

Artificial
Intelligence

Emerging
Technologies
& Metaverse

Internet

Platforms,
Equity & Safety

Privacy
& Security

Youth & Media

HEMISPHERES

*Exploratory Policy Debate Agenda | October
2025*

Interim Reflections on EU-LAC Digital Regulatory Learning

By Urs Gasser, João Victor Archegas, Sandra Cortesi,
Christian Fieseler, Pablo Gómez Ayerbe, Armando
Guio Español, Celina Mendes de Almeida Bottino



Funded by the
European Union

HEMISPHERES is funded by the ERASMUS-JMO-2024-NETWORKS Program.

This report only reflects the authors' view. The European Education and Culture Executive Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information this report contains.

Author(s):

Urs Gasser, Technical University of Munich
João Victor Archegas, ITS Rio
Sandra Cortesi, Technical University of Munich
Christian Fieseler, BI Norwegian Business School
Pablo Gomez Ayerbe, Technical University of Munich
Armando Guio Español, Network of Centers
Celina Mendes de Almeida Bottino, ITS Rio

SUGGESTED CITATION

Gasser, U., Archegas, J. V., Cortesi, S., Fieseler, C., Gómez Ayerbe, P., Guio Español, A., & Bottino, C. M. de A. (2025). *Interim Reflections on EU-LAC Digital Regulatory Learning*. HEMISPHERES. Technical University of Munich.
<https://hemispheres.digital/>



TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. OVERARCHING THEMES: REGULATORY LEARNING AMIDST THE “BRUSSELS EFFECT”	6
3. SELECTED POLICY DOMAINS AND COMPARATIVE APPROACHES	8
3.1. Data Protection and Digital Sovereignty	8
3.2. AI Governance and the Future of Work	9
3.3. Platform Regulation, Freedom of Expression, and Youth Protection	10
3.4. Data and AI Infrastructure: Sustainability and Governance	12
3.6. Emerging Technologies and Quantum Cooperation	13
3.7. Regulatory Experimentation and Trust	13
4. OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRANSREGIONAL COLLABORATION	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This interim report synthesizes early findings from HEMISPHERES on digital regulatory learning between the European Union (EU) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). It highlights how both regions, despite different institutional capacities and legal traditions, are converging on a shared commitment to rights-based digital governance. The analysis emphasizes that cooperation cannot be a one-way transfer of EU norms but must build on reciprocity, adaptation, and experimentation.

Key Insights:

- The “Brussels Effect” is influential but partial: LAC adapts, rather than copies, EU models, creating space for selective incorporation and legal innovation.
- Regulatory learning is a central concept: experimentation and mutual exchange, not harmonization, are the drivers of progress.
- Institutional capacity gaps in LAC - and legitimacy challenges in the EU - shape how rules are implemented and trusted.
- Emerging technologies, especially quantum, illustrate both opportunity and constraint: LAC hosts “islands of excellence” but struggles with systemic underinvestment and brain drain.

Opportunities for Cooperation:

- Data Sovereignty: Foster interoperable frameworks that enable trusted cross-border flows while protecting rights.
- Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Future of Work: Develop shared tools for social protection, algorithmic accountability, and worker data rights.
- Emerging Technologies: Launch a dedicated EU-LAC Quantum Research Fund and adapt European competence frameworks to Latin American and the Caribbean contexts.
- Regulatory Sandboxes: Create a bi-regional “sandbox federation” to test governance innovations across diverse settings.
- Youth Empowerment: Build joint observatories and co-design initiatives that empower young people rather than relying solely on restrictions.

Taken together, these pathways show how EU-LAC collaboration can foster a polycentric, inclusive model of digital governance that responds to global calls for interoperability, accountability, and rights-based oversight. The next step is to institutionalize learning through joint knowledge repositories, communities of practice, and flagship initiatives that anchor cooperation in concrete projects.

This exploratory paper is a product of HEMISPHERES, an international collaboration exploring technology, policy, and regulation across the EU and Latin America and the Caribbean. It represents the culmination of a joint effort by a Working Group of academics from both regions, reflecting the rich diversity of their experiences and opinions. While individual contributors express their views in a personal capacity and may not agree with every statement, they are united by a shared commitment to fostering mutual learning between these distinct regulatory landscapes.

