

Diplomacy on behalf of science in times of pandemic

After six months confronting the COVID-19 pandemic, major hardships still lie on the horizon. As we addressed these challenges with specialists and policymakers from all corners of the world over the course of two weeks, not only did we better understand the multiple dimensions and perspectives of the pandemic, but we also expanded the network of collaborators engaged in debating scientific issues, seeking solutions to pressing health problems, and devising new methods for scientific communication. Dissemination of information has become a vital component for the exchange of knowledge as much as for the implementation of public policies.

In the last week of July 2020, the Institute of International Relations, in partnership with the Institute for Advanced Studies, held the second edition of the Innovation and Science Diplomacy School (InnScid SP) to further explore these issues. Prior to the week of lectures and practical activities, the Public Lectures were organized and open to the general public.

The event was entirely adapted to the current situation and took place online. This format allowed researchers from around the world to follow the round tables, which lasted four days and received several special guests. The opening debate, on July 28, addressed the importance of Scientific Diplomacy, with the participation of Pierre-Bruno Ruffini, from the University of Le Havre, and Funmi Olonisakin, from King's College London. On the 29th, our debate topic was the subnational Science Diplomacy initiatives, with representatives from different parts of the world. On the 30th, in the panel "Science Diplomacy in the world: actors, purposes and relations with Brazil", the group responsible for editing the book on the same topic participated in the event. And on July 31, the final round table discussed the challenges regarding Innovation Diplomacy and funding in the sector.

The debates preceding the InnScid 2020 week were extremely productive and featured researchers from all continents, with an average of 200 participants every day. In addition to the support of the Center for International Negotiation Studies at USP (CAENI), the events also received support from the British Council, UNESCO Brazil, Aberje, FMU, and the undergraduate students from the CAENI-USP.

This edition of the Bulletin features reviews of the debates for each round table. Each article was written by researchers who participated in the events and enriched the debate with their analyses and contributions throughout the week.

The event's program and its results may be found at: <https://2020.innscidsp.com/>

Amâncio Jorge de Oliveira

InnSciD SP 2020 and the importance of Science Diplomacy in times of Covid-19

Gabriela Ferreira e Tato Carbonaro¹

InnSciD 2020 started with a major challenge: to reinvent itself to be completely online due to the Covid-19 pandemic. And what began as a challenge, became an opportunity to learn about the digital possibilities to develop this edition of the school, allowing to reach a bigger audience, what we aimed to do with the Public Lectures week.

Aiming to share knowledge and to expand its activities and reach, connecting more academics and practitioners, InnSciD SP 2020 provided a Public Lectures Programme prior to the School Programme with cutting edge Science and Innovation specialists from all over the world. The week was opened by Dr. Pierre-Bruno Ruffini (University of Le Havre) and Dr. Funmi Olonisakin (King's College London), two major world researchers, presenting complementary perspectives on Science Diplomacy in the contemporary world.

Science Diplomacy: a people centered approach



Dr. Ruffini presented what he called a people centred approach, aiming at favouring the role of individuals in Science Diplomacy (SD). He divided his presentation in four parts, bringing core concepts to SD, and discussing the subjects involved in the practice and in the research agenda regarding it: the statist and the globalist approach to SD, the actors of SD, how scientists can weigh-in on the world order, and the remarkable commitment of scientists to SD.

Ruffini starts presenting the complementarity of the statist and the globalist approaches that give a comprehensive vision of SD.

On the one hand, the statist approach, SD aims to—directly or indirectly—enhance and protect, advancing the countries' national interest. Therefore, uses a traditional diplomatic discourse (state-centred), subset of foreign policy, commonly based on realism. On the other hand, the globalist approach aims to tackle global issues that need to be solved, normally related to global public goods (security, environment, health). Through scientific discourse (mainly by scientists who get an interest from a global perspective), it focuses on common interests and global governance based on science's universalism and idealism. Therefore, there are two drivers of SD: advancing a country's national interests and needs, and addressing global challenges.

Based on Berkman's definition, in which SD is “an international, interdisciplinary and inclusive process involving informed decision making to balance national interests and common interests”, Ruffini stresses that “informed decision making” means bringing scientific knowledge into policy making.

Therefore, actions or set of practices that should be labelled as SD have: i) an international dimension, ii) related to science and technology, iii) that either directly or indirectly advance a country's national interest (statist) or/and iv) aim at transforming the international order (globalist).

