GLOBAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Americas Meeting

2024

GOBIERNO DEL PARAGUAY | CONSEJO NACIONAL DE CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGÍA

CNPq

MINISTÉRIO DA CIÊNCIA, TECNOLOGIA E INOVAÇÃO

GOVERNO FEDERAL BRASIL UNIÃO E RECONSTRUÇÃO

GLOBAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (GRC)

Report on the Americas Regional Meeting 2024

Working Together in Co-creation to Address Global Challenges and Research Management in the Era of AI

21-22 NOVEMBER

CNPq, BRASILIA, BRAZIL

Co-hosted by the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and the National Council of Science and Technology of Paraguay (CONACYT)

1. General Notes:

The GRC Americas Regional Meeting took place on November 21st and 22nd 2024 at the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) headquarters in Brasília, Brazil.

This edition was co-hosted by CNPq and the National Council of Science and Technology of Paraguay (CONACYT), and welcomed authorities of Research Councils and Funding Agencies of the region, as well as researchers and specialists. The meeting adopted a hybrid format and was attended by a total of 38 attendees in-person and 11 online, from 23 institutions and 13 countries.

The participants had two days of content exchange, starting with the exposition of the 02 discussion papers that based the debate on the themes of this edition, "Working Together in Co-Creation to Address Global Challenges" and "Research Management in the Era of AI". The event proceeded with the presentation by GRC Working Groups "Responsible Research Assessment (RRA-WG)", "Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI-WG)" and "Multilateral Engagement (MLE-WG)". It was then followed by 5 panels discussing the themes previously mentioned. The participants also engaged in networking during lunch/coffee breaks and a special dinner at a typical Brazilian restaurant – opportunities that have already created and enhanced institutional partnerships.

Photographic records of the event are available at:
https://photos.google.com/share/AF1QipM1Cr5q10Sb3WzsgjFVmxyvhXtMqdtZq-V70IHo5TBAd3JdQIZTfwWrLOQK3-KLpQ?pli=1&key=ckY4OUtCbXBNNWhFNWFxSmJwYXNVd09wNlUxU1VR

Videos of the event can be seen at:

DAY 1 – WORKING TOGETHER IN CO-CREATION TO ADDRESS GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Part I - https://www.youtube.com/live/1wOJg5EgPfM?si=NdB2-G7fl0dvltsR

Part II - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9XMIryN4Ah0&t=6s

Part III - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NFBXOfyGLCo&t=9895s

DAY 2 – RESEARCH MANAGEMENT IN THE ERA OF AI

Part I – https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ac9HFIDxzt4

Part II - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qWdgr5kssr0

2. Outcomes and Key-takeaways

Updates on the GRC Working Groups

➢ *Responsible Research Assessment working group*

The Responsible Research Assessment (RRA) working group had provided input to the two discussion papers in writing prior to the regional meeting, and therefore focused its presentation at the Americas regional meeting on providing an update on recent and ongoing activities.

The working group's central vision to support GRC participant organizations (and the organizations they fund) to embed approaches to assessment that incentivize and reward the diverse attributes of research excellence in support of a better, healthier research culture that support rigorous research undertaken to the highest standards. The working group task is to work towards a shared understanding and goal of responsible research assessment (RRA) within GRC participants. Its activities are aligned with this vision, as well as with its mission, which is described in the working group's Action Plan and comprises four priority areas:

1. To work towards a collective understanding of responsible approaches to research assessment;
2. To openly share good practices and guidance, in order to support GRC participant organizations in their implementation and embedding of RRA practices;
3. To galvanize support and enable coordinated action across GRC participant organizations, towards implementing common RRA principles;
4. And to extend the knowledge base in RRA where gaps and barriers persist or emerge, building on existing work where possible.

To work towards a collective understanding of responsible approaches to research assessment, the working group developed and published the Dimensions of Responsible Research Assessment framework. This framework includes 11 Dimensions, which are organized according to three categories: (1) Guiding Principles, (2) Governance and Strategy, and Process and Methodology. These Dimensions are not meant to be prescriptive; they are designed to frame future discussions and to support funders in their development and implementation of RRA practices. As such, funders are encouraged to apply these Dimensions in ways that are tailored to their own contexts. The full report, with detailed descriptions for each Dimension, can be found on Figshare at this link.