1. INTRODUCTION

This interim report synthesizes initial policy insights from the various Working Groups exploratory reports of HEMISPHERES, highlighting the heterogeneous dynamics of regulatory learning and cooperation between the European Union (EU) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) - with an initial focus on Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, and Uruguay - across several key digital policy domains. While both regions share a commitment to an open and rights-based digital environment, their distinct institutional capacities, economic priorities, and legal traditions lead to varied approaches and opportunities for mutual learning [see Internet WG, Artificial Intelligence WG, Platforms, Equity & Safety WG, Privacy & Security WG, Emerging Technologies & Metaverse WG, and Youth & Media WG].

2. OVERARCHING THEMES: REGULATORY LEARNING AMIDST THE “BRUSSELS EFFECT”

The connection between EU digital regulations and digital governance in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) is often explained through what is called the ‘*Brussels Effect*.’ This means that European rules don’t just apply in Europe - they also influence global markets because big international companies tend to follow them (*de facto*), and other countries often choose to adopt them into their own laws (*de jure*) [see Internet WG]. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is a prime example of this phenomenon, arguably having become a global benchmark for data protection [see Internet WG, Privacy & Security WG]. However, the sources and recent empirical studies emphasize that LAC does not passively adopt these models; instead, it often adopts high-level orientations (e.g. lawful bases, DPIAs, DPOs), while varying scope, enforcement tools, and sequencing, mediated through concrete learning channels such as networks, conferences, and workshops, to fit local constitutional, legal, and socio-political contexts [see Internet WG, Privacy & Security WG]. The practical need to prioritize the implementation and enforcement capacities associated with such regimes within the constraints of available resources is another factor that shapes adaptation. This adaptive process, characterized by selective incorporation and legal innovation, offers initial lessons for global data governance dynamics, highlighting the importance of regulatory flexibility, cultural embeddedness, and democratic legitimacy [see Privacy & Security WG].

Regulatory learning, a concept recently promoted by governance scholars, emerges as a helpful normative concept, advocating for embracing diverse regulatory approaches as opportunities for experimentation and discovery, rather than a premature push for universal standards [see Internet WG, AI WG]. It involves gathering, analyzing and utilizing any evidence or knowledge relevant to current or future regulatory policy, typically produced through the process of experimenting with innovative regulatory approaches. This is particularly relevant given that LAC countries often cannot (and arguably should not) simply “copy-paste” EU rules due to differing institutional capabilities, administrative, budgetary, and human resource constraints, as well as being influenced by both European and U.S. norms [see Internet WG]. The challenge, then, is to achieve

such learning more systematically by understanding both the type of information generated through experimentation in the EU and LAC, and how it shapes the regulatory process in both regions.

3. SELECTED POLICY DOMAINS AND COMPARATIVE APPROACHES

3.1. Data Protection and Digital Sovereignty

Data protection frameworks are critical for safeguarding fundamental rights and fostering innovation [see Privacy & Security WG]. Europe's regulatory maturity, stemming from decades of experience culminating in the comprehensive GDPR, offers insights for other regions [see Privacy & Security WG]. LAC, inspired by European precedents, has seen multiple waves of data protection legislation since the 1990s, with Brazil's LGPD being a prominent example of a GDPR-inspired law [see Privacy & Security WG]. While these laws often incorporate GDPR provisions like extraterritorial reach, Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs), and Data Protection Officers (DPOs), they also exhibit at least degrees of normative autonomy, adapting principles to local realities [see Privacy & Security WG, Privacy & Security WG]. An example of divergence is the regional treatment of the “right to be forgotten,” which in LAC often clashes with deeply entrenched rights to truth and public memory, especially in post-authoritarian societies [see Privacy & Security WG].

Challenges in institutional architecture for data protection are shared across both regions, particularly in establishing and sustaining independent and well-resourced Data Protection Authorities (DPAs) [see Privacy & Security WG]. While the GDPR mandates DPA independence, funding dependencies may invite political influence [Privacy & Security WG]. LAC-based DPAs, some of which are dual-purpose agencies overseeing both freedom of information and data protection, frequently operate with tight budgets and personnel, straining their focus and credibility [see Privacy & Security WG]. The dissolution of Mexico's formerly independent DPA in 2024 serves as an illustration of how political shifts can impact the operation of independent regulatory agencies [see Privacy & Security WG].

