REPORT ON

GRC AMERICAS REGIONAL MEETING 2021

DATE: 1-3 December 2021

CONICET

CONSEJO NACIONAL DE CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGÍA
CONACYT

FAPESP 60 YEARS 1962 - 2022

REPORT ON
GRC AMERICAS REGIONAL MEETING 2021

CONTENT

RAPPORTEURS

Mariana Miguez – CONICET (Argentina)
Euclides de Mesquita Neto – FAPESP (Brazil)
Maria Teresa Cazal – CONACYT (Paraguay)

Introduction

This text contains the report of the GRC AMERICAS REGIONAL MEETING 2021.

From December 01 through 03, 2021, CONICET (Argentina), CONACYT (Paraguay) and FAPESP (Brazil) organized, in virtual form, the GRC 2021 Americas Regional Meeting. The meeting itself was divided in the GRC main event, on the first two days, followed by a side event co-organized by FOLEC (*Forum Latino Americano para Evaluación Científica*).

The main event of the GRC Regional Meeting that took place on December 01 and 02 had a number of sessions which included:

- Welcome words by Dr. Ana Franchi (President of CONICET)
- Discussion papers:
    - Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research
    - Science and Technology Workforce Development
- GRC Vision and Roadmap.
- Gender Working Group.
- RRA Working Group / IAI

On the third day, December 03 FOLEC/CLACSO co-hosted a side event on the topic of "A turn towards the transformation of evaluative cultures in the Americas: equity, bibliodiversity, multilingualism and inclusiveness".

The main discussion documents are available to be downloaded from the event site:

https://fapesp.br/15191/global-research-council-grc-americas-regional-meeting-2021

A detailed program of the event is attached to this report.

Written contributions. After the conclusion of the event, the organizers have asked the regional participants to provide written comments of the topics that have been addressed at the virtual sessions. The idea was to give the participating agencies a chance to elaborate their views after the virtual discussions and to give a more permanent status to their manifestations.

The present report is divided in two parts. The first part describes the discussions presented at the multiple sessions. The second part presents the written contributions received by the Regional meeting hosts after the conclusion of the virtual seminar.

PART 1: DISCUSSIONS HELD ON THE VIRTUAL SESSIONS

In this part the report addresses the topics that were raised and discussed during the sessions of the event. The order of the session is not chronological. The discussion papers and the presentations made by the keynote speakers are not reproduced in this text.

Session on Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research

The topic of this session was presented by Dr. Michael Steele from the NSF and had Prof. Luiz Henrique Lopes dos Santos from FAPESP as respondent. Moderation was conducted by Euclides Mesquita, FAPESP, Brazil.

In the sequence are listed the main topics and ideas discussed after the presentations.

- The paper presents a new set of questions regarding research ethics and research security that are a welcome addition to the topics that have been addressed in previous GRC Statement of Principles. The issues of conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitments are examples of these new issues.

- The idea that the set of rules and best evaluation practices should not be compromised by the need of rapid assessment processes has found a general agreement. Nevertheless, the question has been raised mentioning that if the assessment process can be accelerated, without compromising its quality, why this could not be extended to 'normal times'.

- Accelerating the review process may shorten the training that is required to identify and mitigate review bias that may be present in the assessment.

- The high-level discussion on principles has been praised, but the need for some operational guidance as how to perform the evaluation and reports on experience developed by the many agencies could be a valuable asset to the discussion.

- The issue has been raised about the connection between rapid research results strategy and research security and government interference and intellectual property risks. This connection, has been argued, has not been well developed. The security issues are very important to GRC participating agencies, but not only for the rapid assessments. This topic should be further explored.

- Research integrity may be considered from two perspectives. First, a more individualistic approach concerning the researchers and their training and also a more structural perspective, related to identifying structural system features that may be responsible to encourage or facilitate integrity breaches.

- Three major challenges to research integrity have been addressed. First, the need to reconsider the dominant practices for assessing the scientific competence for researchers. Second, to identify the virtuous potentialities of open science and also to find means to neutralize the dangerous potentialities or risks involved in the open science practice. The third, but not least important aspect, is to remove structural obstacles preventing the research environment to become equitable, diverse and inclusive.