To openly share good practices among GRC participants, the group is creating a booklet of case studies that will describe concrete actions that funders can consider – informed by the GRC RRA Dimensions – to adopt better RRA practices. To illustrate the effectiveness of such case studies, members of the working group presented two sample case studies from the Health Research Board (HRB, Ireland) and CONICET (Argentina):

- The Health Research Board (HRB)'s case study centers on its **funding scheme**. To maximize the likelihood that publicly funded health research results in positive outcomes to the public, HRB has promoted Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) in their research assessment processes. As a result, members of the public assess PPI elements of an application, which aligns with the GRC RRA Dimension of responsible assessment of research impact.
- CONICET's case study centers on how it implements **Responsible Research Assessment (RRA) in the evaluation of researchers' career trajectories**. CONICET reviewed their assessment methods when evaluating a researcher's career trajectory. This includes mechanisms to consider traditional science, diverse and innovative research areas, the use of broader forms of contributions to research, and the introduction of a narrative CV.

Further details on these case studies, and more, will be published in a case study booklet in the coming months. Additional case studies are still being collected from GRC participant organizations, and can be submitted to the working group at GRC-RRA@ukri.org by using the published Case Study Template. The resulting case study booklet will aim to include case studies from all the GRC regions, and will be representative of all of 11 Dimensions of RRA. The booklet is expected to be published in time for the 2025 GRC Annual Meeting, and its publication may be followed by community engagements and webinars.

Finally, to enable more coordinated action across GRC participant organizations and to extend the knowledge base in RRA, the working group is collaborating with the Research on Research Institute (RoRI) to deliver a second iteration of the GRC's Global Survey on Responsible Research Assessment. Responses have been received from nearly 50 GRC participant organizations to date, across all regions. The survey's deadline has been extended until January 6, 2025, to allow for more responses from GRC members. **The working group is currently seeking more survey responses from the Americas region, to increase regional representation. Members interested in submitting a case study should**

contact the group's inbox to receive the survey link: GRC-RRA@ukri.org. A report with results from this survey will be presented at the 2025 GRC Annual Meeting.

Moving forward, the group will be seeking an extension to its mandate beyond 2025 to further coordinate action around RRA and to ensure ongoing support to GRC participant organizations with regards to RRA. Future activities aligned with this priority include the development of a self-assessment tool and RRA roadmap, that would support funders in assessing their own responsible research assessment practices.

➢ *Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity Working Group*

The EDI Working Group held a session on the Responsible Use of AI in Research Management and contributed to the discussions on co-creation. Below are the main takeaways.

1) On the Responsible Use of AI in Research Management

a. The WG session speaker highlighted that AI must still be wholly understood. Other specialists agreed on the "black box" metaphor to describe how AI arrives at an answer when prompted. At least two other panelists in different sessions also emphasized the need to responsibly address AI use to lower the risk of it contributing to more inequality by reinforcing barriers to less-represented groups in research. However, it was clear that no one in this meeting was equipped to suggest courses of action or concrete initiatives to prevent AI from deepening inequalities and asymmetries in research. Mentions were also made regarding the incomplete and potentially incorrect or biased nature of the data AI relies upon. In this sense, evaluating AI's answers concerning accuracy, fairness, equity, diversity, and inclusion is challenging, making it even more urgent and necessary to address. The participants thus agreed on the need for specific action and endorsed the authors' suggestion to create an AI working group that could guide the GRC's outlook on this issue.

b. However, the EDI WG wonders if another WG is needed or if this work on AI in research management could be advanced as a collaboration among the existing WGs. Given the interconnected issues of EDI, RRA, multilateral engagement, and AI, this seems desirable and feasible. Perhaps a sub-WG could be established with each of the three current WGs, along with additional AI experts and ethicists.

