Management in an LLC, the Shareholders' Meeting). What the organ decides and signs, the company itself is deciding and signing. The organ is the company in action.

The reform introducing SA-IAs does not break this framework: it simply expands the range of possible natures for those organs. Our law already allows a company's governing body to be made up of one person, ten people, or even another legal entity (a company that manages another company).

So, what is the ontological obstacle to delegating ordinary administration to a **technological-algorithmic organ**? None.

Software acts, legally, as the company's executive manager. It applies logical and commercial rules at a speed and efficiency that humans cannot match, but legal attribution does not change: everything the algorithm decides within the limits of the bylaws is directly attributed to the company.

3.3. Cryptographic transparency vs. paper bureaucracy: Blockchain as the definitive, immutable public record.

One of the greatest virtues of this project is that it retires a State control system that is a century behind: one of photocopied minutes, ballpoint-pen signatures, and numbered paper pages.

That analog environment is, paradoxically, the most insecure in the world: accounting books conveniently "get lost" in fires, minutes are tampered with, reconstructed, or backdated to deceive courts or creditors.

SA-IAs replace this record-keeping precariousness with distributed ledger technology, or **blockchain**.

To understand the magnitude of this qualitative leap in transparency, consider the following comparison:

Control Dimension	Traditional Analog System (Law 19,550)	Automated Company System (SA-IA)
Record-Keeping Medium	Bound paper minute books and financial statements, or microfiche.	Cryptographic blocks mathematically chained across distributed networks.

State Audit	After the fact, slow, and bureaucratic. Requires in-person inspectors, formal notice letters, or accounting experts.	Real-time and remote. The State can audit through code (smart auditing) in an automated fashion.
Data Immutability	Vulnerable. Pages can be torn out, altered, or drafted to suit a partner's needs.	Absolute. Once a transaction or decision is recorded on the blockchain, it is mathematically impossible to delete or modify it.
Traceability of Funds	Opaque and slow. Requires lifting bank secrecy and manually reconstructing chains of transfers between banks.	Public and transparent by design. Every inflow and outflow of capital within the digital ecosystem is recorded with its digital fingerprint.

Blockchain technology does not take control tools away from the State; it equips the State with an unprecedented capacity for oversight.

By allowing these companies to record their smart contracts, balance sheets, and fund flows on cryptographic protocols accessible to the General Inspection of Justice (IGJ) or the federal tax authority (ARCA), Argentine corporate law takes a historic leap: moving from the era of rubber stamps and permanent suspicion to the era of **transparency by design**.

State control is no longer a tedious procedure that arrives late; it is an intelligent process that accompanies the business in real time.

SECTION IV. DISMANTLING THE MYTHS: ANSWERS TO COLLECTIVE OBJECTIONS

The public debate around incorporating AI-Automated Companies (SA-IA) and Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) into Argentina's corporate framework has been marked by mistaken interpretations and outright legal anachronism.

Below, the most widespread myths circulating in the press and the halls of Congress are contrasted with the strict regulatory and doctrinal reality of commercial law currently in force in the Argentine Republic.

4.1. Financial and International Security Issues.

MYTH 1: The specter of tax havens and beneficial-owner opacity.

The objection: It is argued that allowing companies operated autonomously through algorithms in blockchain environments dilutes transparency and obstructs the identification of the beneficial owner, turning the country into a haven for money laundering and tax evasion.

The legal reality: This criticism makes the serious error of confusing the *technological medium* of corporate administration with the *obligation of registration and State oversight*.

The introduction of SA-IAs does not repeal or modify a single article of Law 25,246 (Concealment and Money Laundering) nor the oversight powers of the Financial Information Unit (UIF). For an SA-IA to come into legal existence, obtain its Single Tax Identification Code (CUIT) from ARCA, and be registered in the corresponding public registry, it must unambiguously declare its initial capital and identify the human persons who subscribe shares or configure the origin protocol.

Far from fostering opacity, the distributed ledger technology (*blockchain*) underlying these models offers **radically superior immutability and fund traceability** compared to the traditional paper-ledger system.

While traditional companies under Commercial Companies Law No. 19,550 allow for the use of front men and complex "nested-doll" paper corporate structures that are difficult to audit in real time, SA-IAs record every transaction, fund flow, and change in their operating parameters indelibly, enabling dynamic, algorithmic State oversight aligned with the standards of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

MYTH 2: Vehicles for pure speculation with no real job creation.

The objection: It is argued that, since the project contemplates corporate structures capable of operating without direct human employees in their ordinary business, these companies do not contribute to the real economy and serve solely as vehicles for financial speculation.

The legal reality: Argentine commercial law has never conditioned the existential validity of a legal entity on a mandatory requirement to generate direct human employment. That said, in practice, it does generate direct human employment.

Article 1 of the LSC defines a company by stating: *"A company exists when one or more persons, organized under one of the types provided for in this law, undertake to make contributions to be applied to the production or exchange of goods or services, sharing in the profits and bearing the losses."* In other words, an instrument for the production or exchange of goods or services, oriented toward the distribution of profits.

