Summary output

Ethical issues in international and interdisciplinary collaborations

UKRIO roundtable | 28 April 2026

Executive summary

International and interdisciplinary research collaborations play an increasingly important role in addressing complex scientific, societal, and global challenges. By bringing together diverse expertise, perspectives, and resources, such collaborations can generate innovative approaches and produce research with significant impact. However, they can also create ethical challenges that are difficult to anticipate and navigate, particularly where collaborators operate across different disciplinary traditions, institutional structures, regulatory environments, and cultural contexts.

Quick guide

- Guest presentations
- Key discussion themes
- Recommendations arising from the roundtable
- List of roundtable attendees
- Further reading

To explore these challenges, UKRIO convened a roundtable discussion in April 2026, bringing together participants with expertise in research ethics, integrity, governance, and collaborative research from institutions across the UK and internationally. Drawing on experiences from a range of disciplinary, institutional, and national contexts, participants discussed the ethical challenges arising in international and interdisciplinary collaborations and considered approaches to supporting responsible and effective collaborative practice.

This report summarises the key insights arising from the discussion. It examines the ethical challenges identified by participants, highlights examples of emerging and promising practice, and presents a set of practical recommendations developed by UKRIO, informed by the perspectives and experiences shared by participants. Together, these findings aim to support researchers, institutions, funders, and policymakers in strengthening the ethical foundations of international and interdisciplinary research collaborations.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Key findings

Participants emphasised that ethical challenges in collaborative research are rarely resolved through formal procedures alone. While ethics review, governance frameworks, and institutional policies provide an important foundation, many ethical issues arise during research implementation and require ongoing reflection, dialogue, and adaptation.

Four themes emerged consistently throughout the discussion:

1. Ethics is a process, not a checkpoint

Ethical practice requires continual engagement throughout the research lifecycle.

2. Power imbalances create ethical challenges

Imbalances in funding, decision-making, authorship, and recognition can affect the fairness and integrity of collaborations.

3. Context matters

Ethical approaches must be sensitive to local cultures, languages, knowledge systems, and community expectations.

4. Implementation in practice is the critical gap

Translating ethical principles and guidance into practice remains difficult, particularly in complex collaborative settings.

Across these themes, participants highlighted the importance of equitable partnerships, meaningful stakeholder engagement, context-sensitive governance, and mechanisms for identifying and addressing ethical issues throughout the course of a project. The discussion underscored the need to move beyond a focus on procedural compliance and towards context-specific approaches that support ethical decision-making in practice.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Recommendations from UKRIO

Drawing on the discussion, UKRIO has identified a number of priorities for strengthening ethical practice in international and interdisciplinary collaboration.

The recommendations focus on:

- promoting equitable and mutually beneficial partnerships
- supporting context-sensitive approaches to ethical review and informed consent
- encouraging meaningful engagement with local partners, participants, and communities
- strengthening the practical implementation of ethical principles
- embedding ongoing ethical reflection throughout the research lifecycle
- creating institutional and funding environments that support responsible collaboration.

The recommendations are directed towards research teams, research ethics committees (RECs), research institutions, and funders, recognising that responsibility for ethical research is shared across the research ecosystem.

Recommendations for each audience is provided at the end of this document.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Guest presentations

The roundtable began with three short presentations from research professionals with experience in international and interdisciplinary collaborations. Drawing on their own work, each speaker highlighted an approach, strategy, or initiative for addressing ethical challenges that can arise in these research contexts.

These presentations provided both practical insights and a foundation for the wider discussions that followed. Summaries of each presentation are provided below, along with links to relevant resources.

Presentation 1:
Equitable Research Partnerships and the TRUST Code

Professor Doris Schroeder
Director of the Centre for Professional Ethics, University of Lancashire

This presentation examined ethical challenges that can arise in international research collaborations, with a particular focus on 'ethics dumping' – the transfer of unethical research practices from higher-income to lower-income settings. Drawing on case studies and real-world examples, it explored the factors that can contribute to inequitable partnerships and introduced the TRUST Code and the San Code of Research Ethics as frameworks for promoting more fair, respectful, and mutually beneficial international research collaborations.