2) On Working Together in Co-Creation to Address Global Challenges

a. Specific to the Americas meeting, the EDIWG proposes addressing the topic of co-creation, considering some of the issues and challenges that arise when trying to broaden participation in research on a global scale. The WG considers international collaboration and inclusive and equitable citizen participation in research as models for sustainability. The WG suggests that the three working groups collaborate to develop studies and tools to address this issue. To advance this idea, we would like to address three points.

i. *First, how to deal with the imbalance of resources?*

Our rationale is that not all countries come to the collective research table with equal resources, but all come with talent and valuable perspectives. How can we achieve co-creation goals when there is inequity in infrastructure and power to shape research agendas? Our question to research funders will be: What can research funding agencies do to protect their researchers from unequal or inequitable partnerships at the global level and promote opportunities for equitable and inclusive participation in international research schemes that are vetted for mutual benefit? Have the obstacles been identified? Are they known by all involved? Are they being addressed in a way that is understood as fair and just?

ii. *Second, how to make research uphold ecological and social responsibility?*

Our rationale is that working at an international level and involving citizens requires understanding cultural variation, which researchers receive no training in. A lack of awareness, of respect for, and openness to various knowledge, ways of knowing, and cultural norms may cause friction and limit research's relevance, scope, and impact. How can we address complex and interconnected global challenges without meaningful international collaboration and the equitable and inclusive participation of all involved? Our question to research funders will be: What can research agencies do to share, in an EDI-informed way, tools and training for researchers interested in working at the international scale and with diverse participants? What can research agencies do to protect professional researchers and other participants who may be vulnerable to the impacts of power imbalances, assumptions, and biases that perpetuate colonial practices and belief systems? What concrete measures may be taken to overcome obstacles?

iii. *Third, how can the citizen participation aspect of co-creation be developed to ensure that supporting scientific knowledge development benefits policymakers and people?*

Our rationale: Who are the people bridging science to politics, and do they bring the perspective of a group of scientists or the benefit to society? All societies are made up of diverse groups with diverse interests. For example, fossil fuel use has divisive impacts because livelihoods depend on its extraction and continued use, while the more significant interest to society is the reduction of global warming. Often, the most vulnerable populations are most affected by such decisions and have little power to voice their perspectives and lived experiences. How can we reconcile the quest to address significant global challenges and people's needs in ways that equitably include the perspectives of all members of society when considering the solutions? What can research funders do to reduce obstacles to equitable and inclusive citizen participation? Some funders have explored the possibility of supporting citizen science. However, this might create another gap between the research community and the public most affected by the knowledge they produce. A significant challenge would be to foster collaboration among these different communities. Examples listed in the draft paper, such as promoting transdisciplinary research initiatives, ensuring accountability, and supporting open science, seem like promising initiatives to be explored with the recognition and inclusion of EDI considerations.

- ***Multilateral Engagement Working Group***

The working group was created in 2023 with the objective to map the global landscape of mechanisms in the scope of the GRC and develop a roadmap. There are 20 members in the group (5 from Americas) and the main question it faces is: “What can be done in the next few years”?

- Main challenges that were pointed out:
  - Lack of standardized process and framework in organization;
  - A common reason to start multilateral cooperation in themes like biodiversity loss;
  - 75% of the multilateral schemes are led by the Global North;
  - A noticeable trend shows that respondents from the south focus on local, regional concerns (like sustainability & water), while the north prioritizes global, large topics (like climate change and social science);

        - Different timing and differing priorities.

- What´s ongoing? What´s in the agenda?
    - Held 3 webinars with researchers in 11 countries on COVID;
    - Collected funded opportunities from 11 agencies, with seminars showing international opportunities for collaboration;
    - In 2023, held more seminars on AI and open science, and in 2024, two seminars on research security and AI.
    - What should be focused in multilateral engagement?
        - Work on making opportunities and learnings from each region available on an online database and what´s been done on the topic;
        - Discussions based on agendas that have already been defined by a higher group of leaders, and which naturally tend to address issues from the North;
        - What are the priorities to give away scholarships? Oftentimes, the focus is on well-known institutions, but these often tend to be in the same countries (England, US, etc.) What if some PHD student wants to stay in their own regions?
        - Language is a barrier. To open doors, there is a need to bring in other players that don't have English (or even the top language list) as a base language.