And Article 1 of the proposed reform to the General Companies Law defines a company by stating: *"A company exists when one or more persons, organized under one of the types provided for in this law, undertake to make contributions to be applied to carrying out any lawful activity intended to produce direct or indirect benefits for the partners, who share in them and bear the losses. The bylaws may provide for any allocation of those benefits."*

Under this fully valid and accepted standard, traditional structures such as holding companies, pure rent-seeking companies, financial trusts, and capital-intensive companies (fully robotized or automated) operate with complete legality without requiring a minimum headcount of employees.

Labeling technological efficiency as "harmful speculation" is an economic and conceptual contradiction. SA-IAs optimize operating costs, energize commercial activity, and inject liquidity into the market.

Their activity generates taxable income subject to Income Tax and other national and provincial taxes, contributing directly to public revenue and State financing, with a tax-collection efficiency far superior to traditional economic models.

Human job creation.

The argument that SA-IAs do not generate human employment is also false. Automated companies are defined as those that automate the ordinary course of business, but in no way do they prohibit human involvement or human employment.

Consider a wine marketplace. The SA-IA automatically purchases wine from wineries in Mendoza (sourcing prices, placing orders, paying, and requesting delivery), rents a warehouse to store inventory, lists the products on an online store aimed at export markets, runs advertising in different languages and on different platforms, sells to the customer, collects payment, and arranges shipping logistics so the product is delivered by courier to the consumer.

Even though the AI operates automatically and the ordinary business (buying and selling wine) is automated, it generates more real employment for the winery as it sells more wine, generates employment in shipping the wine to the warehouse, in export freight, generates employment for the accountant, the customs agent, the Argentine postal service, brings foreign currency into the country, and pays taxes, among other effects. Claiming that this generates no employment seems rather naïve.

MYTH 3: Forum selection clauses as a loss of legal sovereignty.

The objection: It is alleged that allowing internal or external disputes of technology companies to be submitted to foreign law or international arbitral tribunals (e.g., Delaware, New York, or London) amounts to an unacceptable surrender of Argentine judicial sovereignty.

The legal reality: International forum-selection and choice-of-law clauses in purely patrimonial and international matters are not an "exotic graft" introduced by this project; they are a **sacrosanct principle of Argentine Private International Law that has been recognized and exercised in international contracts for decades**.

Articles 2605, 2606, and 2607 of the Civil and Commercial Code (CCCN) provide that, in matters of international patrimonial rights, the parties have the power to submit jurisdiction to foreign courts or arbitral tribunals operating outside the Republic, and that the chosen forum has exclusive jurisdiction to resolve the dispute.

This practice is the absolute standard in contemporary cross-border commerce: from the issuance of sovereign bonds to software supply contracts and foreign trade transactions carried out by the country's leading companies.

Allowing an Automated Company to choose forums specialized in resolving technology disputes does not weaken the State; it grants legal predictability to international and local investors. No power is being taken away from the State, because the State never held that power in international contracting in the first place — freedom of contract governs, and parties have always been able to choose their forum.

Claiming that the jurisdiction of an international contract cannot be selected by the parties, and that disputes involving highly complex cryptographic protocols or algorithmic optimization must necessarily be resolved under domestic analog procedural rituals (often overwhelmed as they are) is to condemn Argentina to the prehistoric era, destroying the foundations of Private International Law.

4.2. Liability and Damages Issues

MYTH 4: The criminal-liability vacuum for offenses committed by Artificial Intelligence.

The objection: It is claimed that if an algorithm operates autonomously and commits fraud, a scam, or a financial crime, the legal system faces an insurmountable vacuum, since AI lacks consciousness and criminal intent and cannot be subjected to custodial penalties such as imprisonment.

The legal reality: This objection reveals a deep unfamiliarity with the evolution of modern criminal law and, specifically, with the **Corporate Criminal Liability Regime (Law 27,401)** in force in our country.

Argentine criminal law has already moved past the old maxim *societas delinquere non potest* (companies cannot commit crimes). Under Law 27,401, corporations — which also lack a body, soul, or consciousness — are criminally tried and convicted, facing fines, suspension of activities, or revocation of legal status.

Within the framework of an SA-IA, criminal liability is never sought in the source code, but in the human structure that benefits from it, designed and deployed it, or failed to control it.

A crime committed through an algorithm can be directly attributed to the legal entity under the standards of **organizational failure** or **direct or indirect benefit** (Art. 2, Law 27,401).

Likewise, the human persons who programmed the protocol, the administrators who configured its operating parameters, or the controlling shareholders who approved the software's deployment will face criminal liability as principals or accessories, applying the general rules of criminal responsibility (direct intent, recklessness, or negligence).

AI is clearly not a subject capable of criminal liability and cannot be imprisoned, because it is merely an instrument of execution. The same applies when a hacker deploys a virus on a network. The virus cannot be imprisoned — whoever deployed it is the one who goes to prison.

The algorithm cannot be imprisoned, because the algorithm does not commit the crime (it is simply a tool, like a knife). The crime is committed by the person who designed the algorithm, deployed it, and benefits from the unlawful act.