Resources:

- TRUST Code (2018)
- The TRUST Code (video)
- San Code of Research Ethics (2017)

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Presentation 2:
Utility of Rapid Ethical Assessment in the Informed Consent Process for Multidisciplinary Research

Dr Adamu Addissie
Associate Professor of Public Health and Epidemiology, Addis Ababa University

This presentation focused on rapid ethical assessments (REAs), a research approach used to identify and address ethical considerations in settings where researchers have limited understanding of local social, cultural, and contextual realities. Using a global health research case study, it explored how REAs can strengthen collaborative research design and improve informed consent processes. The presentation highlighted practical examples of REA implementation, with particular attention to community engagement, cultural considerations, and challenges associated with obtaining informed consent in rural and resource-limited settings.

Resources:

- A mixed-methods study on perceptions towards use of Rapid Ethical Assessment to improve informed consent processes for health research in a low-income setting (2014)

Presentation 3:
GA4GH's Regulatory and Ethics Work Stream: From Principles to Implementation

Professor Ma'n Zawati
Research Director of the Centre of Genomics and Policy in the Department of Human Genetics, McGill University

This presentation highlighted the work of the Global Alliance for Genomics and Health (GA4GH) Regulatory and Ethics Work Stream (REWS) in developing practical, internationally relevant governance frameworks for genomic data sharing and emerging technologies. It demonstrated how REWS translates complex ethical and regulatory challenges – including cross-border data access, responsible data sharing, and AI-enabled genomics – into actionable, community-driven policies, tools, and guidance. Drawing on real-world initiatives, the presentation illustrated how anticipatory and adaptive governance approaches can support scientific innovation while maintaining public trust.

Resources:

- Regulatory & Ethics Work Stream (REWS)

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Key discussion themes

Following the guest presentations, attendees took part in an interactive group discussion, focused primarily on ethical challenges they had encountered in their own experiences of international and interdisciplinary collaboration. This discussion was guided by a set of questions prepared by UKRIO in advance of the event, informed by topics and suggestions submitted by attendees beforehand.

Ethics dumping

Attendees explored the concept of *ethics dumping*, introduced during Professor Doris Schroeder's presentation. Ethics dumping refers to the transfer of research practices into settings where ethical safeguards are weaker or less consistently applied. In practice, this can effectively amount to the 'export' of unethical research practices from high-income countries to lower- and middle-income countries (LMICs) (Doris Schroeder, 2019).

Ethics dumping may be intentional – where research is conducted in an LMIC that would not be permitted in a high-income country – or unintentional, resulting from limited awareness of ethical issues or weak research governance capacity in the host country (Doris Schroeder, 2017).

Examples discussed included:

- conducting research without appropriate ethics approval
- failing to involve local collaborators meaningfully
- implementing interventions without sufficient regard for local knowledge
- failing to meet commitments related to funding, authorship, or feedback to participants and communities.

Attendees suggested that real-world examples of unethical practice can be very useful in research ethics training. The open-access book *Ethics Dumping* was highlighted as a useful source of case studies.

The related concept of *helicopter research* was also introduced. This term describes when researchers from high-income or privileged backgrounds conduct projects in lower-income settings or with historically marginalised groups, with minimal or no involvement from those communities or with local researchers in the conceptualisation, design, conduct or publication of the research (Nature, 2022). Researchers effectively '*helicopter*' in and out of a setting they are not familiar with.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Shared ethical frameworks

The roundtable highlighted approaches that seek to establish common ground through shared ethical values. Frameworks such as the TRUST Code (*A Global Code of Conduct for Equitable Research Partnerships*) emphasise the values of fairness, respect, care, and honesty, which were identified based on a risk analysis of exploitation in international research collaborations.

Example articles from the TRUST Code

Fairness

Article 1: Local relevance of research is essential and should be determined in collaboration with local partners. Research that is not relevant in the location where it is undertaken imposes burdens without benefits.

Respect

Article 9: Community assent should be obtained through recognized local structures, if required locally. While individual consent must not be compromised, assent from the community may be an ethical prerequisite and a sign of respect for the entire community. It is the responsibility of the researcher to find out local requirements.

Care

Article 12: Informed consent procedures should be tailored to local requirements to achieve genuine understanding and well-founded decision-making.

Honesty

Article 20: A clear understanding should be reached among collaborators with regard to their roles, responsibilities and conduct throughout the research cycle, from study design through to study implementation, review and dissemination. Capacity-building plans for local researchers should be part of these discussions.