Digital sovereignty - an amorphous and contested concept - has become a strategic priority for many states seeking to strengthen their control over digital content and infrastructure in order to protect their national values and interests. This concern is not only a response to geopolitical dynamics between countries, but also to the growing power exercised by a small number of large technology corporations [see Internet WG]. While in the EU context it is often framed as a response to foreign tech dominance and a mechanism to uphold democratic values, LAC's heterogeneous pursuit of digital sovereignty is intertwined with struggles for autonomy in governance and economic development [see Internet WG, Privacy & Security WG].

Closely related is data sovereignty, which can be broadly understood as the right of nations or regions to regulate data handling and transfer within their jurisdictions [Privacy & Security WG]. While the EU has developed a highly institutionalized framework aimed at asserting control over the collection, processing, and transfer of data related to its residents - through mechanisms such as data localization mandates, cross-border transfer restrictions, and stringent corporate accountability requirements (InCountry, 2025) - most LAC countries take a heterogeneous pursuit to data governance. [Privacy & Security WG].

3.2. AI Governance and the Future of Work

AI governance is a critical area for regulatory learning. The emergence of AI Safety Institutes (AISIs), for instance, marks a promising, albeit fragile regulatory innovation, initially focusing on mitigating existential and systemic risks [see AI WG]. However, there is an increasing need to broaden the definition of "AI safety" to incorporate broader and varied societal concerns like fairness, labor rights, and regional inequalities, especially those relevant to the Majority World [AI WG].

The EU has established a distinctive approach through the EU AI Office, which integrates technical expertise with regulatory support, combining the evaluation of general-purpose AI models with compliance coordination under the AI Act [see AI WG]. The European Centre for Algorithmic Transparency (ECAT), for instance, complements this core capacity by conducting algorithmic audits and risk assessments for large online platforms [see AI WG]. LAC can learn from Europe's model by establishing scientifically grounded institutions and fostering proximity

to regulatory processes [see AI WG]. However, chronic underfunding of AI research and policy institutions in the Majority World remains a significant challenge, potentially limiting their influence on the global AI agenda [see AI WG].

Regarding AI's impact on the future of work - among the most significant policy concerns related to AI - both regions are grappling with uncertainties around job displacement, productivity enhancement, and the transformation of labor markets [see AI WG]. However, they are doing so from different starting points. European policy makers seek to manage workforce transitions within a developed, formalized economy through policies emphasizing reskilling, lifelong learning, and a risk-based regulatory framework [see AI WG]. In contrast, LAC lags significantly in AI adoption and investment due to structural barriers such as a severe digital divide, high labor market informality, and substantial skills gaps [see AI WG]. Policies in LAC tend to prioritize foundational prerequisites like investing in digital infrastructure, addressing skills deficits, and promoting formalization [see AI WG].

The rise of digital platforms and “gig work” presents a complex challenge in both regions, but especially in LAC. Digital platforms have transformed various sectors in the region, including domestic care, governance, and the gig economy. While they promise to formalize employment in a region where job informality is widespread, ensuring workers’ rights and establishing legislation remain challenging due to the ambiguous nature of the workforce. Ultimately, these new forms of labor, often underpinned by AI-driven algorithmic management and precarious data work, adds another layer of complexity to existing labor protection issues, particularly within LAC’s informal economy [see AI WG, Platforms, Safety and Equity WG].

3.3. Platform Regulation, Freedom of Expression, and Youth Protection

Platform regulation has evolved significantly in the EU, from early “safe harbor” provisions inspired by the U.S. model (Section 230 Communication Decency Act) to vastly more comprehensive and restrictive frameworks [see Platforms WG]. The EU’s Digital Services Act (DSA) represents a major milestone in this respect, establishing due diligence, transparency, and risk-mitigation obligations for intermediaries, with stricter norms for Very Large Online Platforms (VLOPs) [see

Platforms WG]. The DSA aims to strike a balance between safeguarding freedom of expression and addressing societal harms by limiting government interference to judicial takedowns and implementing safeguards around content moderation processes [see Platforms WG]. From a comparative perspective, a major difference is institutional capacity: the EU has specialized bodies like the DSA Board, whereas many LAC state agencies lack the necessary technical resources, political stability, or autonomy to demand transparency and accountability from large platforms [Platforms WG].