MYTH 5: Cyber vulnerability, code failures, and the inoperability of the "Kill Switch."

The objection: It is warned that leaving corporate governance in the hands of software exposes third parties' assets to systemic risks arising from hacking, programming "bugs," or cyberattacks, arguing that the speed of algorithmic transactions neutralizes any human emergency-stop mechanism (*kill switch*).

The legal reality: Technological risk is not ontologically different from ordinary commercial or industrial risk; both are fully addressed and resolved by general tort law doctrine.

Article 1757 of the Civil and Commercial Code (CCCN) clearly establishes the principle of **strict liability for created risk**. Any person (natural or legal) who introduces into society an activity that, by its nature or the means employed, is capable of causing harm, must answer for it on a strict-liability basis.

If an SA-IA's algorithm fails or is compromised by a third party, the company answers with its entire assets to the injured parties, and cannot invoke "software fault" as a defense.

Moreover, including a *kill switch* or emergency-stop protocol is not an unworkable utopia, but a technical standard required under the duty of due diligence.

The contemporary insurance market (through Cyber Risk policies and technology performance bonds) already prices and covers these risks with complete solvency. Setting up an SA-IA entails an obligation to plan for Business Continuity Plans, turning technological risk into a perfectly insurable and manageable contingency cost.

MYTH 6: Limited liability as a trap that incentivizes wrongdoing.

The objection: Critics argue that this model's limitation of liability creates a perverse incentive for developers and financiers to program ultra-risky or fraudulent algorithms, knowing that, should the venture fail, bankruptcy will affect only the software while shielding their personal assets.

The legal reality: This argument ignores the force and power of one of the most well-established tools in Argentine corporate law: the doctrine of **disregard of legal personality** (piercing the corporate veil), set out in Article 54, third paragraph, of the Commercial Companies Law (LSC 19,550).

This principle of disregarding legal personality is a basic tenet of commercial law, and is also clearly included in Article 3, second paragraph, of the proposed reform to the General Companies Law currently under legislative consideration.

It states: *"Inapplicability. The legal personality of the company may be disregarded when it is used for purposes extraneous to the company, to violate the law, public policy, or good faith, or to defeat the rights of partners or third parties, without requiring proof of fraudulent or harmful intent."*

Limited liability for partners is a general rule meant to promote investment, but it has never operated as a blank check for fraud.

Argentine law is unequivocal: when a company's legal personality is used to defeat third parties' rights or violate the law or public policy, the legal personality of the company (and its limited liability) collapses. This is also known as "piercing the corporate veil."

If a group of people designs an SA-IA with code aimed at fraud, abuse of dominant position, or asset stripping, courts will immediately apply Article 54 of Law 19,550, or Article 3 of the future General Companies Law. The immediate effect will be joint and unlimited liability for all damages and debts, imposed on the partners and controlling parties who made the act possible. Corporate shielding in Argentina protects genuine business risk, but yields completely in the face of fraud and abuse of the law.

4.3. Political-Philosophical and Consumer Issues.

MYTH 7: Yuval Noah Harari's "non-human corporate State."

The objection: Echoing warnings raised by philosopher Yuval Noah Harari, critics claim that granting legal personality to autonomous algorithms creates an entity with no moral restraints and no fear of prison, capable of operating coldly and relentlessly to evade regulation, hacking the democratic system and markets from within.

The legal reality: Harari's thesis is a valuable exercise in political philosophy and dystopian warning, but it suffers from a serious conceptual error regarding the technique of **legal fictions**, which civil and commercial law has handled with complete ease since the 1800s.

Traditional corporations operating today in Argentina (and around the world) likewise have no "moral restraints," no "consciousness," no "fear of prison," and cannot be locked in a cell; by definition, they are instruments for organizing resources, optimizing capital, and generating profit.

The law has never entrusted corporate legality to the "morality" of the legal entity, but rather to the **coercive force of the legal system**.

AI does not introduce an ontological mutation into the commercial corporation; it introduces an improvement in operational efficiency.

The causal link between the human being and the machine remains unaltered for purposes of legal attribution.

The law does not need an AI to "feel guilt" or "fear prison": it is enough to apply **piercing the corporate veil** (Art. 54 LSC – Art. 3 of the proposed General Companies Law), **vicarious liability**

(Art. 1753, CCCN), **strict liability for created risk** (Art. 1757, CCCN), or the principles of criminal law, among others. And the matter is resolved.

If an SA-IA deploys evasion tactics or predatory market conduct, the economic sanctions (fines, forfeitures, automated freezes of digital wallets, and forced dissolution of the entity) destroy the algorithm's operational viability.

The law knows how to tame legal fictions; it has been doing so successfully for more than two hundred years.

MYTH 8: The "lone reckless pioneer" syndrome and global non-existence.

The objection: It is argued that, since this corporate form is not yet widespread in leading countries or advanced economies, Argentina would be acting irresponsibly by turning itself into an "extreme legal experimentation lab."

The legal reality: Confusing regulatory leadership with recklessness is the historic argument used by conservatism to perpetuate technological underdevelopment and economic dependence.