- Open science practices increase the degree of transparency of research processes and thereby increase enormously the scientific community's ability to assess the quality and integrity of scientific publications.

- Understanding international collaboration as a driving force for the scientific process implies that the potential risks of scientific transparency must indeed be seriously considered. These risks must be carefully weighed and prevented, but they must be carefully treated just as what they are: as collateral risks of scientific collaboration, a process that is valuable in itself, a process that cannot and should not be stopped by any reason.

- The commitment to the values of equity, diversity and inclusion implies defining merit in terms of the key concept of potential to acquire knowledge and skills and obtain important results, and not only to be defined in terms of the stock of knowledge and skills already acquired and results already obtained by the person being evaluated.

- Building trusts among international funding and performing agencies are key to improved research ethics and research security. Promoting the training of researchers in other countries, creating programs to exchange qualified staff among funding agencies, increasing information exchange and transparency among agencies, further development of the Lead Agency review process based on GRC Statement of Principles, are some of the possible actions to be encouraged to increase research ethics and security.

- The development of joint strategies able to detect and provide disclosure of conflicts of interest and also to develop a collaboration plan to resolve conflicts of commitments, especially for multisectorial research activities were addressed in the discussion.

Session on Science and Technology Workforce Development

The main presentation on this topic was given by Andrea de Jesús and Reynaldo A. Lee V. from SENACYT, Panama. The moderation was by Shaun Baron from NSERC, Canada.

In the sequence are listed the main topics and ideas discussed after the presentations, organized in sub-topics.

Brain circulation x brain drain.

- It is recognized that researcher's mobility is not equal among countries. The largest movements are from Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs) to High Income Countries (HICs).

- How can the GRC promote the brain circulation instead of brain drain. What policies can enable greater circulation in the Americas Region. How can eventual return of researchers to home countries be promoted? The investment on the development of new talents may be increased considering that the resources invested in creating talented researchers result in more circulation and international cooperation.

- What joint schemes may be created in the Americas region to increase the international mobility of early career researchers aiming to complement their scientific training and make full use of their talent?

- What cooperation programs may be developed within the Americas Region in order to share intellectual experience, research costs and infrastructure.

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

- There is a challenge to build a diverse S&T workforce and provide multiple academic career paths to distinct social groups in the region.

- Regarding gender equality, it is usually recognized that women are still a minority in the research workforce.

- Progress has been reported regarding some EDI dimensions on the continent, but there is a need for further policies and programs. For instance, Chile has implemented a national policy on gender in order to decrease the gender gap. FAPESP has data on gender but no data on skin color and other diversity groups.

- Another issue addressed was the question of what strategies may the funding agencies develop to help decrease a job market shortcomings and hardships on the many stages of a researcher career during the harsh economic times, like the one caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

- The topic of how funding agencies may cooperate with the private sector or industry in order to promote the creation of a research working force and promote the absorption of the researchers in these branches, was debated in the session.

- The issue of creating a research and scientific workforce in countries that do not have an industrial base or innovation policies in many areas has been raised.

- The idea of creating programs and opportunities for researchers to be able to transit between public and private research activities and institutions was also discussed.

- The formation of a workforce on S&T must bear in mind the capacity of local absorption of these talents by respective STI ecosystem, aiming to support brain circulation but preventing brain drain.

Session on Vision and Road Map

The GRC Vision and Roadmap document was presented by the Michael Bright, secretary of the GRC.

In the sequence are listed the main topics and ideas discussed after the presentation.

- There was a large agreement among the participants that the Vision and Roadmap presented at the event contained the core issues regarding the development of the GRC for the next decade.

- From the Americas' regional perspective, the topics of increasing the participation of the regional funding agencies and their perception of the added value to be brought by collaborating within the GRC was stressed.

- The need to increase the participation of the regional HORCs within the GRC activities, in order to increase the legitimacy of the GRC within the region was a discussion topic.

- The idea of establishing GRC dedicated Points of Contact in the region was perceived as a positive development to be implemented.