In LAC, the regulation of digital platforms is in the process of consolidation, with a rough consensus on the need to regulate how platforms manage their internal content policies, emphasizing transparency and accountability [see Platforms WG]. Countries like Brazil have set benchmarks with the rights-focused Marco Civil da Internet (2014). However, the region has largely struggled to effectively balance free speech with online content regulation, partly due to the difficulty of negotiating with powerful platforms given GDP disparities [see Platforms WG]. Legal frameworks in LAC are still evolving, and so are related concerns that laws which address challenges with ambiguous tools may lead to restrictions on freedom of expression [see Platforms WG].

Youth protection in the digital environment is a shared concern, encompassing issues like mobile phone use in schools, social media access, age verification, and parental controls [Youth WG]. Europe, through frameworks like the DSA and GDPR, has introduced robust provisions for child safety [Youth WG]. Several European countries are moving towards stricter age verification systems, with the EU exploring the use of the EU Digital Identity Wallet for age verification. On the other side of the Atlantic, Brazil has enacted a national law prohibiting mobile phone use in schools, aligning with international policies.

Other LAC countries like Uruguay face unique challenges in implementing device bans due to existing digital inclusion initiatives like Plan Ceibal, which integrate technology into education [see Youth WG]. While platforms like Meta and Google are implementing new features for “Teen Accounts” and parental controls, these measures also serve to preempt criticism and regulatory pressure [see Youth WG].

The coexistence of different - and often non-interoperable - youth protection strategies and laws across countries and regions can result in a fragmented regulatory landscape. Divergent rules across jurisdictions pose significant

challenges to platform compliance efforts, and may result in uneven levels of protection for youth depending on their geographic location.

Beyond restrictive measures like bans, a comprehensive approach to youth digital well-being requires fostering collaborative platforms, such as a Europe-Latin America and the Caribbean Forum on Youth & Digital Regulation, to engage diverse stakeholders, including young people themselves. This broader perspective emphasizes the importance of cultural and educational mediation strategies, alongside technical solutions, to empower youth and families with the skills and understanding needed to navigate digital environments confidently.

3.4. Data and AI Infrastructure: Sustainability and Governance

Data is a critical asset for AI development, and data governance frameworks are deeply intertwined with AI development and governance [see AI WG]. Challenges include growing concerns that existing data governance frameworks are insufficient for AI's data utilization, leading to fragmented regulation and potential for biased outcomes [see AI WG]. Treating AI as digital public infrastructure (DPI) is proposed to reframe it not as a private commodity but as a public good, ensuring democratic governance, participatory oversight, and inclusive access. This is considered crucial for maintaining societal sovereignty over technological infrastructures [see AI WG].

LAC faces significant challenges with insufficient AI infrastructure and a lack of cohesive data governance strategies, often relying on foreign cloud services, which raises concerns over data sovereignty and operational costs [see AI WG]. The Latin American Artificial Intelligence Index (ILIA, 2024) highlights regional disparities and challenges in retaining AI talent and establishing strong governance. Energy consumption for AI models and data centers is another pressing concern, particularly in regions with unevenly distributed renewable energy sources like LAC [see AI WG].

The increasing use of AI in creative industries has also raised concerns about copyright laws and authorship recognition [see AI WG]. While the EU AI Act imposes transparency requirements regarding training data usage for general-purpose AI models, LAC's regulatory responses remain nascent and by

and large fragmented [see AI WG]. More recently, however, LAC countries are beginning to address this challenge. Brazil’s PL 2338/2023, along with similar legislative proposals in Chile and Colombia, is a prime example, as it proposes requiring disclosure of copyrighted material in AI training and fair compensation for rights holders. Globally, the U.S. plays an influential role in shaping normative expectations around AI and copyright, with litigation and policy experimentation likely to influence both the EU and LAC [see AI WG].

3.6. Emerging Technologies and Quantum Cooperation

Emerging technologies such as neurotechnology, immersive systems, and quantum technologies illustrate both opportunities and constraints for EU-LAC regulatory learning. In LAC countries, national strategies and research initiatives are beginning to emerge, with Argentina, Chile, and Colombia among the early movers and universities in Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina producing significant output. Yet persistent challenges - including underinvestment, fragmented ecosystems, and risks of brain drain - limit the ability to translate these efforts into sustainable innovation pathways [see Emerging Tech WG].