First, the factual premise of the objection is false. Jurisdictions of the highest corporate reputation and legal certainty, such as the State of **Wyoming (USA)**, have been regulating and granting legal personality to Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) since 2021, followed by specific regulatory frameworks in Switzerland, the Cayman Islands, and the European Union's regulatory *sandbox* schemes.

Second, Argentina has a successful historical precedent under this very same logic: the passage of the Digital Signature Law (Law 25,506) in 2001. At that time, **those same anachronistic voices** branded the law a "dangerous experiment" that dealt a fatal blow to the legal certainty provided by notaries and paper documents.

Today, the digital signature is a pillar of electronic commerce, judicial notifications, and the State's move away from paper. Being a legislative pioneer is not a flaw; it is the only way to capture investment from the global knowledge economy before it settles in Delaware or Estonia.

And that's just talking about commercial law — not to mention the country's brilliant legislative innovations such as the Female Quota Law, the Equal Marriage Law, the Gender Identity Law, among many other forward-looking pieces of legislation.

Conservatism always uses the same argument — "it's an experiment," "it's dangerous," "it's better not to move forward" — but time always proves it wrong.

MYTH 9: The erosion of the IGJ's regulatory and oversight powers.

The objection: Bureaucratic sectors warn that corporate automation strips the General Inspection of Justice (IGJ) or public registries of substance, with the State losing its capacity for prior control and ongoing oversight due to the absence of physical minutes and in-person shareholder meetings.

The legal reality: The State's regulatory power is not measured in tons of archived paper, nor in mandatory in-person procedures; it is a control function that must evolve toward efficiency.

The traditional system of paper minutes, handwritten signatures, and quarterly financial statements is the ideal environment for fraud: books "get lost," are tampered with, reconstructed at convenience, or backdated.

An automated company whose decision-making processes, algorithmic shareholder meetings, and financial statements are recorded publicly and cryptographically on a blockchain network offers a standard of **real-time objective transparency and immutability** that is infinitely superior to analog bureaucracy.

State oversight does not disappear; it modernizes.

The IGJ and public registries shift from preventive, formal oversight (slow, costly, and prone to discretionary application by officials) to **intelligent, real-time auditing**.

The State gains efficiency by being able to supervise the compliance parameters of thousands of companies in milliseconds through code (*smart auditing*), optimizing public resources.

MYTH 10: Local consumers left unprotected by the "lack of a service window."

The objection: It is claimed that consumers will be left completely defenseless when contracting with companies operated by algorithms, since, in the event of a breach of contract or widespread harm, there will be no individual or business office available to file a complaint.

The legal reality: Consumer law in the Argentine Republic is governed by public-policy rules of constitutional rank (Art. 42, National Constitution) and by the Consumer Protection Law (Law 24,240), the application of which is entirely independent of the internal or technological structure chosen by the provider.

A consumer never sues a call center employee or an app's programmer; they sue the legal entity that owns the service.

If an SA-IA engages in deceptive advertising, overbilling, or fails to deliver a good, the user exercises their rights the same way they do today against a digital bank, an airline, or a transactional platform: through electronic dispute-resolution channels (such as COPREC or its provincial equivalent) and through legal action directed against the company's corporate assets.

Effective judicial protection is not guaranteed by a "physical service window" (which barely exists today anyway), but by **financial solvency and the enforceability of judgments**.

The assets, bank accounts, and digital wallets of an SA-IA are fully subject to judicial attachment, guaranteeing full compensation for any harm caused.

This criticism is honestly rather absurd, given that hundreds of companies without service windows or public-facing offices already operate today and can be sued in civil court if they breach

consumer-protection rules (Pedidos Ya, Uber, JetSmart, Mercado Libre, Mercado Pago, Ualá, online academies, banks, Apple, Google Argentina, Microsoft, Norton, etc.).

MYTH 11: Systemic incompatibility due to the lack of human will (CCCN).

The objection: It is argued that the project is incompatible with the general theory of voluntary acts under the Civil and Commercial Code, which requires discernment, intent, and freedom (exclusively human attributes) for entering into contracts and making binding decisions.

The legal reality: This criticism makes the serious error of confusing the legal act of creation and programming with the technological mechanisms of delegated execution.

Human will, meeting all the requirements of Article 260 of the CCCN, is fully expressed in the company's **founding act**. It is human beings (the founders, developers, and investors) who, exercising their discernment, intent, and freedom, decide to sign the formation agreement, structure the software's operating rules, and "switch on" the algorithm, equipping it with clear mandates and specific limits.

AI does not act with "autonomous will" in any metaphysical or biologically conscious sense; **it executes, in delegated fashion, the pre-programmed will** of its creators as expressed in the lines of code.

Argentine private law is governed by the principle of **freedom of contract** (Art. 958, CCCN) and the **organ theory of corporate law**.

Just as a traditional board of directors delegates the execution of daily operations to managers or attorneys-in-fact through written mandates, the partners of an SA-IA delegate ordinary execution to a software agent. The legal nature of the act of delegation is exactly the same. So is the human voluntariness behind that delegating act.