- The need to increase communication among the Americas funding agencies as well as among them and the GRC has been recognized as an important task to be carried on in the near future.

- The need to structure strategies and programs among the Americas' funding agencies that address local or regional issues did receive approval from the participating agencies. There are clearly global issues to be tackled by the GRC, but there are also specific regional themes to be treated.

- The discussion whether the GRC should assume a more permanent structure, funded by a subscription model or to keep the existing voluntary supporting scheme was addressed. Pros and cons were raised, but no concluding consensus was achieved.

EDI session

The session addressed the question on how Gender equality and EDI action plans contribute to *Science and Technology Workforce Development* and to *Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results*, by discussing research funding agency equality action plans that were formulated and are being implemented by funders in two countries – Canada and Chile.

An equality plan is a set of actions designed to articulate a strategic view aimed at building opportunities for broadening participation in and contributions to the research endeavor, seen as necessary requirements for research excellence. In the last few years, such plans have been formulated by funding agencies and research performing institutions to address the obstacles faced by researchers because of various forms of bias and discrimination such as gender bias, ableism, racism, language bias and so forth. Some plans focus on one specific aspect, such as gender equality; others adopt a broader view, as EDI action plans.

The presentation was led by Ana Almeida, from the GRC-GWG, and FAPESP.

The first speaker was from Chile, Dr. Carolina Torrealba, Undersecretary of the Ministry of Science, Technology, Knowledge and Innovation Chile on the Gender National Policy in CTCI, who addressed the scope of this policy and how through enacting this plan they can address issues such as ethics, integrity and culture in the context of Rapid Research results, and research workforce development from a gender equality perspective.

The second speaker was from Canada, Nathalie Podeszfinski, Manager of Canada's Dimensions Programme, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), presented their pilot program Dimensions, which is one initiative within its Tri-Agency EDI Action Plan, to illustrate how such engagement with post-secondary institutions can contribute to achieving a more equitable, diverse and inclusive research workforce.

After the presentation, the discussion was enriched by three panelists: Dr. Mario Pecheny (CONICET), Prof. Jose Roberto de Franca Arruda (CAD FAPESP), and Dr. Jong-on Hahm (NSF)

RRA session

This session was moderated by Prof. Alejandro Adem, President of NSERC.

Shawn McGuirk, Senior Policy Advisor at NSERC, presented the new Responsible Research Assessment (RRA) Working Group of the GRC. He was joined by three of his fellow RRA working group members from the Americas:

- Cynthia Veronica Jeppesen (CONICET, Argentina)
- Alicia Juliana Kowaltowski (FAPESP, Brazil)
- David O'Brien (IDRC, Canada)

The GRC working group on RRA presented the current stage of their work and the perspective for the next year:

- Responsible research assessment (RRA) is an umbrella term for approaches to assessment which incentivize, reflect, and reward the plural characteristics of high-quality research, in support of diverse and inclusive research cultures.
- The GRC conducted a survey of 55 of its participant organizations to determine the state of play on RRA; results were published by the Research on Research Institute in November 2020 in a paper entitled "The Changing Role of Funders in Responsible Research Assessment"
- This paper informed the November 2020 GRC conference on the same topic, which was attended by over 1000 participants worldwide.
- As a result of this conference, the GRC published a report and call to action in May 2021, calling on its member organizations to support the adoption of RRA globally by developing a collective understanding of RRA; learning through collaboration; and sharing information and best practices.
- A working group was established in September 2021 to achieve this goal, representing 17 organizations across all 5 regions of the GRC. It is co-chaired by Claire Fraser (UKRI) and Mohammed Ahmad S. Al-Shamsi (KACST, Saudi Arabia). Work is now underway to establish key priorities and deliverables for the working group, over a proposed initial term of 4 years.

- The GRC RRA working group looks forward to more discussions on how it can best provide guidance and support to participant organizations on embedding RRA in their practices.

IAI Presentation

Moderated by Alejandro Adem (NSERC)
Presenter: Marcella Ohira, IAI Deputy Director/Capacity Building Director.