3.1 WORKING TOGETHER IN CO-CREATION TO ADDRESS GLOBAL CHALLENGES

The discussions highlighted central challenges for the co-creation of knowledge and the integration of transdisciplinary research (TDR) into the mainstream of Science, Technology, and Innovation (ST&I) policies, in particular:

- Trust between academic actors, local communities, and stakeholders is slow, yet, an essential process. Funding instruments must ensure equitable participation, with special attention to traditionally underfunded local communities.
- Local communities are often not adequately recognized and compensated for their participation in research projects.

- Evaluation criteria and funding systems still favor disciplinary approaches over transdisciplinary projects. The lack of flexible timelines and continuous financial support hinders the progress of long-term collaborative initiatives.
- The research agenda is often defined by Global North, limiting the inclusion of Global South. There is a pressing need to foster greater leadership from developing countries.
- There is a significant gap in the training of researchers to deal with transdisciplinary science, which requires skills in conflict management, cultural mediation, and cross-sectoral dialogue. Needs to be emphasized that specific policies should be aimed at preparing scientists to integrate knowledge diversity and engagement with local communities. Many researchers face challenges in adopting transdisciplinary approaches due to insufficient training and support.
- Funding agencies play a critical role by promoting collaborative research across sectors, facilitating international partnerships, supporting the development of technical and scientific capacities, and converting co-created knowledge into effective practices while disseminating best practices globally. To achieve this, funding agencies must revise their practices, considering the time and resources needed to foster strong partnerships and build trust among different stakeholders.
- Many successful projects are not followed up after their completion, resulting in missed opportunities for continuous learning and replication.
- Despite the exponential growth in scientific production on transdisciplinary research, as evidenced by publications indexed in Web of Science, resistance to institutional and academic recognition of collaborative approaches as equivalent to disciplinary research remains.

3.1.1 Good Practices Presented

Good practices on co-creation and transdisciplinary co-production approaches in different contexts, showcasing the integration of science, industry, governments, and communities were shared, as for instance:

- From the United States, shared by the National Science Foundation, the *Civic Innovation Challenge (CIVIC)*, focused on solving local problems through collaborative solutions with communities, and the *Global Centers Program*, which promotes international partnerships to address issues like climate change and the bioeconomy in a “lean and fast model of one-year pilots, with projects that must have a clear vision for integration with different

partners and ownership from local communities". These cases demonstrated how the integration of indigenous and western knowledge to resolve water crises in transboundary jurisdictions underscores the power of interdisciplinarity and co-creation.

- From the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI), experiences with "Collaborative Research Actions" (CRA) were shared, which integrates scientists and communities to solve regional challenges, such as the impacts of climate change in transboundary areas and water security. The importance of structured follow-up to overcome academic inertia and the need for greater flexibility in funding cycles to support co-creation processes were emphasized.
- From Brazil, the presentation by the local funding agency from São Paulo State (FAPESP) highlighted initiatives such as the *Biota Program*, which combines knowledge co-production with transdisciplinary teams and scientific communication. Other notable examples included the *Public Policy Research Program*, where scientists work directly with policymakers to align research with governmental action, and the *Long-Term Ecological Research Program (PELD)*, which exemplifies the use of pedagogical calls to educate scientific communities.

These cases show how co-creation and transdisciplinary co-production can transform research into tangible outcomes, fostering inclusive and impactful innovations aligned with global challenges and local realities/demands.