The validity of the legal act originates in the human mind that designed the rules of the automated corporate architecture.

SECTION V. SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT FOR ARGENTINA

Approving AI-Automated Companies is not a merely technical discussion or an abstract debate for legal academics. It is a high-impact economic decision that will directly affect our country's productive matrix. At a historic moment when Argentina urgently needs to cut red tape, attract genuine foreign currency, and establish itself as a relevant player in the global market, this law will serve as a powerful catalyst.

We are not regulating the future; we are unlocking the economic engines of the present.

5.1. Attracting Foreign Direct Investment (FDI): Argentina as Latin America's tech corporate-structuring hub.

Historically, Latin America has lagged behind in the race to attract venture capital. When major investment funds from Silicon Valley, Europe, or Asia decide to back technology startups in the region, they impose harsh structural conditions. Chronic distrust of Latin American commercial registries — characterized by slowness, hidden costs, and a lack of serious regulatory frameworks for digital assets — leads them to require that companies be incorporated abroad.

With the approval of SA-IAs, Argentina changes the game. By offering a modern, secure legal framework adapted to smart contracts, the country immediately positions itself as the **technology corporate-structuring hub for the entire region**.

This will generate a chain economic impact:

- **A massive inflow of foreign currency:** International funds will no longer require entrepreneurs to export their legal personality abroad. Investment capital will flow directly into accounts and financial instruments based in Argentine territory.
- **Development of a global services ecosystem:** The establishment of these companies will demand highly sophisticated local infrastructure: server nodes, cybersecurity providers, firms specializing in code audits, and export-oriented legal consulting, driving demand for highly skilled employment.
- **Reputational effect:** Positioning Argentina on the map of *AI-friendly* and *tech-forward* jurisdictions creates an intangible but devastating competitive advantage over regional competitors that opt for regulatory paralysis.

5.2. Cost efficiency for the State and the private sector: A drastic reduction in litigation over formal defects and faster commerce.

Analog bureaucracy carries a hidden cost that chokes both the private and public sectors.

Traditional corporate disputes tend to drag on for years in commercial courts due to a recurring factor: formal defects, challenges to shareholder meetings based on notification flaws, unclear accounting records, or forged signatures.

The SA-IA introduces **absolute operational efficiency**. By automating the company's ordinary business through self-executing code, human management errors and formal transaction costs are eliminated at the root.

For **businesses**, recurring notarization fees, paper-based public notices, endless red tape before public registries, and months-long manual accounting audits are reduced to zero. Business decisions are executed and recorded instantly, allowing tech SMEs to compete on equal footing, in terms of speed, with any global corporation.

For the **State**, since decisions are recorded publicly and immutably on the blockchain, there is a massive relief for the commercial court system. Lawsuits and disputes over "whether a given partner signed the minutes or not" disappear, since the cryptographic signature is unambiguous. Courts stop wasting time settling archaic formalities and can focus their resources on resolving substantive disputes, speeding up the administration of justice for society as a whole.

5.3. The multiplier effect: How SA-IAs will energize key sectors (Fintech, Agtech, Logistics, and Energy).

Corporate automation is not limited to the pure software sector; it has a multiplier effect on the traditional pillars of the Argentine economy, transforming them through algorithmic efficiency:

- **Fintech (Financial Technology):** It will enable the creation of local automated investment funds that rebalance their portfolios in real time according to predictive algorithms, operating with their own legal personality and paying taxes domestically. It will facilitate automated microloans for the unbanked, issued by an AI that assesses credit risk in seconds.
- **Agtech (Agricultural Technology):** Imagine an SA-IA dedicated to managing grain silos and logistics. Connected to IoT (Internet of Things) sensors in the fields, the algorithm can autonomously detect grain moisture levels, hire freight transport from local carriers when shipping rates are optimal, and sell the harvest on the grain market at the exact microsecond international prices favor the producer — all without red tape, under a legally recognized corporate structure.
- **Logistics and Supply Chain:** Automated companies managing vehicle fleets or smart warehouses, dynamically purchasing performance bonds for each trip, paying tolls, settling municipal fees, and autonomously reordering stock upon detecting shortages, reducing distribution downtime to historic lows.
- **Energy and Mining:** Companies operated by algorithms that manage the purchase and sale of surplus energy on smart grids, optimizing the consumption and distribution of renewable energy minute by minute, stabilizing the national power grid, and lowering costs for heavy industry.

The same applies to every other sector of the Argentine economy (wine production, the automotive industry, chemicals, metalworking, manufacturing, etc.). All of them will be energized by Agentic Artificial Intelligence.

In conclusion, approving Automated Companies does not benefit an isolated group of programmers; it injects a shock of competitiveness, transparency, and speed into the entire Argentine economy, laying the institutional groundwork for productive development over the coming decades.

SECTION VI. SOME PROPOSED BEST PRACTICES

In light of everything stated above, we also understand that for a technologically pioneering law to be truly viable, it is not enough to extol its economic virtues or theoretical soundness; it is also essential to offer certainty to those who fear losing institutional control.