¹ Gabriela Ferreira, PhD in International Relations (USP/KCL), researcher at Caeni-USP.

Tato Carbonaro, PhD in Communication Sciences (USP), researcher at GENN.

After presenting the comprehensive approach on SD, Ruffini discusses who are the actors of SD. He starts stressing that institutionalised/official/*de jure* positions are normally performed by science counsellors/attachés at Embassies (in bilateral negotiations) or international organisations (multilateral activities) mainly: to collect and to analyse information; to facilitate contacts between the communities of countries' researchers/of innovators; to promote S&T productions originating from their countries; to organise the reception of official delegations.

To exemplify those actions, he presents the official objectives of the UK Science and Innovation Network (SIN) in France² as displayed in the UK government website: to influence science and innovation policies of French government, industry and academia to benefit the UK; to improve UK policy based on international experience and emerging opportunities and challenges with France; collaboration and partnerships; to stimulate strategic science collaborations with France to benefit the UK and deliver wider policy goals; to harness French international technology partnerships and investment to grow UK innovation capability. Therefore, the SIN aims to raise UK's influence, benefitting the country—not only to collaborate.

Consequently, each country has a model of S&T diplomatic network, depending on their interests: the USA and the UK have the environment and global challenges profile; Canada aims business and trade; France, Germany and Italy have an academic profile; Switzerland have a higher education, research and innovation integrated profile.

Ruffini ends this part of his presentation bringing the views of Gluckman, who acted as Chief Scientific Advisor of New Zealand, and stressed the importance of independence of advisement: his function was to inform policy—and not to make it—giving science privilege as an input into police, acting as a broker.

In the third part of his presentation, Ruffini discusses how scientists can weigh-in on the world order by alerting and denouncing threats on global public goods (as “whistleblowers”), as the world's climate emergence, food security and nutrition, and biodiversity and ecosystem services. International scientific experts provide expertise in view of international negotiations, informing their government and contributing to science-policy interfaces, sometimes acting informally (track 2 diplomacy) in which scientists work outside an official negotiation or mediation process, reporting back to their political leaders; or gathering intelligence. From a globalist approach, they help government, academia, non-profit organisations, elevating the voice of scientific community. In this sense, Ruffini brings Berkman³ and Soler⁴.

To finish the third part of his presentation, Ruffini discusses the difference between being a researcher on science diplomacy and being a science diplomat, since SD is a “catch all” concept. Scientists in research programs with international dimensions, having relationship with scientists abroad are not necessarily doing science diplomacy, as described in the first part of his presentation. The mistake would be to classify the act of doing research involving international relations and science, but not exactly doing science diplomacy. So, the criteria to define a science diplomat would be the permanence of their function: if they are punctually or long-lasting acting as such.

In the last part, Ruffini presents the remarkable commitment of scientists to SD, writing and advancing the knowledge on the subject.

To illustrate, he conveys two benchmark pieces: New frontiers on SD by the Royal Society (2010) and a Pragmatic perspective from the inside wrote by Gluckman, Turekian, Grimes, Kishi (2017). Both texts present a taxonomy of SD: in the 2010's document, SD is defined as informing

² For more information access: <https://www.gov.uk/world/organisations/uk-science-innovation-network-in-france>

³ “[H]elping to balance national interests and common interests (...) science diplomacy is a source of hope and inspiration for the benefit of all on Earth across generations”.

⁴ “SD appeared as the perfect tool to make all my long-held idealistic views of science actionable and operational”.

foreign policy objectives with scientific advice (science in diplomacy); facilitating international science cooperation (diplomacy for science); and using science cooperation to improve international relations (science for diplomacy). In the 2017's taxonomy, SD are the actions designed to directly advance a country's national needs; to address cross-border interests; and primarily designed to meet global needs and challenges.

He also points that many diplomats advance the SD state of art, as Richard Benedick, Daryl Copeland, Bhaskar Balakrishnan. Professional backgrounds of science counsellors and attachés are various. They can be career diplomats (as in the USA and UK), university scholars and researchers (as in France and Italy), or officials from the ministry of research (as in China, Germany and Japan).