The Inter-American Institute for Global Change (IAI) provides nations of the Americas with the tools and institutional capacities to better face the challenges posed by global environmental change. This collaborative, multinational effort is guided by the understanding that global change is complex, multifaceted, and urgently requires innovative science and training to increase regional capacities. The IAI is guided by the principle of open science and data. The IAI supports problem-driven transdisciplinary research, based on the premise that viable solutions must come from the equitable participation of experts from diverse disciplines and stakeholders, particularly those most affected by global change. The IAI's capacity building program underpins all science efforts. The enhancement of institutional capacities by the IAI is developed through the establishment of partnerships with intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, research institutions, associations and civil society. This diverse community of partners provides the requisite to understand the needs of the Parties. New initiatives include the Science, Technology, Policy (STeP) Fellowship Program, the Transdisciplinary Training Academy, and the Science-Diplomacy Center. These combined efforts aim to increase the ability of countries of the Americas to adapt and respond to changing global environmental conditions.

FOLEC/CLASCO side event on "A turn towards the transformation of evaluative cultures in the Americas: equity, bibliodiversity, multilingualism and inclusiveness".

The side event started with welcome words from Dr. Mario Pecheny, Vice President of Scientific Affairs and Member of the Board of Directors on behalf of Social Sciences and Humanities, CONICET.

The presenter was Laura Rovelli, Coordinator Latin American Forum for Research Assessment (FOLEC) CLACSO, along with the panelists: Dominique Babini, Open Science Adviser (CLACSO), Fernanda Beigel, Researcher (INCIHUSA-CONICET).
During the discussion, some concepts regarding strengthen Science as a public good, were highlighted:

- Provide **opportunities to access, contribute to and benefit** from open science, regardless of discipline, geographic location, gender, ethnicity, language or socio-economic circumstances;

- Build on collaborative practices, services and infrastructures and long-term funding models that ensure the **equitable participation** of science producers from less advantaged institutions and countries;
- **Integrate community knowledge** into the solution of problems of societal importance;
- Promoting **bibliodiversity** and encouraging **multilingualism** in the practice of science, in scientific publications and in scholarly communications;
- Support **collaborative, non-commercial** publishing models that do not involve article or book processing charges;
- Harmonise **incentives and evaluation systems** in favour of open science, taking into account the wide range of missions that form the knowledge production environment, and the different forms of knowledge creation and communication that are not limited to publication in international peer-reviewed journals.

Also discussed regarding the importance of recognition of Open Science in RRA:

- Develop and value open science skills throughout educational and professional trajectory of students and researchers.
- Reduce the influence of the impact factor of journals, starting by eliminating all references to this indicator and the H-index in the texts of calls for projects and in the evaluation of careers (example of the University of Utrecht or the European Research Council).
- Value open science and the diversity of scientific production in the evaluation of research and teaching staff, projects, universities and research organizations.
- Encourage research centers and organizations to sign up to and support the effective application of the principles adopted.

PART 2: WRITTEN CONTRIBUTIONS SEND AFTER THE VIRTUAL SEMINAR

Contribution of the IDRC – Canada, on the Session on Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research

IDRC: the paper would benefit from a more fulsome discussion on what rapid research funding is, why it is needed and then highlight the ethical issues and operational tensions it creates for funders. At present, the central message appears to be that funders can and should uphold principles established by the GRC and others and that we can do so at an accelerated pace. Yet, we don't think recent experience shows we are doing the same thing in less time. Though we agree with

the statement that 'merit review should not be compromised' (p3) but we don't find that statement very helpful unless there is some guidance on what might be contemplated to accelerate the pace of merit review. If an agency takes 6 months to process a normal competition and they are now being asked to complete a competition cycle in 2-3 months, something will have to change. The paper creates the impression that we can simply accelerate our processes. A policy maker reading this statement might wonder, if agency X can adjudicate a competition that responds to a rapid onset emergency in 2 months, why does it take so long during 'normal' times.