While there was broad agreement that these types of frameworks provide a valuable foundation, attendees highlighted the challenges of operationalising them into their day-to-day practice. They noted their effectiveness depended on meaningful engagement and ownership by those involved in the research, alongside their ability to recognise and adapt to different contexts.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Universal principles and contextual realities

A recurring theme in the discussion was the tension between universal ethical principles and the diversity of research contexts. While principles such as autonomy, beneficence, and justice are widely accepted, their application is often shaped by cultural, social, and linguistic factors.

Attendees highlighted examples including:

- the limited understanding of research processes in some communities
- the challenge of translating complex concepts into locally meaningful terms
- the importance of collective or family-based decision-making in relation to individual participation in research.

Such factors can complicate standard approaches to ethics review and informed consent, reinforcing the need for flexibility and context-sensitive approaches.

It was noted that a range of established guidance documents exist to help researchers navigate these challenges. Examples include:

- the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research (NHMRC) – *Ethical guidelines for research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples*
- the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) – *Ethics of Health Research Involving First Nations, Inuit and Métis People*.

While each of these are context-specific, they share a common emphasis on the importance of community engagement, and, in some circumstances, support approaches based on collective consent, such as seeking permission from community leadership alongside obtaining individual informed consent.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Rapid ethical assessment for context-sensitive practice

Attendees considered *rapid ethical assessment (REA)*, introduced by Dr Adamu Addissie in his presentation. This is a form of rapid ethnographic[1] assessment conducted at the beginning of a research project to help reconcile universal ethical guidance with the realities of a specific research context. REA should not be confused with rapid ethics review or approval processes. Rather, it is a brief qualitative exercise designed to map the ethical terrain of the research setting before participant recruitment begins, enabling researchers to tailor informed consent processes and other aspects of study design to local circumstances (Adamu Addissie, 2014).

REA was noted as particularly beneficial for studies involving vulnerable groups, sensitive topics, settings with limited prior exposure to research, invasive data collection, community-based research, randomised controlled trials, and longitudinal studies.

Case Study: Why might REA be required?

Dr Adamu Addissie discussed examples from Sub-Saharan Africa, where the collection of blood samples can be challenging due to local beliefs and rumours surrounding 'blood stealing' and perceptions of blood as a lifeforce. Such concerns may be exacerbated by poor understanding of the consent process, potentially resulting from:

- ineffective communication between researchers and participants
- power imbalances
- insufficient time for discussion
- limited consideration of local cultural factors during the consent process.

These examples illustrate how standard approaches to informed consent may not always be sufficient in different cultural contexts and why additional engagement may be needed.

More information on this study is available here.

[1] Ethnography is a qualitative research method in which a researcher studies a particular social/cultural group with the aim to better understand it. It is both a product and process, where the researcher actively participates in the group to gain an insider's perspective. Source: The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

The concept of *therapeutic misconception* was also discussed as a potential ethical risk. This occurs when participants have difficulty distinguishing between research and clinical care, believing that participation is intended primarily to provide treatment rather than generate new knowledge. In such circumstances, informed consent will not be fully valid.

Attendees noted that REA had been successfully employed to undertake focused engagement with communities and stakeholders before finalising study design, often including multidisciplinary research teams. This process enabled researchers to identify context-specific ethical risks and adapt their methods accordingly (Tewodros Tariku Gebresilase, 2017).

From procedural compliance to meaningful informed consent

Attendees expressed concern that current approaches to informed consent can prioritise procedural compliance over genuine participant understanding. Rather than viewing consent as a one-off event, it should be understood as an ongoing process that requires continued engagement with participants throughout the research lifecycle. This places the focus on communication that participants can understand and engage with, rather than simply the completion or compliance with procedural requirements.

Standardised participant information sheets (PIS) and consent forms (CF) can sometimes inadvertently hinder this objective. When developed without local input, these documents can include technical, legal, or regulatory language that is difficult for participants to understand. For example, UK-based research organisations frequently use standard consent document templates. Data protection officers and funders may require the inclusion of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) language, even when it may be of limited relevance or difficult to apply in non-EU settings[i].