Ruffini affirms that SD seems to be more a concern of scientists than of diplomats. However, he ponders that it may reflect the size of the professional population in both areas, or merely a question of technical legitimacy based on knowledge about science itself.

However, he concludes that the central word in science diplomacy is diplomacy, and finishes his presentation raising two questions:

- a) Do scientists promote an idealistic discourse on SD?
- b) Does science contribute more than diplomacy to SD?

Leadership infrastructure in times of crisis

After the presentation given by Dr. Ruffini on SD, Dr. Olonisakin examines the contemporary moment of the world with the pandemic and the possibilities of SD, questioning the world's leadership infrastructure and its efficiency to tackle global problems.



From a globalist perspective, Dr. Olonisakin stresses that SD could be optimum globally, fostering a global alliance between science and political leaders with a formal mobilization to tackle COVID-19. However, what we've seen is a retreat of many great nations to their national boundaries, what shows the great challenge for the global society at this point in time.

While the expected would be to see states bringing scientists together to collaborate to tackle covid-19, we've seen the opposite. In this perspective, Olonisakin put questions to the audience:

- a) What that kind of events say about the global order and, in particular, about the global leadership infrastructure?
- b) Is the current global order and whatever we can make of the global leadership infrastructure can still fit for purpose?
- c) Does the United Nations has the capacity to influence the mobilization of global society in crisis moments?

The necessary components, or pillars, of a leadership infrastructure that we can use to mobilize society have been missing for quite a while. Nevertheless, until the Covid-19 pandemic, there was no global crisis forcing the global society to review this absence. The pandemic exposed the severe weakness of the United Nations to achieve the political and economic global mobilization to respond collaboratively to a threat that is global in its pattern, in its reach, and in its impact—hence, in response patterns.

The concept of social mobilization cannot be taken for granted even because each institution has its own definition of what “social mobilization” means. For example, for the World Health Organisation (WHO), “social mobilization is the process of bringing together all societal and personal influences to

raise awareness of and demand for health care, assist in the delivery of resources and services, and cultivate sustainable individual and community involvement”⁵.

When humanity existence is endangered, social mobilization is much more spontaneous: it’s intense, it’s rapid, it’s more total. It’s not a routine act of governance since it has the purpose of responding to a fast-changing crisis situation like COVID-19 brought to us.

The deployment of a whole of a system response to the threat of crisis depends on a leadership infrastructure to take actions like raising collective budgets to mitigate the losses for all. In many places, even though the first speeches claimed for equality, with the unfolding of the crisis some people became much more threatened than others due to poverty, the structural inequality that afflicts specially people of colour.

According to Olonisakin, it shows the need of a global conversation on the topic, because the more you know about the impact of a crisis, the more you are able to feed a global voice and agency to help to address the different needs and realities, creating a common strategy. In the light of the pandemic, it was possible to see diverse degrees of success and failure in whatever kind of countries: rich, poor, democracies, authoritarian. The neutral leadership is a critical aspect of this, and how it is exercised in relation to societal mobilization is central to the responses and the outcomes achieved in crisis situations.

COVID-19 pandemic was a test of an existing capacity to national, regional and global leadership. What this leadership infrastructure looks like? Looking outside of the frame of routine governance that made some countries nationally so successful, and the UN not really able to rally the war together—and it’s not only about the constitution of the Security Council—it is possible to conjecture about the construction of many pillars that sustain this leadership infrastructure.

Leadership infrastructure is combination of the formal institutional elements of governing and the foundational relationships, shared values, and expectations that underpin and foster institutions across society. In essence, society already has the hardware of leadership infrastructure: the physical sites in which governance takes place, run by many in a daily basis. However, we have to move forward and talk about the software that, sometimes, is constituted outside those formal institutions, biding society together.

Every society has a prevalent system for governing life in common, this operational system. The foundational layer of the software in the operational system, is what promotes action, and is commonly overlooked by the academy when compared to the attention given to the formal institutions. Leadership is little theorised as phenomenon that is essential to the survival and reproduction, without which governing is incomplete and inconsequential: leadership is a must have, not only desirable.

Covid-19 exposed this lack of leadership, and the dysfunctionality of the relationship between the governing bodies (the hardware) and the plurality within societies (the software). There’s no just one way to exercise this leadership. And, even though we found experts across countries, regions, disciplines collaborating. However, every time things go back near to what we consider normal, this issue is not called into critical question: what channels of influence exist that can help us to put those pieces together? The binding relationships of trust with any part of the UN is where we should be looking for the answers to pull back the pieces of the global leadership infrastructure, looking at the Security Council and the General Assembly actions during the time of the Korean war.