3.1.2 Recommendations and next steps

The main recommendations from the Panel were:

- Strengthen co-creation models towards the development of a global framework with clear processes and methodologies and integrate co-creation as a criterion in public calls and policies;
- Capacity-building and education initiatives to train/empower researchers in transdisciplinary collaboration and community engagement, promoting educational programs that bring together science and public policies and providing communication skills to enhance interaction between researchers and communities. There is a strong need to teach researchers how to get different levels of opinions and bring different levels together in the way that they can learn how to co-create, and fill in the knowledge gaps to do so;

- Develop sustainable partnerships, establishing mechanisms to fund underrepresented stakeholders, ensuring fair compensation and recognition for participants, encouraging regional demands to be answered by appropriate calls in local languages for greater inclusivity (prioritize projects addressing local needs).
- New partnerships require lots of efforts and time to mature – for funders and for research teams to form relationships with tribal nations, private sector, local communities, third sector organizations, etc.
- Institutional changes are necessary to restructure funding cycles to align with the needs of co-creation, prioritizing approaches that embrace solution-oriented and inclusive science, creating funding schemes that allow longer and more flexible cycles, suitable for partnership building and co-production.
- Funders need to create opportunities to build trust between interdisciplinary stakeholders, and between funding agencies as well. There need to be trust for co-creation. Important to foster it through specific calls and through more opportunities to connect.

3.1.3 Final thoughts on Co-creation

The panels highlighted that co-creation and transdisciplinarity are promising yet complex approaches that require time, resources, and appropriate institutional changes. Equitable partnerships, capacity building and flexible funding are fundamental for science to effectively address global challenges. The presentations and discussions underscored several key lessons about how co-creation can shape the future of science and innovation. It emphasized that co-creation demands a systematic approach to integrate different stakeholders, with clear definition of roles and focus on collaborative actions. Furthermore, flexibility in project management and funding cycles was deemed essential to meet the needs of long-term projects, which often require adjustments and realignments.

Additionally, the importance of scientific communication was highlighted as a tool for engaging diverse audiences and building trust, fostering open dialogue between science, society, and public policymakers. Concrete examples of integration between science and innovation were presented, reinforcing that co-creation is an effective approach for translating scientific knowledge into social and economic impacts.

Finally, the inclusion of ethical considerations and the appreciation of local contexts were emphasized as critical factors to ensure the broad benefits of co-creation initiatives that must be equitable, sustainable and aligned with the challenges and aspirations of the communities involved.

3.2 **RESEARCH MANAGEMENT IN THE ERA OF AI**

The discussions highlighted what AI is about, the future of AI, challenges regarding the field (worldwide and in the Americas), definition and predicts on the future of AI and recommendations to GRC regarding next steps in the region. AI was positioned as a critical enabler for tackling issues such as climate change, healthcare inequities, and educational gaps.

Discussions highlighted its potential to revolutionize various sectors, not only by enhancing efficiency but also by fostering inclusivity and collaboration. As a tool for co-creation, AI promises to bridge gaps between diverse actors, such as academic institutions, governments, industries, and local communities.

A recurring theme was the diversity of AI applications, spanning areas such as machine learning, natural language processing, and decision-making algorithms. The discussions underscored the urgency of fostering collaboration to leverage AI as a tool for societal progress.

They equally highlighted the importance of ethical frameworks and inclusive policies to ensure that AI technologies are accessible and equitable.

Participants called attention to the need to address systemic challenges such as the digital divide, privacy concerns, and regulatory gaps. The event also showcased effective use cases of AI in research activities. Such examples highlighted the potential for AI to streamline processes, improve decision-making, and accelerate innovation.

It was agreed that AI is here to stay and it will have a significant and lasting impact on workforce, agriculture, healthcare, education, and on how to conduct research and innovation, reshaping the very foundations of our economies and societies.

The digital divide will widen with AI and countries may be classified into 3 groups:

1. Resource owners and technological generators: data center owners, training centers, hardware needed to create these data centers;
2. Application developers: using existing resources and technologies;
3. Consumer of what has been developed: wich will increase technological dependence of Latin America.

There is an urgent need to prevent AI from widening inequalities, especially in Latin America. The question is: should it accept becoming part of group 3, make an effort to be in group 2, or collaborate in the region to be in group 1? Should the region settle for consuming AI or strive to be active developers or resource generators? To that extent, coordination

among research and development agencies is necessary for the region to mature its Science, incorporating good practises and regulations to converge towards positive integration.