This led to a broader discussion about the different functions that consent documentation can serve. While participant information sheets and consent forms can provide evidence that appropriate consent procedures have been followed, it was noted that consent documentation is sometimes valued more as a record of compliance and protection than as tools to support participant understanding. The primary purpose of informed consent should remain the empowerment of participants and support for informed decision-making.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Attendee quote

Consent empowers the participant; consent documents empower the researcher (and I guess to some extent the insuring institution). As risk to either researcher or participant increases, greater documentation may be needed for everyone's protection and demonstration of understanding.

In response, attendees highlighted the need for more flexible and context-sensitive approaches to obtaining informed consent, including:

- verbal explanations
- visual tools, such as illustrations
- locally relevant examples and analogies
- dynamic consent processes (e.g., eConsent), particularly for online research.

Ethics as dialogue and mediation

Throughout the discussion, attendees emphasised that ethical challenges cannot always be resolved through fixed rules or universal solutions. Instead, they often require dialogue and mediation between different perspectives, with decisions reached through discussion, negotiation, and compromise. Attendees highlighted the importance of creating spaces for these conversations, both within research teams and between researchers and RECs.

This was seen as particularly important in international and interdisciplinary collaborations, where differing disciplinary assumptions, professional norms, and cultural expectations may shape how ethical issues are understood.

Importantly, ethical disagreements were framed not as problems to be solved, but as conflicts that must be continuously managed. The concept of *agonistic pluralism* was discussed as a way of understanding situations where competing values may never fully align, and where processes depend on working through disagreements rather than eliminating them.

Attendees suggested that effective ethical mediation requires dedicated time and opportunities for discussion, reflection, and adaptation, rather than an exclusive focus on obtaining approvals. Without such spaces, meaningful mediation can be difficult to achieve in practice.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Role of research ethics committees (RECs) and research organisations

RECs were recognised as central to ethical oversight but also subject to practical limitations. Attendees noted challenges, including limited resources and access to relevant expertise in the cultural, legal, and social contexts in which research is conducted. Concerns were also raised about reliance on standard templates and the limited flexibility these can sometimes allow.

At the same time, examples were shared of committees engaging constructively with researchers through discussion, allowing amendments where new issues emerged, and helping to build mutual understanding rather than simply providing feedback. Attendees viewed these interactions as opportunities for learning, capacity building, and adaptation within research organisations.

International research was recognised as particularly complex, often involving multiple partners, stakeholders, governance requirements, and ethical frameworks. Attendees suggested that RECs should encourage discussion and mediate around ethical review feedback, particularly where research takes place across different cultural or regulatory contexts.

The value of working with local partners, including universities, community organisations, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), was also emphasised. Such partnerships were viewed as good practice for strengthening local knowledge, improving cultural understanding, and supporting researcher safety.

Finally, attendees highlighted the role of RECs and research organisations in supporting inclusive research and enabling the meaningful participation of groups often described as vulnerable or underrepresented in research[ii].

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Power dynamics in research

Power imbalances were identified as a cross-cutting issue shaping many of the ethical challenges discussed during the roundtable. Attendees highlighted disparities in control over funding, decision-making, recognition, and influence, as well as the marginalisation of local partners' perspectives and expertise. Principal investigators were seen as having a particularly important role in addressing these dynamics through decisions about partnerships, resource allocation, and collaboration structures.

Attendee quote

Principal investigators underestimate the power they have to make a difference here.

Examples of power imbalances discussed include:

- control of budgets by a single partner
- dominance of one partner's framework, priorities, or ways of working
- unequal roles, responsibilities, or authorship arrangements
- limited involvement of local researchers, communities, or other marginalised voices
- decision-making concentrated within a single institution.

Attendees emphasised that ethical practice should explicitly address inequalities in power, capacity, and influence within research collaborators. This was seen to require active capacity building, meaningful inclusion of local partners and communities, and more equitable approaches to decision-making and recognition.

Attendees also shared relevant resources and examples of good practice, including:

- The Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) – *Equitable Research Partnerships Toolkit.*
- *Operationalising a real-time research ethics approach: supporting ethical mindfulness in agriculture-nutrition-health research in Malawi*

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Data governance and fragmentation

Data governance[2] was discussed as a complex and evolving area that extends beyond policies and regulations. Attendees noted that governance can be particularly challenging in international and interdisciplinary collaborations, where researchers may be working across different legal and regulatory frameworks, institutional requirements, disciplinary norms, and expectations around data access, ownership, sharing, and reuse. Effective governance was therefore seen as requiring the coordination of roles, processes, technologies, and oversight mechanisms to maximise the value of data while ensuring its responsible use.