Legislators who hesitate to approve Automated Companies are not doing so out of hostility toward the future, but out of a legitimate concern for citizen safety, market stability, and the State's capacity to respond to an unforeseen technical failure.

For this reason, this document is not framed as blind deregulation or a digital free-for-all. On the contrary, to address these concerns, we propose incorporating highly precise technical and legal safeguards that act as safety nets, ensuring that the State retains its regulatory power and that third-party rights remain fully protected against any software failure.

These safeguards or best practices should not be written into the General Companies Law itself, since that would hinder its amendment or the future addition of further requirements. They can simply be required through a Ministerial Resolution, or by the Provincial Registries of Legal Entities upon receiving an application to form an SA-IA.

Numerous technical and legal tools exist to doubly protect legal certainty, but for the sake of this document's scope, we will develop only four best-practice proposals that reinforce the security of this SA-IA model:

6.1. The "Kill Switch" standard: Regulating emergency-stop protocols held by licensed human administrators.

One recurring fear is the possibility that an algorithm could "go haywire," enter an infinite loop of harmful transactions, or suffer a massive cyberattack, operating at a speed that leaves humans as mere spectators of a financial catastrophe.

To address this, one best practice is the absolute requirement of having a **Kill Switch**, or Emergency Stop Protocol.

What does this mean in practice? It is a hierarchically superior line of code built into the company's smart contract. Once activated, it immediately freezes all operations, transfers, and contracting activity carried out by the Artificial Intelligence agent, placing the company into a "technical pause" state.

Who holds the key? The key to this emergency button cannot be left floating anonymously on the internet. It must be mandatorily assigned to an identified human person: a **Human Contingency Administrator**, who must be a licensed professional registered with the public registry.

If the algorithm exhibits erratic behavior, violates market regulations, or is hacked, this administrator has the legal duty and the obligation of due diligence to activate the *kill switch*. In this

way, the final word and absolute control of the system always remain in the hands of a human being accountable under the law.

6.2. Mandatory Annual Code Audit (the technical equivalent of financial statements).

Just as traditional companies are legally required to submit financial statements signed by a licensed public accountant once a year to demonstrate their financial health, SA-IAs could be subjected to a periodic **Technical Code Audit**.

What does this involve? An independent, licensed software engineering firm or computer forensics expert must thoroughly review the lines of code of the company's smart contract and operating algorithms.

What is the goal? To issue a technical opinion certifying that the software has not been maliciously modified to commit fraud, that it does not present known critical cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and that it continues to precisely respect the originally approved regulatory limits and corporate purpose. This report is submitted digitally to the public commercial registry alongside traditional financial statements, ensuring that the "machine" never operates outside the parameters authorized by the State.

6.3. Founder Identity and Cryptographic Certification Protocol (Corporate KYC).

To definitively put to rest the myth that these companies foster anonymity, opacity, or money laundering, a strict **Know Your Customer (KYC)** protocol can be established at the very moment the company is founded.

What does this involve? It can be required that the public cryptographic keys controlling or originating the SA-IA be unfailingly linked to the founders' real digital identity, through the National Digital Identity system or official biometric validation mechanisms.

What is the goal? Even though the company operates in an automated fashion on the blockchain on a day-to-day basis, this creates a permanent "registry mirror." The State knows, with exact mathematical precision, which human being switched on the system and who holds the deep governance credentials of the company. There is no room for "ghosts" or pseudonyms on the network; the origin of capital and ultimate control are always tied to a first name, last name, and an associated national ID or passport.

6.4. The role of the "Human Procedural Liaison Agent."

To definitively eliminate procedural uncertainty about how the Judiciary, ARCA, the Provincial Registries of Legal Entities (DPJ), the IGJ, or other State oversight bodies can formally communicate with an automated entity (resolving the judicial puzzle of where to send formal notice to an algorithm), it can be made mandatory to appoint a **Human Procedural Liaison**

Agent, whose notification details are recorded in the Automated Company's formation documents.

Requirements and profile: This role cannot be filled by just anyone, nor by a bot. It must mandatorily be held by a **licensed attorney** in the jurisdiction where the company is registered.

Scope of liability: It is essential to clarify that this professional (the **institutional liaison**) **assumes no financial, civil, or criminal liability** for the acts, debts, or failures generated by the SA-IA's algorithm in its ordinary business. Their responsibility is strictly limited to faithfully fulfilling their formal representation duties: receiving, acknowledging, and forwarding notifications to the human persons who control the system.

Procedural function (the registered domicile): This attorney's law office functions as the **physical, legally established domicile** of the automated company for all purposes under Article 75 of the Civil and Commercial Code. If a judge orders an injunction, if ARCA initiates an audit, or if a consumer files a lawsuit, notice is validly served in the traditional, analog manner at this legal agent's office.

This safeguard creates a perfectly balanced ecosystem: companies operate at the speed of light using Artificial Intelligence, while the Argentine State retains a professional, human point of contact for litigation and communication under due-process rules. No SA-IA can come into existence or remain active without a licensed attorney backing its institutional liaison.