The EU, by contrast, has developed structured initiatives such as the Quantum Flagship and the European Competence Framework for Quantum Technologies (CFQT), which align education, research, and industrial development.

For LAC countries, the challenge is not replication but adaptation: cooperation must link these frameworks to regional priorities in health, agriculture, and energy, ensuring that innovation advances are grounded in local needs. This makes emerging technologies, and quantum in particular, a revealing case study of how regulatory learning depends on both structural capacity and reciprocal exchange [see Emerging Tech WG].

3.7. Regulatory Experimentation and Trust

Regulatory sandboxes are emerging as critical policy instruments for managing technological change in a controlled and iterative manner [see Privacy & Security WG]. In LAC, different types of sandboxes, such as Brazil’s Attorney General’s Office (AGU) and Colombia’s AI sandbox, are increasingly viewed as “learning infrastructures” that actively inform broader policy and regulatory development

[see Privacy & Security WG]. Somewhat in contrast, the EU's approach to sandboxes is narrower and legalistic, with the AI Act mandating regulatory sandboxes at the member state level while providing limited implementation guidance. These dynamics and nuances suggest a significant opportunity for mutual learning, with LAC potentially benefiting from the EU's established regulatory infrastructure and the EU learning from LAC's more flexible and participatory models [see Privacy & Security WG]. Both regions are currently in the process of proposing regional cooperation models on regulatory sandboxes. This creates an opportunity not only to learn from each other's experiences, but also to develop common methodologies - potentially paving the way for an ambitious transatlantic experimentation initiative in the near future.

The premise that regulatory frameworks can directly foster public trust is widely debated in the realm of data protection [see Privacy & Security WG]. While regulation can mitigate risks and increase transparency, trust is a complex, relational phenomenon that cannot be fully engineered by law alone [see Privacy & Security Working Group]. In Europe, the GDPR aims to cultivate trust through strong individual rights and independent oversight, but public trust remains variable. In LAC, trust-building efforts often foreground public engagement, transparency, and social justice concerns due to their human rights traditions [see Privacy & Security WG]. This offers opportunities for cross-regional insights into how trustworthiness is cultivated through consistent, inclusive, and accountable governance, rather than merely legislated [see Privacy & Security WG].

4. OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRANSREGIONAL COLLABORATION

In addition to existing divergences, the EU and LAC share common goals and face similar dilemmas, opening opportunities for mutual regulatory learning and cooperation. Areas for collaboration that have surfaced in the Working Group exploratory papers emerge at different levels of the “policy stack” and range from strategic to more implementation-oriented. They include the following:

- ***Nuanced Approaches to Data Sovereignty:*** Both regions are working to reconcile cross-border data use with fundamental-rights safeguards and strategic autonomy. Areas of collaboration include fostering interoperable frameworks that support trusted cross-border data flows while safeguarding personal data and privacy rights, avoiding rigid data localization policies when unnecessary. Initiatives like the Red Iberoamericana de Protección de Datos (RIPD) and the MERCOSUR Framework Agreement on Electronic Commerce promote regulatory convergence and cross-border data flows in LAC, which aligns with the EU’s strategic priorities. It is also time to deepen cooperation on shared infrastructure mechanisms and public-private data sharing arrangements. Developing protocols to facilitate such collaboration would further support interoperability and trust across sectors.
- ***Connectivity & Net Neutrality:*** An open Internet is a policy objective in both regions, yet implementation and enforcement diverge. The EU applies a regional Open Internet regime (with BEREC guidance and case-law that generally limits zero-rating), while LAC frameworks are heterogeneous and shaped by access and affordability constraints. Debates also differ in emphasis, from Europe’s “fair-share” funding and 5G rollout to LAC’s access-first priorities and rural connectivity gaps. Cooperation can focus on a joint, evidence-driven learning track that compares EU case-law with LAC practice and tests context-sensitive options against shared openness, competition, and affordability metrics.
- ***Privacy by Design (PbD) and “Dark Patterns”:*** Both regions are grappling with how interface and system design can either protect or undermine user rights. While Privacy by Design (PbD) is enshrined in the GDPR and has been incorporated into the legal frameworks of countries such as Brazil and Chile, implementation varies widely, with many systems lacking proactive safeguards

from the outset. At the same time, manipulative design practices - or “dark patterns” - continue to erode user autonomy and trust. Here, LAC’s strong consumer protection traditions and rights-based legal frameworks position it well to contribute to this agenda. A joint EU-LAC effort could advance design standards that integrate PbD principles while explicitly countering dark patterns. Such collaboration could include interoperable maturity-level assessments of PbD implementation, cross-regional sharing of research on manipulative design, and co-development of guidelines that make privacy-enhancing and user-respecting interfaces the default. By linking these two design challenges, cooperation can move beyond compliance toward a more holistic vision of trustworthy and rights-based digital environments.