Pages 6-7 on processes and criteria for merit-review do go further than prior GRC statements but this discussion needs to be alert to the tensions that tight timelines create. In one jointly funded program we supported, we gave reviewers two weeks to review and submit their assessments. Yes we tried to create a diverse review pool but there was no time to provide training on how to identify and mitigate review bias and we dispensed with the normal panel meeting to calibrate scoring. This was all done to accelerate funding decisions.

Many agencies responded to COVID-19 in various ways but were guided by the driving operational imperative to get new projects/programs up and running quickly. It's appreciated that the paper wants to stay at the level of principles with references to the GRC's Statements on Ethics and Peer/Merit Review, but is there space to provide some operational guidance when rapid research results are called for? What many funders can now reflect on is how they may have altered their standard operating procedures for their COVID funding opportunities. When we were developing our COVID competitions, we looked to see what other agencies were doing. Our counterparts at NSERC paid close attention to what programs agencies were funding and what operational changes they introduced. This may be of interest. When we looked to see how rapid-response facilities were structured, only a couple of examples could be identified. One of them was NSF's RAPID program that enabled researchers to submit time-sensitive proposals. Proposals are internally reviewed. The funding level was not high but those behind this funding opportunity likely judged that time-sensitive research requires quicker approval than standard merit review processes can provide. We highlight this example because it is clearly not the process standard grants at NSF go through.

One suggestion would be to discuss the pressures of funding in such contexts and how agencies might respond in the future. We imagine the regional meetings might have generated examples of how agencies innovated and this would be of interest.

Other comments to consider:

- The paper extends our interest to include the conduct of ethical research. Our sense is that few funders monitor research grants and there are a couple of examples of how funders investigate unethical research practices if they come to light. The responsibility for monitoring ethical research seems to be directed to research performing organizations. Is there any opportunity to or interest in stating the role of funders in monitoring the conduct of research?
- The principles on pages 4-5 are relevant and appropriate. Not on the list but one that has guided public health and humanitarian interventions is the principle of 'do no harm'. This principle is embedded in ethics approvals but its relevance to research in rapid- onset emergencies may warrant its inclusion.
- The topics introduced on pages 7 to 11 (e.g., research security, government interference, IP risks) are important topics for GRC participating agencies. The connection to rapid-results research, however, is not developed. Is there anything particular about rapid-research funding that raises the prominence of these issues? Unless there are logical connections to the central theme, we would suggest deleting these topics. We are not saying they are unimportant for GRC members, on the contrary, but if there is no connection to rapid-results research, we think these ideas would be more forceful if developed in a separate paper.

Contribution of FAPESP, Brasil, on the Session on Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research

COMMENT ON THE RESEARCH ETHICS, INTEGRITY AND CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF RAPID RESULTS RESEARCH

Author: Prof. Luis Henrique Lopes dos Santos
SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR FAPESP PESQUISA MAGAZINE

I would like to single out, in very general terms, some of the issues that are guiding the ongoing debate in FAPESP on the role of funding agencies in promoting research integrity.

I think the history of designing and implementing institutional research integrity policies has had two phases. In the initial phase, beginning in the turn of the century, the main purposes were:

(i) to make the research community aware of the ethical importance of the commitment of researchers, and other people involved in the research system, with the value of veracity – veracity concerning development of research, dissemination of its results, and identification of the real authorship in scientific publications;

(ii) to define means to prevent the breach of this commitment, through education and scientific training of individual researchers, in order to make them able to discriminate good and bad scientific conducts, and through the institution of formal procedures for the identification, investigation and punishment of scientific misconducts by individual researchers.

In recent years, besides these purposes, which are certainly very important from what we may call an individualistic perspective, new purposes have also become central, as a result of the adoption of what we may call a structural perspective. These purposes consist in identifying structural features of the research system which may be responsible for encouraging breaches of research integrity, and identifying means to restructure the research system so as to provide scientific activity with the most possible favorable environment for the production of the best possible science.

From this structural point of view, I think there are at least three major challenges to be faced: to redirect today's dominant practices for assessing the scientific competence of researchers; to identify ways to benefit from the virtuous potentialities and means to neutralize the dangerous potentialities involved in the dissemination of practices of open science; and to remove structural obstacles for research environments to become more equitable, diverse and inclusive.