As AI is already happening, the Americas has to be prepared for the challenges and ensure that no country and people is left behind. It can help us considerably to decrease the time taken to perform certain tasks or to review processes, ensuring that there is human oversight to do so.

AI is only good as the data it´s trained upon - as it is usually available in more volume in global north, so there is a need to ensure that data is also reflective of the global south.

It was also raised the opportunity to further address issues of privacy and information security uploaded into AI tools – countries have chosen either to withhold scientific breakthroughs externally, or have prohibited that research proposals, review information and related records be to non-approved genenerative AI tools, with the concern that this content become public. On this topic, differing opinions on open Science were presented, with some leaning more towards some protection of data, and others arguing that science should not have a party or borders.

Concerns over tranparency, bias, and hallucinations, and the importance of maintaining human oversight and data Governance over AI systems were pointed out, as AI is not always reliable (examples on AI fabricating contents into medical transcripts and Papers being retracted due to lack of humam review were mentioned).

2.2.1 Opportunities in AI highlighted

AI offers significant potential to reduce human bias in decision-making processes. By providing objective, data-driven insights, AI can promote fairness and inclusivity in funding allocations, research evaluations, and hiring decisions – if properly set up and utilized. Additionally, its ability to analyze diverse datasets enables the identification of underrepresented voices and ideas, fostering a more equitable research environment.

In addition, several efficiency gains in research activities through AI were highlighted as transformative, including:

● Automated evaluation of scientific texts: tools for automatic summary and classification, plagiarism detection, and key data extraction may help to streamline academic work.

● Collaboration network analysis: co-authorship maps, citation analysis, and prediction of future collaborations will facilitate stronger connections among researchers.

● Scientific impact assessment: AI predicting research impact, identifying emerging trends, and analyzing social and economic effects of scientific work.

● Research quality assessment: automated tools aiding in bias detection, reproducibility analysis, and data verification, ensuring high standards in scholarly work.

- Customized assessments: Personalized recommendations and tailored reports enhancing decision-making processes for funders and researchers.
- The potential for AI to assist in post-conference summaries and actionable recommendations was also emphasized, showcasing its ability to turn complex discussions into practical insights.

AI's capacity to address resource allocation challenges is another significant opportunity. For instance, healthcare systems can leverage AI to optimize the distribution of medical supplies or predict patient influx during crises, ensuring timely and efficient responses. Similar approaches to research resource allocation may enhance the prioritization of funding for high-impact projects, streamline the use of laboratory facilities, and identify gaps in collaboration networks. By aligning resource distribution with emerging scientific trends and societal needs, AI can drive more effective and equitable outcomes in research ecosystems.

Workforce transformation is a particularly promising area. AI-driven upskilling and reskilling programs, spanning K-12 education to professional training, may help prepare individuals to meet the demands of an AI-driven future. Capacity-building initiatives can enable researchers and policymakers to navigate the evolving AI landscape effectively. Participants highlighted experiential learning programs, such as internships in AI-focused organizations, as crucial for bridging theoretical knowledge and practical application. These programs not only build technical skills but also cultivate a deeper understanding of the ethical and societal implications of AI.

Furthermore, AI's ability to democratize access to advanced educational resources was emphasized. By tailoring learning experiences to individual needs, AI can help close educational gaps and empower underrepresented groups, fostering greater inclusion in the workforce and beyond.

3.2.2 Recommendations and next steps

Looking ahead, the 2024 GRC Americas Regional Meeting raised several critical questions that demand further exploration at both regional and global levels:

- Balancing innovation with regulation: how can frameworks be developed to encourage experimentation and growth while safeguarding against risks such as bias, misinformation, and unethical applications? Responsible AI is a multi-sector and multidisciplinary challenge, requiring adaptative policies that envolve alongside technological advancements.
- Protecting privacy while fostering collaboration: how can secure data-sharing mechanisms be established that respect national and individual rights while enabling researchers to collaborate across borders to tackle global challenges?
- Promoting inclusion for smaller nations: What strategies can empower smaller nations to transition from consumers to active contributors in the AI ecosystem? Specifically, how can Latin America foster regional cooperation through shared resources, infrastructure, and expertise to position itself as a global innovator and reduce inequalities between the Global North and South?
- Investing in collaborative initiatives: Establishing and strengthening a dedicated GRC working group focused on responsible AI development and cross-regional collaboration was highlighted.