⁵ “In order to employ social mobilization, members of institutions, community partners and organizations, and others collaborate to reach specific groups of people for intentional dialogue. Social mobilization aims to facilitate change through an interdisciplinary approach”. To more information, access: <https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/social-mobilization/en/#:~:text=Social%20mobilization%20is%20the%20process.sustainable%20individual%20and%20community%20involvement>.

Sub-national Science Diplomacy Initiatives

Kelly Komatsu Agopyan⁶

The actions of subnational governments in the international sphere is not a novel theme within the scholarly literature on International Relations, which has been addressing this issue for at least two decades in a debate sometimes referred to as – albeit not unanimously – paradiplomacy. While these actors lack the legal prerogative to conduct international relations, cities, states, and regions perceive international actions as useful for strengthening public management and promoting local interests, resulting in direct benefits to their population. Similarly, the role of subnational entities in Science Diplomacy has also become an increasingly central debate, although divergences still exist as to the prospect of an effectively local diplomacy.

Such was the topic of the second open virtual conference of the São Paulo School of Advanced Science on Science Diplomacy and Innovation Diplomacy (InnSciD SP) held last Wednesday, August 29, 2020. Three specialists who work directly with the issue provided their contributions from the perspectives of different subnational governments: State of São Paulo (Raquel Rocha – Invest SP); Mexico City (Alma Mondragón – Secretariat of Education, Science, Technology, and Innovation), and Barcelona (Alexis Roig – Sci Tech Diplo Hub). The three dialogues converged to reinforce the idea that subnational actors are central for tackling global challenges and problems. Furthermore, they do not rival against federal entities, but rather contribute towards more effective results on behalf of national interests and demands.

Science as a strategic decision-making resource in the formulation of more effective local public policies was one of the points raised during the presentation of an existing fellowship program in Mexico City, which resumes the longstanding debate about the importance of an increased articulation and union between science and public policy. Cities as strategic innovation poles was another point raised by the Invest SP representative, who emphasized both the city of São Paulo, which houses the so-called “unicorns”, as well as other cities within the state such as Campinas and São José dos Campos. In this sense, for example, it becomes important to emphasize the role of building innovation networks and new ideas that emerge amidst the pursuit for answers to the Covid-19 pandemic.

In turn, the Barcelona experience suggested a few other initiatives for building local networks and collaborative approaches in the field of science and technology, in an attempt to create interaction platforms between diplomats, innovation sectors, diaspora researchers who are university alumni in the city, among other initiatives.

Despite the tangible and successful examples of local science diplomacy, the effectiveness of this perspective remains disputed in countries that lack the same administrative organization of decentralized federated entities such as Brazil. What are the necessary structures for subnational governments to conduct science diplomacy? Which subnational governments are we talking about? Does the debate comprise *only* major cities and metropolises that are technological and innovation hubs with major research infrastructures? How may we ensure sustainable funding from subnational governments to obtain this infrastructure? What would be the role played by public-private partnerships? How may science diplomacy help to strengthen urban public policies and/or urban management? These are just some of the issues that need to be developed further in this urgently necessary debate on subnational science diplomacy, given that much of the global problems of our times and in the future will become increasingly conspicuous at the local level.

⁶ PhD candidate at the Institute of International Relations at the University of São Paulo (IRI-USP), where she also holds a master’s degree. Bachelor degree in International Relations at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Currently a researcher at USP Municípios Program (“USP Municipalities”) and member of the IRI’s Graduate Studies Group on Gender and International Relations “MaRIas”. She was International Relations advisor at the São Paulo’s Municipal Secretariat for Human Rights and Citizenship. Her research is mainly focused on urban studies, public policies and human rights.

Science Diplomacy in the world: actors, purposes and relations with Brazil

*Ademar Seabra da Cruz Júnior*⁷

*Júlia Mascarello*⁸

*Aline Chianca Dantas*⁹

*Carolina Veras Micheletti*¹⁰



The panel “Science Diplomacy in the world: actors, purposes and relations with Brazil” of the open lectures series of the São Paulo Innovation and Science Diplomacy School (InnScid), in July 30th 2020, gathered researchers and representatives who presented essential information on the innovation systems and Science Diplomacy (SD) of Germany, Japan and Switzerland. The discussions are the result of a book of the CNPq Research Group International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation (RICTI)¹¹ that is in its final edition phase.