6.5. Other best-practice tools and institutional safeguards.

As mentioned, there are numerous legal and technical tools that can secure and provide legal certainty to this system of Automated Companies, but for reasons of document length, we cannot develop all of them here.

We will develop them in other related documents, or upon request from any interested party.

SECTION VII. HONORABLE LEGISLATORS: APPROVE AUTOMATED COMPANIES AND LET US LEAD THE WORLD.

A nation's laws are not marble monuments meant to remain unchanging; they are living tools that must evolve to serve the development, competitiveness, and prosperity of its people.

When the Commercial Companies Law was passed in Argentina in 1972, commerce moved exclusively on paper, shareholder meetings required mandatory physical attendance in a room, and the notion of a self-executing contract belonged strictly to science fiction.

Today, more than half a century later, trying to force the digital economy of the Artificial Intelligence era into those same analog molds is not just an anachronism — it is a form of strategic blindness.

Paper bureaucracy is the stronghold of inertia; blockchain transparency is the engine of an economy that never sleeps, never lies, and never stops.

This White Paper has demonstrated that incorporating **AI-Automated Companies (SA-IA)** into Argentine corporate law does not represent a leap into the unknown or an unregulated experiment. On the contrary, it is the natural maturation of our legal system, capable of absorbing the speed of software without giving up an ounce of the legal certainty and control the State must guarantee.

7.1. A model of sovereign balance.

Throughout this document, we have dismantled, one by one, the myths of fear and suspicion. We have shown that criminal, civil, and commercial liability is not diluted within lines of code, but rather finds clear, efficient, and robust channels of attribution within the existing legal framework. This proposal does not dehumanize the law; quite the opposite — it elevates the role of human professionals and equips them with unprecedented tools.

By establishing globally pioneering safeguards — such as the emergency stop button (*Kill Switch*) managed by licensed professionals, mandatory code audits, cryptographic KYC, and the indispensable role of the **Human Procedural Liaison Agent**, held exclusively by licensed attorneys — Argentina is not blindly copying foreign regulations.

It is demonstrating that **we are not replacing the human mind with digital code; we are equipping our professionals' judgment with an execution engine that runs at the speed of light.**

We can build a balanced, sovereign ecosystem: a legal architecture where companies operate with mathematical efficiency through artificial intelligence, with absolute traceability on the blockchain, while the State always retains a professional, human point of contact for dialogue, notification, and litigation under due-process rules.

7.2. A call to action for policymakers.

The debate that legislators face in Congress is not merely technical; it is profoundly human.

The relevant question is not whether automated companies will exist or not — the global market has already adopted them, and technology does not ask permission to move forward.

The real question your vote must answer is: where do we want them to operate, where do we want them to pay taxes, and where do we want them to generate wealth?

Argentina's dilemma is not whether we should embrace Artificial Intelligence, but whether we will be the architects of its adoption or the subjects of its foreign deployment.

Voting to reject or delay automated companies is a vote for the *status quo*. It is a deliberate decision to keep driving away the talent of our developers, engineers, and entrepreneurs toward jurisdictions that have already understood the rules of this new international game.

Banning the future does not protect the present; it only condemns us to the past. Embracing innovation and leading it is the only path toward 21st-century algorithmic and economic sovereignty.

Voting in favor of this reform means assuming a position of undeniable regional leadership. It sends an unmistakable signal to global markets that our country is a safe, modern, and predictable place to establish technology-based investments.

Fundamentally, **it means laying the legal groundwork so that the next unicorns of the knowledge economy are born, grow, and become established here, under Argentine law.**

History shows that nations which thrive are not the ones that try to build walls against progress, but those with the political courage and legal sophistication to coordinate and regulate it with strategic vision. The regulatory design is ready, the institutional safeguards have been proposed, and the legal tools already in force are more than sufficient. The future of production, of highly skilled employment, and of Argentina's technological sovereignty is being legislated today. The decision is in your hands.

SECTION VIII. GLOSSARY

This glossary translates certain technological concepts and traditional legal institutions into direct, accessible, and rigorous definitions, intended for use by legislators, advisors, and the media.

8.1. Technological and Cryptographic Concepts

Artificial Intelligence (AI): Software-based systems capable of processing large volumes of data, recognizing complex patterns, and carrying out logical tasks, operational decisions, or predictions based on the goals and instructions set by their human creators.

Autonomous AI Agent: Artificial Intelligence software programmed to operate independently, carrying out tasks, making business decisions, and managing financial resources within a framework of parameters and limits strictly pre-established by its programmers or directors.

Blockchain: A decentralized, public, and tamper-proof digital data ledger. It functions as a shared accounting book in which information copied into "blocks" cannot be erased, altered, or tampered with by any party without the consensus of the network.

Smart Contract: A self-executing computer program recorded on a blockchain. It translates legal agreements into lines of code that execute automatically and mathematically the exact moment the stipulated conditions are met (for example: *"If the supplier delivers product X, automatically transfer payment Y"*).

Decentralized Autonomous Organization (DAO): A digital entity or community whose governance rules, fund management, and operational decisions are entirely encoded in smart contracts on the blockchain, dispensing with a hierarchical structure or a traditional board of directors.