These considerations emphasize the necessity for ongoing dialogue, investment in regional and global partnerships, and the development of inclusive strategies to ensure that the benefits of AI are equitably distributed.

3.2.3 Final thoughts on Research Management in the Era of AI

The panels reaffirmed that AI has the capacity to serve as a transformative catalyst for innovation and societal progress. However, realizing this potential requires a deliberate focus on inclusivity, ethical considerations, and robust policy frameworks. These elements are essential for creating an ecosystem where the benefits of AI are shared broadly and equitably.

Equally important is the need to foster stronger collaborations across sectors and borders. The creation of capacity and infrastructure that support sustainable and responsible AI development will be significantly accelerated if it unites diverse stakeholders, from academic institutions to governments and industries. This collaborative approach will not only enhance regional innovation but may also help to position regions such as Latin America and other Global South countries as significant contributors to the global AI landscape.

Lastly, the discussions underscored the importance of aligning AI initiatives with societal values and local contexts. By addressing the unique challenges and aspirations of different communities, AI can become a tool for meaningful change, driving solutions that reflect both global priorities and local needs. This alignment is key to ensuring that the transformative power of AI translates into tangible and lasting benefits for all.

GRC Americas Regional Meeting 2024

Brasília/Brazil
Hybrid event

The GRC Americas Regional Meeting is a multilateral, scientific event, implemented in the framework of the Global Research Council and preparatory to the global annual meeting of the organisation. This year's regional meeting in the Americas region will be co-hosted by Brazil and Paraguay, organized by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development - CNPq (Brazil) and Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnologia – CONACYT (Paraguay), and is expected to welcome authorities of Research Councils and Funding Agencies of the region.
Dates & Venue: 21 and 22 November, Brasília, Federal District; Participation: in-person and web-streamed.

DAY 1: WORKING TOGETHER IN CO-CREATION TO ADDRESS GLOBAL CHALLENGES

November 21st

08:00 – 09:00 Welcome Coffee

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 9:00 – 09:35 ***Opening Remarks***

Opening ceremony host: Mr. Lélio Fellows / General Coordinator of International Cooperation in ST&I – CNPq

- ✓ Mr. Ricardo Magnus Galvão – President, CNPq – 5'
- ✓ Mr. Benjamin Barán – Ministry-President – CONACYT Paraguay – 5'
- ✓ Mr. Carlos Eduardo Matsumoto – Head of International Affairs – Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI), Brazil – 5'
- ✓ Mr. Shaun Baron – Representative of the Global Research Council (GRC) – 5'

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 9:35 – 10:05 ***Presentation of the Discussion Papers***

- ✓ Mr. Sakhar B. Alkhereyf – Co-Chair of the Shared Scientific Committee, GRC and Professor, King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology– 15'
- ✓ Mr. Fatih Sinan Esen – Chief Scientific Programmes Senior Expert, The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK)– 15'

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 10:05 – 12:35 ***Panel 1: Updates – GRC Working Groups***

- ✓ Panelist 1: Mr. Shawn McGuirk – Co-lead of the Responsible Research Assessment Working Group (RRA-WG) 45'
- ✓ Panelist 2: Ms. Ana Maria Fonseca de Almeida – Co-lead of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity Working Group (EDI-WG) 45'
- ✓ Panelist 3: Mr. Shaun Baron - Multilateral Engagement Working Group (MLE-WG) 45'

- ✓ Q&A Session – 15´

12:35 – 14:05 – Lunch Time and Networking

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 14:05 – 15:20 ***Panel 2: Working Together in Co-Creation to Address Global Challenges***