⁷ Diplomat, coordinator for Science, Technology and Innovation Diplomacy of the Working Group on International Relations and ST&I, UFSC-Brazil (RICTI/UFSC).

⁸ PhD candidate in International Relations at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (PPGRI-UFSC). Researcher in the research group CNPq International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation (RICTI). E-mail: juliamascarello@hotmail.com.

⁹ Professor of International Relations at Universidade Paulista (UNIP) Brasília. PhD in International Relations at the University of Brasília (UNB). Researcher in the CNPq Research Group International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation (RICTI / UFSC). Email: alinechiancadantas@gmail.com.

¹⁰ Bachelor student in International Relations at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). Researcher at the CNPq Research Group International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation (RICTI/UFSC). Fellow of Florianópolis Innovation Network at CIA Primavera ACATE in the Vertical Business initiative.

¹¹ The group “International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation” was registered at the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) as a research group linked to the Federal University of Santa

The book aims at gathering essential data and information (qualitative and quantitative) on the innovation systems of the leading countries in the field, with a focus on the interface between domestic innovation policy and SD of the countries considered.

In the case of Germany, it is considered a leading innovation country not only in Europe, but in the world, it dedicates high investments in Research and Development (R&D), and counts with an organized and connected innovation system. Despite the country's absence of a specific SD strategy, its purposes involve the generation of scientific knowledge abroad and internationalization of education, developing its industry capacities, ensuring its national security as well as solving global problems and achieving sustainable development. Germany SD is oriented towards almost all the regions of the world and in different areas. Regarding its relations with Brazil, the countries have cooperated in Science, Technology and Innovation (ST&i) since 1969, firstly with focus on the nuclear area and since the 21st century towards environmental protection, management of natural resources and energy, with a focus on renewable energies and energy efficiency.

In its turn, Japan has been promoting its SD since the first decade of 21 st century and its main goal is to achieve a better position in the international order through the country's involvement in global issues and the promotion of international cooperation in ST&I. Japan is already an outstanding player considering ST&I indicators, especially when it refers to patents and R&D investments. However, there are challenges to be overcome, such as shortage of human resources, necessity of more R&D public investment and integration between public and private sectors. In terms of ST&I bilateral relations with Brazil, it should be mentioned, on the one hand, the development of important international cooperative initiatives over the years, but on the other, it is observed that there is still a gap in their interactions and possibilities of improvement.

Finally, Switzerland, one of the most innovative countries in the world, has an organized SD system, which is based on a broad dialogue with the actors responsible for its implementation, serving domestic interests. The country has strategies aimed at higher professional training, scientific renewal, human medicine and innovation. However, the priority areas of its SD initiatives are not specified. In the same way, swiss actors of SD in the world and in Brazil are also unclear about their purposes. Although a vague discourse on building networks among the innovation actors prevails, there is no indication of a delimited purpose.

Considering the points mentioned at the panel, we observe the importance of ST&I for the countries' development and how SD can be an useful instrument in order to achieve a more sophisticated position in this sphere. Therefore, researches about this latest topic are very welcome in International Relations.

Catarina in 2016. Our proposal is to advance in interdisciplinary research on the interfaces between International Relations and Science, Technology and Innovation, including applied research and service activities aiming at promoting an active and rational internationalization of regional and national innovation system's actors. See more at: <http://ricti.ufsc.br/>.

Current innovation cycle reaffirms soundness of financial technology in Brazil

Caliel Calves da Costa¹²

Before the start of its formal activities this year, the organization of InnSciD - The São Paulo School of Advanced Science in Science and Innovation Diplomacy - provided the public a week full of relevant discussions on essential topics to understand the complex period we are going through and its challenges. Among the proposed debates, that of financial technology stood out for providing reflections and possible solutions to the difficulties that Brazil is going through with the severe financial crisis it faces. In addition, alternative routes to envision greater cooperation between nations were also discussed.