- ***AI and the Future of Work:*** Both regions face AI-driven automation and the platformization of work, which disproportionately affects lower-income and informal workers and raises due-process, surveillance, and social-protection gaps. In Europe, policy emphasizes reskilling and social dialogue within a risk-based regime that treats employment-related AI as high-risk under the AI Act, alongside the Platform Work Directive on algorithmic management and status reclassification. In LAC, structural constraints - digital divide, informality, and skills gaps - limit diffusion of augmentation benefits even as platform/data work expands, amplifying precarity. Cooperation should therefore extend beyond training to: portable and contributory social-protection models for platform workers; interoperable worker-data access and contestability rights; shared audit and risk-assessment playbooks for algorithmic management; and comparative pilots that measure job-quality outcomes under AI and platform governance, adapted to institutional capacity in each region.
- ***Bi-Regional Quantum and Emerging Technology Cooperation:*** Emerging technologies, and quantum computing in particular, offer a strategic opportunity for deepening EU-LAC collaboration. Rather than one-way transfers of expertise, cooperation should focus on building reciprocal innovation ecosystems that align Europe’s frameworks with LAC’s application contexts. Priorities include co-developing national and regional quantum strategies, establishing a dedicated EU-LAC Quantum Research Fund to ensure joint ownership of outcomes, and adapting competence frameworks such as the CFQT to local linguistic, institutional, and socio-economic realities. Educational mobility and industrial partnerships are equally important for anchoring cooperation in practice. Programs modeled on Erasmus Mundus, as well as industry-academia

initiatives like Cemex-IBM-Monterrey Tech in Mexico and Kipu Quantum-Quantum South in Uruguay, can connect training directly to employment and applied research. By embedding reciprocity, structured return pathways, and alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (particularly in health, clean energy, and agriculture), quantum cooperation can become a flagship example of polycentric regulatory learning that strengthens both regions at the same time.

- **Sandboxes for Adaptive Governance:** Sandboxes are gaining traction in both regions as tools to manage technological innovation while safeguarding rights. Countries including Brazil, Chile, Uruguay and Colombia are considering sandboxes to inform legal reform and build institutional capacity , while EU member states are adopting more formalistic approaches under the regime of the AI Act. This asymmetry creates space for mutual learning via a “sandbox federation” with common metrics, a shared case library, and cross-participation among regulators, researchers, and firms.
- **Youth and Digital Regulation:** Policymakers in both regions are addressing the impact of the digital environment on youth. While there is general consensus on the importance of safeguarding youth in the digital environment, responses remain fragmented - examples include age-based restrictions, bans on smartphone use, screen time limits, or in-app restrictions. Many of the current interventions tend to assume specific attitudes and values, and rely on digital knowledge and skills of parents/caregivers and/or fail to match the complexity of children’s lived experiences. Measures may even restrict access to valuable opportunities for learning, connection, and expression. EU frameworks offer strong provisions on child safety, transparency, and platform accountability. LAC countries are exploring similar approaches with a focus on restrictions, including national laws prohibiting mobile phone use in schools. Collaboration might prioritize school-policy pilots with rigorous evaluation; bi-regional observatories for age verification and platform compliance; and co-development of resources and youth co-design formats that reflect lived experience and inclusion goals.

Ultimately, the overarching goal of these (and other) opportunities for collaboration identified by the initial Working Group contributions is to foster a polycentric and inclusive model of digital governance that reflects diverse societal values while responding to global calls for interoperability, accountability, and rights-based oversight in the digital age. Continued multi-stakeholder dialogue, action-oriented research collaborations, and concrete cooperation vehicles can

help shape a human- and society centered and rights-based digital order. This calls for an investment in robust infrastructures for regulatory learning, including institutional experimentation mechanisms and the design of adaptive, bridge-building institutions like a proposed EU-LAC Task Force on Regulatory Innovation in AI.