Attendee quote

Data governance is not just policies...it's a cross functional set of roles, policies and enabling technologies. They all work together. The idea here is to maximise the net benefit out of the data assets that we have.

Within this context, in his opening presentation Professor Ma'n Zawati identified *data fragmentation* as a significant challenge. Data may be dispersed across different systems, organisations, or jurisdictions, making it more difficult to access, govern, and use effectively[iii].

These challenges are often particularly pronounced in international research collaborations. Although the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) aims to harmonise data protection standards across Europe, differences in national legislation, regulatory requirements, and ethical guidance can still create fragmentation[iv]. Researchers working across multiple jurisdictions may therefore need to navigate differing approaches to data protection, privacy, and governance.

To address these challenges, Professor Zawati highlighted the *Framework for responsible sharing of genomic and health-related data* as a useful resource for supporting the effective and responsible sharing of genomic and clinical data. The framework promotes a harmonised, human rights-based approach to data sharing through a set of foundational principles and core governance elements.

[2] Data governance (DG) is the exercise and enforcement of policies, processes, guidelines, rules, standards, controls, roles, responsibilities and accountabilities to manage data as a strategic asset. Source: Oxford University.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Framework for Responsible Sharing of Genomic and Health-Related Data: Core elements of good data governance

Transparency

Develop clearly defined and accessible information on data sharing, including purpose, processes, procedures, and overall governance nature of the data. Ensure that a fair process for access adjudication is in place.

Accountability

Institute best practices for monitoring and responding to non-compliance e.g., data misuse, data breach, failure to obtain prior ethics review, noncompliance with security procedures.

Engagement

Facilitate contributions from the public and participants e.g., citizen engagement (e.g. UK Biobank).

Further core elements

- data quality and security
- privacy
- data protection and confidentiality
- risk-benefit analysis
- recognition and attribution
- accessibility and dissemination.

Attendees suggested that fragmentation should not be viewed solely as a problem to be eliminated. While differences in governance frameworks can create barriers to collaboration, they can also encourage dialogue and the development of shared approaches. Rather than pursuing complete uniformity, the research community should pursue a model of coordinated diversity that balances consistency with the flexibility needed to respond to different legal, ethical, and cultural contexts.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Managing evolving data security risks

Attendees highlighted that risks related to data security are often underestimated or not fully communicated, particularly in international research contexts. They emphasised the importance of being transparent with participants about potential risks and the limitations of data protection measures, recognising that data security can never be guaranteed.

This concern was linked to the rapid evolution of technology. Attendees noted that advances in analytical methods, including artificial intelligence, may increase the risk of re-identification or data triangulation, even where data has been treated as anonymised. As a result, assumptions about privacy and data protection may need to be regularly reassessed.

Discussion focused on the need for proportionate safeguards based on the sensitivity of the data, supported by effective systems for risk mitigation, monitoring, and reporting. Attendees stressed that ethical responsibility depends not only on stating that protections are in place, but also on maintaining infrastructure and governance needed to support them. They also noted that ethical ambitions must be balanced with practical realities and that implementation often requires navigating competing priorities while maintaining core ethical principles.

The Biobank breach[3] was referenced as an example of these challenges, particularly in relation to different levels of data access, such as open, registered, and controlled access.

More broadly, attendees emphasised the importance of ongoing review, flexibility, and feedback mechanisms so that governance approaches can evolve in response to emerging risks and practical experience.

[3] The Biobank in the UK is a collection of health data, given by voluntary members of the public. In 2026, datasets containing de-identified medical information for 500,000 participants were listed for sale on a Chinese website. Source: BBC.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Recommendations arising from the roundtable

Research teams

Research teams sit at the centre of many of the ethical challenges discussed during the roundtable. Attendees emphasised that ethical practice in international and interdisciplinary collaborations depends not only on formal approvals, but on how researchers engage with partners, communities, and participants throughout a project. Issues such as power imbalances, differing cultural expectations, and challenges around informed consent often emerge during implementation rather than at the design stage. The recommendations below focus on supporting meaningful engagement, context-sensitive decision-making, and ongoing ethical reflection throughout the research lifecycle.

