

DAILY RADAR

QUIET-DAY EDITION / ONE BASE READING / PRIMARY-SOURCE LED

**TODAY IN ONE
SENTENCE**

No material new development was found in the last 24-72 hours; the useful move today is to turn AI literacy from tool familiarity into observable judgement, responsibility and agency.

EDITORIAL JUDGEMENT

A quiet day is information, not an empty page

FACT

The review found no new primary-source development in the monitoring window that materially changes, confirms or challenges yesterday's edition. Items located were mainly scheduled courses, events, previously reported implementation dates or secondary commentary.

EVIDENCE AND LIMITS

This is a bounded search judgement, not proof that nothing happened anywhere. Publication and indexing delays are possible. Repeating yesterday's EU enforcement, UNAM assessment and agent-security items without new evidence would create volume rather than insight.

PROJECT CONNECTION - INFERENCE

The radar is more useful when silence remains visible. Selectivity protects attention and prevents announcements, marketing and isolated claims from becoming project premises.

BASE READING / EDUCATION

AI literacy is broader than knowing how to use a tool

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS

The 2026 OECD-European Union framework defines AI literacy through technical knowledge, durable skills and attitudes that let learners engage with, create with, manage and shape AI while evaluating benefits, risks and ethical implications. It explicitly says that simply interacting with AI tools neither develops nor demonstrates those competences.

QUALITY AND LIMITS

This is an authoritative, internationally reviewed, non-binding framework for primary and secondary education. It is a curriculum and policy guide, not causal evidence that its proposed competences improve learning. Adaptation is required for higher education, professional education and Brazilian conditions.

WHY IT MATTERS

It reinforces the project's distinction between visible performance and genuine capability. AI literacy should include explaining system limits, checking outputs, choosing when not to delegate, considering affected people and retaining responsibility for decisions.

FOR A PROFESSOR

Redesign one activity so students must show four roles: engage with an AI output, create or revise with it, manage its risks and boundaries, and shape the final decision with a justified human choice.

FOR A PROCESS ENGINEER

Add an AI-literacy gate before automation: can the process owner explain the model's role, identify failure modes, verify outputs, define escalation and stop the system? Tool fluency alone is not operational control.

BRAZIL WATCH / FIXED DAILY SECTION

No material change; keep privacy-centred experimentation under observation

STATUS

No material Brazilian development was found in the last 72 hours. The latest meaningful signal remains the ANPD's 27 July 2026 publication of the English version of its Technology Radar on Generative AI, originally released on 21 July. The MEC AI-in-Education regulatory sandbox also remains relevant, with no new public result located today.

EVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The ANPD and MEC pages are primary institutional sources. The ANPD radar maps risks; it is not binding regulation or evidence that safeguards work in practice. The MEC sandbox is designed to generate evidence, but public test results are not yet available.

EDUCATOR	ENGINEER / PROFESSIONAL	CITIZEN
Treat student data, provenance and the right to understand automated decisions as part of learning design. Ask what Brazilian evidence will show that an educational AI helps learning rather than only task completion.	Map personal-data flows, permissions, logs, retention and accountable owners before integrating AI. A pilot should have measurable learning or service outcomes, not only adoption metrics.	Privacy-centred governance matters before a comprehensive AI law is complete. Watch whether experimentation is transparent, contestable and accessible beyond well-resourced institutions.

WHAT TO WATCH NEXT

MEC publication of sandbox selections or tests; ANPD work on deepfakes and generative AI; movement of PL 2338/2023; and evidence about unequal access to infrastructure, training and effective redress.

SYNTHESIS

Capability must become observable, not assumed

Today's reading does not change a core project premise. It sharpens an operational question: what evidence would show that a learner or professional can engage, create, manage and shape AI responsibly - rather than merely obtain a polished output? A useful next step is to make those competences visible in one assessment or process review.

REFLECTION QUESTION

If AI literacy is not tool use, what behaviour would convince you that a student or professional can still judge, refuse and take responsibility when the tool is persuasive but wrong?

DIRECT SOURCES

[OECD / European Union - Empowering Learners for the Age of AI \(2026\)](#)
[Brazil ANPD - Technology Radar on Generative AI \(27 July 2026\)](#)
[Brazil MEC - AI-in-Education regulatory sandbox](#)