- ✓ Panel moderator: Ms. Dalila Andrade de Oliveira – Director, Institutional and International Cooperation and Innovation, CNPq
- ✓ Key note speaker: Mr. Daniel Salamone – President of National Scientific and Technical Research Council - Argentina 30´
- ✓ Panelist 1: Ms. Teresa de la Puente – Program Director – National Science Foundation (NSF) – USA 15´
- ✓ Panelist 2: Mr. Omar R. López Alfano - Science Director - Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research 15'
- ✓ Q&A Session – 15´

15:20 – 15:50 Coffee Break and Networking

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 15:30 – 17:00 ***Panel 3: Working Together in Co-Creation to Address Global Challenges***

- ✓ Panel moderator: Ms. Marisa Mamede – Program Officer, CNPq
- ✓ Key note speaker: Mr. Luis Telo da Gama – General Secretary of the Iberoamerican Program of Science and Technology for Development (CYTED) 30'
- ✓ Panelist 1: Mr. Ricardo Magnus Galvão – President, CNPq 15´
- ✓ Panelist 2: Mr. Alexander Turra – São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), Brazil 15´
- ✓ Panelist 3: Mr. Franklin Morales – Head of International Technical Cooperation – Secretariat for Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENACYT), Ecuador 15'
- ✓ Q&A Session – 15´

17:00 – 17:10 Day 1 Final Session

- ✓ Rapporteur wrap up - 10´

19:30 – 22:00 Social event

- ✓ Special Dinner at a typical Brazilian restaurant

DAY 2: RESEARCH MANAGEMENT IN THE ERA OF AI

November 22nd

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 10:00 – 11:50 ***Panel 3: General Concepts on AI in S&T Funding Agencies in the Americas***

- ✓ Panel Moderator: Ms. Dileine Amaral da Cunha – Coordinator of Negotiation, Advisory and International Studies, CNPq

- ✓ Key note speaker: Mr. Benjamin Barán / Ministry-President of CONACYT - Paraguay 30´

- ✓ Panelist 1: Ms. Ana Vasquez Herrera – Cooperation Manager – National Agency of Investigation and Innovation, Uruguay- 15´
- ✓ Panelist 2: Mr. Carlos Mondragón Velásquez / Advisor, National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation of Peru 15´
- ✓ Panelist 3: Ms. Jessica Robin, Deputy Head, Office of International Science and Engineering, NSF– 15'
- ✓ Panelist 4: Mr. Anderson Gomes – Director, Center of Management and Strategic Studies (CGEE), Brazil – 15'

- ✓ Q&A Session – 20'

11:50 – 13:20 – Lunch Time and Networking

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 13:20 – 15:10 ***Panel 4: Cases of Regulation and Adaption of AI in STI Sector***

- ✓ Panel moderator: Mr. Olival Freire Jr. – Scientific Director, CNPq

- ✓ Key note speaker: Mr. José Francisco Salm Junior – Senior Researcher of the Higher Institute of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Lisbon (ISCSP) – 30'

- ✓ Panelist 1: Mr. Horacio Caniza Vierci – Advisor, CONACYT (Paraguay) – 15'
- ✓ Panelist 2: Mr. João Pildervasser – Academic Affairs Manager, Springer Nature (Brazil) - *15'*
- ✓ Panelist 3: Mr. Wagner Meira Jr. / vice-coordinator of IAIA INCT – 15' (Brazil)
- ✓ Panelist 4: Mr. Jurandy Almeida, Federal University of São Carlos (Brazil) – 15'

- ✓ Q&A Session – 20´

15:10 – 15:40 Coffee Break and Networking

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 15:40 – 15:50 ***Rapporteur Wrap Up***

(GMT -3 – Brasilia Time) 15:50 – 16:05 ***Day 2 Final Session and Closing Remarks***

- ✓ Mr. Ricardo Magnus Galvão – President, CNPq – 5'
- ✓ Mr. Benjamin Barán – Ministry-President – CONACYT Paraguay – 5'
- ✓ Mr. Shaun Baron – Representative of the Global Research Council (GRC) – 5'