Going forward, it is crucial to institutionalize learning through joint knowledge repositories, communities of practice, and iterative dialogues so that experimentation translates into measurable and equitable policy advancement.

Learning Across Regions:

Initial High Level Takeaways from HEMISPHERES

Based on initial insights from the HEMISPHERES Working Groups, several clusters can be identified that offer opportunities for improvement in the digital governance landscape, particularly concerning the relationship and cooperation between the EU and LAC regions:

Systematized Approach for AI Cooperation: *There is a need for a systematized approach to foster cooperation, collaboration, and governance mechanisms for AI between both regions. This should include mechanisms to strengthen collaboration among diverse stakeholders from both regions, such as academics, entrepreneurs, and civil society actors, among others.*

Addressing Constraints on Regulation Adoption: *LAC countries often cannot (and should not) simply “copy-paste” EU regulations due to differing institutional capabilities, administrative, budgetary, and human resource constraints, as well as being influenced by both EU and U.S. norms. This highlights the need for adaptive rather than direct transposition of rules and methodologies that facilitate this process. Conversely, there is much that LAC can contribute to the EU, offering valuable experience and best practices for development and implementation.*

Moving Beyond “Brussels Effect” as Unilateral Power: *While the Brussels Effect is a useful concept, there’s a need to reconceptualize it by incorporating systematic political*

economy conceptions of instrumental and structural power, allowing for enhanced measurability and moving beyond simplistic views of the EU as a unitary entity.

Institutionalizing Regulatory Learning: *Regulatory learning should become a central pillar of the cooperation agenda between both regions. This includes roadmaps for the exchange of information, lessons learned, and novel (experimental) methods, as well as an examination of how such learning shapes the broader LAC and EU cooperation framework. Structures like joint knowledge repositories, policy clinics, regional summits, and dedicated communities of practice can support these activities and goals.*

Bridging Legal and Economic Differences for Cooperation: *Cooperation and regulatory learning needs to take into account different approaches, such as regionally divergent legal instruments for international collaboration, and disparities in economic development leading to resource scarcity and a relative shortage of technological expertise in LAC. Ultimately, managing the resources and time required for capacity-building initiatives — particularly those involving advanced technologies — is essential for any successful collaboration.*

PROJECT INFORMATION

CALL: ERASMUS-JMO-2024-NETWORKS (Jean Monnet Policy Debate)	TOPIC: ERASMUS-JMO-2024-NETWORKS-H EI-NON-EU-LATIN-AMERICA
TYPE OF ACTION: ERASMUS-LS (ERASMUS Lump Sum Grants)	PROPOSAL NUMBER: 101176829
PROPOSAL ACRONYM: HEMISPHERES	TYPE OF MODEL GRANT AGREEMENT: ERASMUS Lump Sum Grant
REPORTING PERIOD: From 01.11.2024 to 31.11.2027	TYPE OF MODEL GRANT AGREEMENT: ERASMUS Lump Sum Grant
REPORT VERSION: 1.0	DATE OF PREPARATION: 26.08.2025
BENEFICIARY ORGANIZATION: Technical University of Munich (TUM), Germany	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Urs Gasser	PROJECT COORDINATOR: Pablo Gómez Ayerbe
PROJECT COORDINATOR ORGANIZATION: Technical University of Munich (TUM), Germany	PROJECT COORDINATOR EMAIL ADDRESS: pablo.ayerbe@tum.de



Norwegian
Business School



SciencesPo.



Instituto
de Tecnologia
& Sociedade
do Rio



Technische Universität München



UASD

UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA
DE SANTO DOMINGO
Principio de América - Fundada el 20 de octubre de 1538



UCU

Universidad
Católica del
Uruguay



UNIVERSIDAD
DE CHILE

UTEC

UNIVERSIDAD DE INGENIERÍA
Y TECNOLOGÍA



CETYS
Centro de Estudios en
Tecnología y Sociedad



Universidad de
San Andrés



UNIVERSIDAD
DEL NORTE



UNIVERSIDAD DE BOCOTÁ JORGE TADEO LOZANO

UIC
barcelona



Utrecht
University