Corporate KYC (Know Your Customer): A security and legal-compliance protocol that requires reliably identifying the real identity, physical documentation, and background of the human persons behind any transaction, digital wallet, or company formation.

Public Key and Private Key: A cryptographic security system equivalent to a digital signature. The public key functions like an account number that anyone can see in order to send funds; the private key acts as the secret, non-transferable "password" that authorizes transactions and signs legal acts.

8.2. Legal and Corporate Concepts.

AI-Automated Company (SA-IA): A type of limited-liability legal entity whose internal administration, ordinary operations, and execution of commercial contracts are delegated to an Autonomous AI Agent.

Human Founding Act: The initial, indispensable milestone through which one or more human persons decide to form the company, adopt its bylaws, define its corporate purpose, and program the legal and operational limits within which the Artificial Intelligence will act.

Human Procedural Liaison Agent: A proposed mandatory role for SA-IAs. This is a licensed attorney who represents the company for the purpose of establishing a unified physical legal domicile and acting as the official recipient of all judicial, administrative, or third-party notifications.

Kill Switch (Emergency Stop Protocol): A mandatory security mechanism, coded into the core of the company, that allows the Human Procedural Liaison Agent or the partners to immediately freeze the algorithm's operation in the event of technical anomalies, regulatory violations, or force majeure events.

Mandatory Code Audit: An annual, independent technical review carried out by computer forensics experts to certify that the SA-IA's software and smart contracts operate strictly under the rules of the approved bylaws and applicable law.

Disregard of Legal Personality: An institution of Argentine corporate law (Art. 54 of the current LSC – Art. 3 of the proposed General Companies Law) that allows the corporate "veil" to be pierced when the company is used for purposes outside its nature, to violate the law, or to defeat the rights of third parties, making the human partners behind the entity directly and jointly liable.

Strict Liability: A principle of civil law (Art. 1757, Civil and Commercial Code) establishing that whoever derives an economic benefit from an inherently risky activity or object (such as autonomous software, a factory, a demolition company, or anything else) must answer for any harm it causes, regardless of whether there was direct intent to cause harm.

Regulatory Sovereignty: A State's capacity to enact its own laws and exercise legal control over the economic and technological activities taking place within its territory or involving its citizens, avoiding dependence on foreign courts or regulations.

Algorithmic Sovereignty: A State's capacity to control, regulate, and understand the artificial intelligence technologies and systems that affect its citizens' lives, avoiding exclusive dependence on infrastructure or logic imposed by foreign corporations.

Organ Theory: A principle of corporate law under which the acts of the human persons who manage a company are not considered "acts of a third-party representative," but acts of the company itself. In SA-IAs, this concept is extended to AI to establish that the algorithm is not an independent subject, but the executive arm (the administrative organ) configured by the partners.

Delegated Human Will: A legal doctrine explaining that AI has no "will of its own" nor free will. Its business decisions are the automated, deferred execution of the original will of the human beings who programmed its parameters, limits, and economic objectives.

Dedicated Asset Pool: The set of assets, money, or digital holdings that partners separate from their personal estate and allocate exclusively to the company, to be managed by the AI and used to answer to creditors. This prevents commingling of assets and limits investors' risk to the capital contributed.

Transactional Friction: The cost, in time, money, red tape, and intermediary signatures, required by traditional analog commerce. Reducing transactional friction to zero is the main economic benefit of SA-IAs, enabling instant, intermediary-free transactions.

SECTION IX. REGULATORY REFERENCES

9.1. National Regulatory Framework (Laws in Force)

- Commercial Companies Law No. 19,550.

Art. 1 and 2 (nature of the legal subject and statutory company types); Art. 54 (disregard of legal personality and fraudulent intent); Arts. 141 to 150 (general regime of administration and representation), among other provisions cited.

- Civil and Commercial Code of the Argentine Nation.

Arts. 141 to 144 (commencement of legal entities' existence and their distinct legal personality); Arts. 284 to 288 (principle of freedom of form, written expression, and validity of digital signatures); Arts. 1757 and 1758 (strict liability for risk or defect arising from things and from inherently risky activities), among other provisions cited throughout this document.

- Digital Signature Law No. 25,506, Corporate Criminal Liability Law No. 27,401, Consumer Protection Law No. 24,240, Law 25,246 amending the Criminal Code, among other laws cited in this document.

9.2. Proposed Corporate Law Reform: General Companies Law currently under debate. (May 2026, File INLEG-2026-53661873-APN-PTE).

- Automated Companies — Articles 14 and 102.
- Decentralized Organizations (DAO) — Chapter II, Section V (Articles 258 to 265).
- Organ Theory and Freedom of Contract — Article 2 and Article 70.
- Disregard of Legal Personality (Corporate Veil Doctrine) — Article 3.
- Transparency and Digital Recordkeeping — Article 6, Article 41, and Article 263.

9.3. Comparative Law and International Precedents

- Wyoming Limited Liability Company Act (W.S. 17-29).
- European Union Regulation on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act).
- UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996) and on Electronic Signatures (2001).