Recommendations:

- Engage with stakeholders and communities, creating space to listen to different perspectives before making decisions.
- Open up discussion rather than rushing to decisions, and use reflection to help guide research activities.
- Adapt communication to the audience by using plain, non-technical, and accessible language.
- Use formats, examples, and explanations that are meaningful to participants and appropriate to local contexts.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the participant group, or work with collaborators who have relevant expertise.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Research ethics committees (RECs)

Attendees recognised the important role of research ethics committees in supporting ethical research while also acknowledging the practical challenges they face when reviewing projects that span different disciplines, cultures, and regulatory environments. Discussion highlighted the value of ethics review as a process of dialogue and mediation rather than solely one of oversight and compliance. The recommendations below encourage approaches that enable constructive engagement with researchers, support context-sensitive ethical review, and create opportunities for ethical issues to be explored as projects evolve.

Recommendations:

- Engage with researchers through discussion, rather than relying solely on written feedback or the application of rules.
- Use discussion and mediation to explore ethical issues and potential solutions.
- Consider flexibility in communication and consent approaches where appropriate to the research context.
- Maintain ongoing engagement with researchers, including when projects return with amendments following the identification of new issues.
- Draw on contextual and cultural expertise, including community perspectives where appropriate.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Research organisations

Research organisations play a critical role in shaping the conditions under which ethical research can take place. Participants noted that many challenges arise not because ethical principles are absent, but because organisational processes, templates, and governance requirements can be difficult to adapt to complex collaborative research environments. Organisations therefore have an important role in creating the time, flexibility, and support needed to translate ethical commitments into practice. The recommendations below focus on enabling meaningful ethical deliberation, improving coordination across governance functions, and supporting researchers working in diverse contexts.

Recommendations:

- Move beyond purely procedural approaches to ethics and create space for reflection, discussion, and mediation.
- Allow adaptation of processes, templates, and requirements to different research contexts, rather than applying them rigidly.
- Provide the time, support, and resources needed for meaningful engagement and ethical assessment.
- Recognise that ethics, data protection, and governance requirements can create practical constraints, particularly in complex or international research.
- Improve alignment between these functions, rather than relying on fixed formats that may not suit all contexts.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Research funders

The discussion highlighted how funding structures can significantly influence ethical practice in collaborative research. Decisions about what activities are funded, how success is measured, and the timescales available for project development can affect stakeholder engagement, partnership building, ethical assessment, and the management of power imbalances. Attendees emphasised that many of the activities required for ethical and equitable collaboration occur before or alongside the main research itself. The recommendations below focus on how funders can help create the conditions for responsible collaboration by supporting early engagement, ethical reflection, and the sharing of practical experience across the research community.

Recommendations:

- Support formative or upstream research activities, including stakeholder engagement and ethical assessment.
- Support the sharing of case-based experience, including both challenges and examples of successful practice.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Conclusion

The discussions summarised in this report highlight both the growing importance of international and interdisciplinary collaboration and the practical ethical challenges that can accompany it. While many of these challenges are not new, participants emphasised that they are becoming more visible and complex as research becomes increasingly global, interconnected, and dependent on collaboration across disciplinary and institutional boundaries.

By convening this roundtable, UKRIO sought to create a space for researchers, institutions, funders, and other stakeholders to share experiences, identify common concerns, and explore potential solutions. The findings demonstrate that strengthening ethical collaboration requires action across the research system – from clearer expectations and support structures to greater investment in relationship-building, cultural understanding, and ethical reflexivity throughout the research process.

UKRIO hopes that the insights and recommendations presented here will contribute to ongoing discussions across the sector and inform future policy, guidance, and practice. As patterns of collaboration continue to evolve, ensuring that research partnerships are not only effective but also ethical, equitable, and sustainable will remain an important priority for the research community.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