The panel of speakers was composed of: Dr. Marcelo Barbosa (Chairman of CVM - Brazilian Securities Commission - *local *SEC*) representing the regulators of the financial market in Brazil; Dr. Ingrid Barth (Executive Director of ABFintechs and Founder of Linker) representing the market; and Secretary Pedro Ivo Silva (Diplomat in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil) representing the State and its efforts to advance the innovation agenda in the area. In their comments, the guests were very successful in bringing to light essential aspects of the current Brazilian reality and the paths that would allow the contemporary innovation cycle in financial technology to be enhanced and accelerated by diplomatic and cooperation efforts. In this opportunity, we will discuss how the current innovation cycle reaffirms the solidity and consistency of the state of financial technology in Brazil.

Secretary Pedro Ivo Silva, in his remarks, explained that the country has been adopting in the last decades several measures focusing on the strategic dimension of scientific diplomacy and innovation for this purpose, either through negotiations, or through the mapping of international good practices. As an example, the diplomat mentioned *PIX* - a new method for making instant payments that will work uninterruptedly launched by the Central Bank of Brazil (*Bacen*) in order to lower the cost of payments and bank transfers. This new tool comes to make the already consistent Brazilian banking system more flexible and less bureaucratic, and in its development it had clear inspirations in successful experiences abroad mapped by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, such as the already mature “*Immediate Payment Service*” (India) and “*Zelle*” (USA), founded in 2017.

Similarly, during the discussions, Dr. Ingrid Barth indicated that “*Open Banking*” – a system in which the users have possession of their data, making it possible to transfer the information to any platforms they use - is a tool analyzed by *Bacen* based on similar systems in the United Kingdom. Once again indicating how the dialogue between nations can provide essential developments for the progress of the national financial agenda.

Additionally, Dr. Marcelo Barbosa recovered mature discussions occurring at CVM in his argument. According to Barbosa, the Brazilian regulatory environment is also safe, stable and predictable, because it accepts the challenges that international experience brings with a pioneering and proactive attitude. He illustrated this point indicating the great responsibility for which CVM has been debating *blockchain* technology and issues related to *Bitcoin* and its regulation since 2017. To make a complimentary point to this thought, we can also mention the conversations about the *regulatory sandbox* - which, according to *Bacen*, is an initiative that allows institutions that are already authorized and those not yet authorized by *Bacen* to test innovative projects (new products, services or business models) with real customers, subject to specific regulatory requirements.

¹² Caliel Calves holds a bachelor's degree in international relations from the University of São Paulo (USP) and is a researcher at the USP-OAS Electoral Observatory. He is currently a government relations consultant and political risk analyst. In addition to integrating education and political renewal organizations such as Legisla Brasil and Politize!

It is important to mention that for this innovation cycle to be effective; attention is needed to some relevant changes both in the scope of institutional policy and in regulatory issues. From a political point of view, it is essential that the structural reform agenda (Tax Reform and Administrative Reform) is able to progress strongly in the coming years, so Brazil can go back to being considered a safe destination for foreign investment and achieving fiscal balance. In addition, it is also necessary to implement the General Law on the Protection of Personal Data (LGPD) responsibly, so that the initiatives and enterprises in the country can have a solid regulatory basis in their data processing procedures.

Finally, as Dr. Ingrid Barth mentioned in her statements, there is no innovation without international cooperation. For this reason, it is necessary for the State structure to invest in new engagement strategies alongside its allies and commercial partners to continue its efforts, both domestically and internationally, in learning and incorporating, with due diligence, optimal solutions for the national reality. Thus, the State will be able to promote a greater inclusion of the population in banking services, and make the Brazilian financial ecosystem more competitive, considering that traditional organizations in the sector will have to readjust to the new needs of the population and to the strong competitors in the technology market.



Análise CAENI. Publicação do Centro de Estudos das Negociações Internacionais (NAP-Caeni), Instituto de Relações Internacionais da USP.

Coordenação científica: Amâncio Jorge de Oliveira.

Colaboradores: Cristiane de Andrade Lucena Carneiro, Janina Onuki, João Paulo Cândia Veiga, Pedro Feliú Ribeiro.

Assistente executiva: Vanessa Munhoz

Site: www.caeni.com.br

E-mail: caeni@caeni.com.br

Facebook: www.facebook.com/caeni.usp

InnSciD SP: <https://innscidsp.com>