It is a good and important challenge for funding agencies to redesign the dominant practices for assessing the scientific competence of researchers in order to value criteria capable of measuring the quality of scientific contributions of researchers and the qualitative impact of these contributions in their research areas and also in order to take into account that the absence of positive results for a

period can be justified by good reasons, such as the courage to face problems which may be as audacious as they are risky.

I think it is also beyond any reasonable doubt that open science practices increase the degree of transparency of research processes and thereby increase enormously the scientific community's ability to assess the quality and integrity of scientific publications. But it is also true that, at the same time, the dissemination of open science practices in a context characterized by the explosion of possibilities for virtual communication requires the design of complex systems of means to exercise this collective scientific control over the quality and integrity of scientific publications.

This kind of ambivalence that is characteristic of scientific transparency is also responsible for the ambivalence of the processes of global scientific collaboration. International collaboration is certainly a driving force for the advancement of science and is something that simply cannot be given up. On the other hand, nobody can deny that the absolute and uncontrolled transparency of research projects and results can cause social and political risks of various orders, concerning the preservation of the environment, public health, public safety, national security, and so on.

So, the potential risks of scientific transparency must indeed be seriously considered, they must be carefully weighed and prevented, but they must be carefully treated just as what they are: as collateral risks of scientific collaboration, a process that is valuable in itself, a process that cannot and should not be stopped by any reason.

Finally, I also think that it is beyond any reasonable doubt that a research environment characterized by the values of equity, diversity and inclusion are desirable not only by general ethical and political reasons, which by the way would be a sufficient justification for us to desire them. It is justified also by strictly scientific reasons.

I think it is already a well-established fact that research environments with a low degree of equity, diversity and inclusion with respect to ethnicity, color, gender and social origin are much more vulnerable to scientific biases, not only concerning the way of conducting researches, but also, and perhaps mainly, concerning the way their research agendas are defined. Thus, since creating the best favourable environments for the production of the best science is an imperative of research integrity, to conceive and implement effective inclusive policies in the scientific environment must be qualified as an imperative of research integrity.

The imperative of equity, diversity and inclusion imposes itself on research institutions and also on funding agencies. As far as funding agencies are concerned, this imperative must have strong consequences upon patterns of scientific evaluation. One of the essential goals of scientific evaluation must be to ensure equity, diversity and inclusion, whether among evaluators or among the ones evaluated. Commitment to this essential goal does not imply abandoning merit as the fundamental standard in scientific assessment processes. It implies, as a matter of fact, the redefinition of the concept of merit, the adoption of a concept of merit that proves to be the most relevant to scientific assessments.

Commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion values implies that merit is to be defined not in terms of the stock of knowledge and skills already acquired and results already obtained by the person being evaluated, but in terms of the relationship between, on the one hand, the stock of knowledge and skills already acquired and the results already obtained and, on the other hand, the set of opportunities the person evaluated has had to acquire knowledge and skills and obtain important results, because of her membership to a socially disadvantaged group.

In other words, the commitment to the values of equity, diversity and inclusion implies defining merit in terms of the key concept of potential to acquire knowledge and skills and obtain important results. Thus, in addition to being ethically fair, the commitment to these values promotes the advancement of science, as far as it allows the research community to take in talents that otherwise would be simply wasted and as far as it allows the research community to create research agendas and to open scientific paths that otherwise would remain in the shadows.

****

Contribution of ANID, Chile on the Session on Science and Technology Workforce Development

ANID: In relation to workforce development it is important not to focus on formation of human capital, but also whether STI ecosystem can absorb this human capital to avoid brain drain. It might be interesting to analyze connection between public and private sectors and education.

ANID has various instruments for development of human capital starting with undergraduate studies up to postdoc in public and private sector. If necessary, details can be sent out.

****

Contribution of ANID, Chile on the Session on RRA - Responsible Research Assessment:

RRA – it is important to include evaluation of instruments not only before and during implementation process, but also mid and long-term evaluation after projects are completed. This can allow analysis of the impact of instruments, especially with big funding, like research centers, in the society.