List of roundtable attendees

Full name	Organisation	Role
Adamu Addissie	Addis Ababa University	IRB Chair
Stephanie Allison	University College London	Assistant Director, Research Ethics Service
Natasha Awais-Dean	King's College London	Research Integrity Manager
Rachel Beaton	University of Stirling	Research Integrity & Governance Manager
Rosie Bellamy	University of Warwick	Head of Research Integrity and Quality Assurance
Matthew Billington	University of Liverpool	Research Integrity and Research Ethics Manager
Alexandra Davey	Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh	Deputy Director of Science (Research)
Ed Gerstner	Springer Nature	Director, Research Environment Alliances
Nicolas Gold	University College London	Associate Professor, Computer Science
Lyn Grove	London School of Economics and Political Science	Senior Research Ethics Manager
Liz Hales	University College Cork	Research Ethics Officer
Maura Hiney	University College Dublin	Adjunct Professor of Research Integrity
Catherine Hitchens	University of East London	Ethics, Integrity and Compliance Manager
Em Howes	Northumbria University	Research Ethics and Integrity Coordinator

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Full name	Organisation	Role
Marten Juurik	Estonian Research Council	Head of the Research Integrity Unit
Irene Kavanagh	University College Cork	Research Officer (Research Integrity & Culture)
Mary Beth Kneafsey	University of Glasgow	Head of Research Governance, Policy and Integrity
Martin Lindley	University of New South Wales, Sydney	Chair of Human Research Ethics Committee
Anthony Lockett	King's College London	Senior Lecturer
Kate Millar	University of Nottingham	Professor
Ruth Patricia Moran	Atlantic Technological University	Research Integrity Officer
Alicen Nickson	Cranfield University	Director, Academic Excellence
Hala Othman	Northumbria University	Research Ethics and Development Coordinator
Claudia Pallise Perello	Amsterdam UMC	PhD Candidate
Charlotte Pettitt	Leeds Beckett University	Research Ethics and Integrity Manager
Yashar Salamzadeh	University of Sunderland	Senior Lecturer in Digital Business
Bec Scane	Newcastle University	Research Integrity and Compliance Manager
Doris Schroeder	University of Lancashire	Director of the Centre for Professional Ethics
Pallawi Sinha	University of Suffolk	Senior Lecturer in Childhood Studies and Education
Elinor Toland	University of Glasgow	Research Integrity Adviser

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Full name	Organisation	Role
Leisha Wickham	Royal Holloway	Research Ethics and Integrity Manager
Toni Wheeler	University of Oxford	Senior Research Compliance & Strategy Manager
Ma'n Zawati	McGill University	Associate Professor, Research Director

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026

Further reading

[i] UKRI, GDPR and research – an overview for researchers
Available at: https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/policies-standards-and-data/gdpr-and-research-an-overview-for-researchers/

[ii] Doris Schroeder, n.d. 2024 *Vulnerability Revisited*
Springer Cham s.l.:Springer Cham
Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57896-0

[iii] Alexandra Jonker, T. K., n.d. *Data fragmentation, defined.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/data-fragmentation

[iv] Lawlor, R. T., 2022. The impact of GDPR on data sharing for European cancer research. *National Library of Medicine*.
Available at: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36400103/

References

Adams, M. W. K. &. T. E., n.d. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods – Ethnography.* [Online]
Available at: https://methods.sagepub.com/ency/edvol/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-communication-research-methods/chpt/ethnography#_

Adamu Addissie, G. D. M. J. N. T. A. H. M. Y. F. B. F., 2014. A mixed-methods study on perceptions towards use of Rapid Ethical Assessment to improve informed consent processes for health research in a low-income setting. *National Library of Medicine*.

Alexandra Jonker, T. K., n.d. *Data fragmentation, defined.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/data-fragmentation

Doris Schroeder, J. C. F. H. S. F. V. M., 2017. *Ethics Dumping – Case Studies from North-South Research Collaborations*. s.l.:Springer Cham.

Doris Schroeder, K. C. M. S. R. C. P. H.-K., 2019. *A Global Code of Conduct to Counter Ethics Dumping*. s.l.:Springer Cham.

Health, G. A. f. G. &., n.d. *Framework for responsible sharing of genomic and health-related data.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.ga4gh.org/framework/

Nature, 2022. *Nature addresses helicopter research and ethics dumping.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-01423-6

Tewodros Tariku Gebresilase, Z. D. G. T. T. S. T. A. A. G. D. M. N. F. T.-A. A. A., 2017. Rapid Ethical Appraisal: A tool to design a contextualized consent process for a genetic study of podoconiosis in Ethiopia. *Wellcome Open Research*.

© UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) 2026