ANNEX I – PROGRAM

Global Research Council (GRC) Americas Regional Meeting 2021 and Side event from Latin American Forum on Scientific Evaluation (FOLEC)
December – 2021

Program

Host Agency: Conicet (Argentina)
Co-hosts: Conacyt (Paraguay) and FAPESP (Brazil).

Date: December 1st and 2nd
Time for sessions: 13:00 - 16:00 (GMT-3) (Argentina local time)
Date: December 3rd (Side event)
Time for sessions: 14:00 – 15:30 (GMT-3) (Argentina local time)
Attendants: Senior Staff or Agencies representatives.
Format: Virtual.

Sessions:

- Welcome words by Dr. Ana Franchi (President of CONICET) (15 min).
  - Welcome words will include a brief report of the Americas' Regional Scientific Workshops on Covid-19 (October-November 2021).

- Discussion papers: presentation and debate
  - Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research (1,5 hours)
  - Science and Technology Workforce Development (1,5 hours).
- GRC roadmap and vision (45 min).
- Gender Working Group (45 min).
- RRA Working group / IAI (50/60 min)
- Side event from FOLEC: Panel Discussion (90 min)

  - FOLEC side event aims to contribute to the axis "A turn towards the transformation of educative cultures in the Americas: equity, bibliodiversity, multilingualism and inclusiveness"

PROGRAM

DAY 1	
13:00 - 13:15 Welcome (15 min)	Welcome words by Dr. Ana Franchi (CONICET) Report of the America's Scientific Workshops con COVID-19.
13:15 - 14:45 Session 1 (1,5 hours)	Discussion paper **Research Ethics, Integrity and Culture in the Context of Rapid Results Research** Presenter: Dr. Michael Steele (NSF) Moderator: Euclides de Mesquita Neto (FAPESP) Respondent: Luis Henrique Lopes dos Santos (FAPESP)
Break (15 min)	
15:00 - 15:45 (45 min)	Discussion Paper **GRC Roadmap and Vision** Presenter: Michael Bright GRC Secretary

DAY 2	
13:00 - 14:30 Welcome (1,5 hours)	Discussion paper **Science and Technology Workforce Development** Presenters: Andrea de Jesús and Reynaldo A. Lee V. (SENACYT) Moderator: Shaun Baron (NSERC)
Break (15 min)	
14:45 - 15:30 (45 min)	**GRC Gender Working Group / EDI** Presentation: Ana Almeida – GRC-GWG, FAPESP Moderator: Luiz Eugênio Mello - Scientific Director FAPESP Speaker 1: Dr. Carolina Torrealba - Undersecretary - Ministry of Science, Technology, Knowledge and Innovation Chile on the Política Nacional de Género en CTCI Speaker 2: Nathalie Podeszfinski, Manager of Canada's Dimensions Programme

	Panelists: -Dr. Mario Pecheny - CONICET -Prof. Jose Roberto de Franca Arruda- CAD FAPESP - Dr. Jong-on Hahm, Program Director, Office of International Science and Engineering, National Science Foundation, USA
15:30 - 16:15 15:30-15:45	**GRC - Responsible Research Assessment Working Group** Moderator: Alejandro Adem (NSERC)
15:45-16:00 **Q&A**	**Inter-American Institute for Global Change (IAI)** Moderator: Alejandro Adem (NSERC)
16:15 – 16:30	Closing Remarks

DAY 3 (SIDE EVENT)	
14:00- 15:30	**FOLEC Roundtable: "A turn towards the transformation of evaluative cultures in the Americas: equity, bibliodiversity, multilingualism and inclusiveness".** Welcome by Dr. Mario Pecheny, Vice President of Scientific Affairs and Member of the Board of Directors on behalf of Social Sciences and Humanities, CONICET. Panelists: ● Laura Rovelli, Coordinator Latin American Forum for Research Assessment (FOLEC, in Spanish), CLACSO ● Dominique Babini, Open Science Adviser, CLACSO ● Fernanda Beigel, Researcher INCIHUSA-CONICET/Centre for the Study of Knowledge Circulation, Argentina