

**MEETING OF THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP
PARIS, 14-15 OCTOBER 2008**

Draft outcome of proceedings

Welcome and introduction to the meeting

Director General for higher education, Patrick Hetzel, welcomed the participants at the Sorbonne and recalled the fact that 10 years before, the Sorbonne Declaration had been adopted in the same building. The meeting would be co-chaired with the Director for European and International Relations and Cooperation, Marc Foucault.

1. Adoption of the agenda

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_1a [draft agenda]
BFUG (FR) 14_1b [draft annotated agenda]

The agenda was adopted.

2. Outcome of proceedings of the last BFUG and Board meetings

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_2a [BFUG Brdo]
BFUG (FR) 14_2b [BFUG Sarajevo]
BFUG (FR) 14_2c [Board Bled]

The outcomes of proceedings of the BFUG meetings in Brdo and Sarajevo were adopted. The BFUG also took note of the minutes of the Board meeting in Bled.

3. Information by the French Presidency

The BFUG took note of the information provided by Mr Marc Foucault, who presented the higher education part of the programme of the French EU Presidency, which focussed on two main themes: mobility and lifelong guidance (slides of presentation in annex).

4. Qualifications frameworks

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_4a [QF CG draft report]
BFUG (FR) 14_4b [Synthesis of NQF reports]

Sjur Bergan (Council of Europe), chair of the qualifications frameworks coordination group presented two documents: (1) a synthetic overview of the state of development of national qualifications frameworks in the different countries; and (2) a draft report of the coordination group (slides of presentation in annex).

He urgently requested those countries that have not designated yet a national correspondent for their national qualifications framework to do so as soon as possible and to communicate the coordinates to the Bologna Secretariat.

BFUG took note of the information and agreed largely with the conclusions of the report. Several delegations underlined the importance of progress in developing the qualifications frameworks for the EHEA. The implementation of qualifications frameworks remains a priority action line for the years to come and should as such be mentioned in the Bologna Beyond 2010 report. More discussion is needed on which concrete actions should be included in the next period. Given the fact that the deadline of 2010 for having the national qualifications frameworks in place seems to have been too ambitious for a large number of countries across the European Higher Education Area, the question was raised whether the Ministers should not revisit the timing of implementation. It was

proposed to introduce a staggered deadline to avoid a rushed or superficial implementation that would be detrimental to the quality of national qualifications frameworks, while at the same time not losing momentum.

The BFUG is invited to attend the Bologna seminar on qualifications frameworks, co-organised by Georgia and the Council of Europe, Tbilisi, 27-28 November 2008.

The BFUG also took note of the proposal to organise a conference on qualifications frameworks in Ireland in autumn 2009.

The discussion will be continued during the Czech Presidency. The final report will be submitted for approval at the February 2009 BFUG meeting.

5. Report of the ENIC-NARIC working group on the analysis of the National Action Plans for Recognition

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_5 [ENIC-NARIC report]

The BFUG took note of the presentation of the report (see annex) by Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia) and shared the conclusion that recognition should remain a priority for the following decade. The analysis of the national action plans for recognition showed that most so-called action plans were in fact more overviews of the current state of affairs. The main messages of the report, including that substantial effort is needed to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention are truly reflected in the actual recognition practices, should be integrated in the Bologna Beyond 2010 report and should also be reflected in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué. It was agreed to draw up a list of decisions to be taken under Czech Presidency to allow delegations to consult at home and to formulate a position.

6. Draft report of the BFUG working group on employability

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_6 [preliminary empl. WG report]

The BFUG took note of the presentation of the draft report by Rachel Green (UK), chair of the employability working group. The report draws upon a small survey conducted among BFUG members. BFUG was informed that the responses would be published on the Bologna website shortly after the meeting. BFUG members that had not submitted their responses yet or would like to provide updates still had the opportunity to do so. One of the most important recommendations of the report: at national level further communication is needed to ensure that the Bologna Process is widely known and understood. BFUG members were invited to participate in the employability seminar to be held in Luxembourg, 6-7 November 2008, and to encourage employers to do the same.

7. Draft report of the BFUG working group on European higher education in a global setting

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_7 [preliminary Global WG report]

Barbara Weitgruber (Austria), chair of the working group, presented the draft report. The BFUG was asked to react on the conclusions and recommendations, except for the question of the possible status for third countries, which was to be discussed under item 9 of the agenda.

The BFUG generally welcomed the report, especially the inclusion of the proposal made at the Sarajevo meeting to establish policy fora for dialogue between the EHEA and other parts of the world. A first such meeting will take place on 29 April 2009 but the modalities for future fora should be fleshed out. There was agreement that communication on the Bologna Process to the wider world should not be limited to explaining structural reforms, but should also take a comprehensive approach of the Bologna Process through its principles: stakeholder involvement, academic freedom and institutional autonomy, cooperation, education as a public responsibility etc. It was also suggested that dialogue should not be limited to Ministers only but should involve all

stakeholders. In future, policy fora could take place in the margins of Ministerial conferences or throughout a work programme period and at various levels. The Chair of the working group invited the delegations to submit further editorial comments on the draft report in writing by the end of the month.

8. Update on independent assessment of the Bologna Process

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_8 [update independent assessment]

Peter van der Hijden (European Commission) referred to the document prepared by the Bologna Secretariat on the selection of tender and the kick-off meeting and informed the BFUG that more content-related information on the research project would follow soon.

The European Commission and the BFUG representatives in the advisory board will make sure that the BFUG will be kept informed throughout the entire duration of the project. It was confirmed that the 12 in-depth cases to be selected will include both EU and non-EU countries and countries that joined the Bologna Process at different moments in time.

9. Preparing the 2009 report on Bologna Beyond 2010

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_9 [draft Beyond 2010 report with comments]
BFUG (FR) 14_9a [issues for discussion]

The Chair introduced the methodology of the discussion. In advance of the meeting, several delegations had proposed concrete amendments to the draft report, a large number of which can simply be taken over. There were, however, divergent opinions on several issues, where a decision of the BFUG was necessary. The Bologna Secretariat had therefore prepared a paper with issues for discussion in order to facilitate the discussion.

General comments

- Coherence is needed between the Bologna Beyond 2010 report and the conclusions and reports of the working/coordination groups.
- Throughout the document the term "higher education institution" should be used instead of "university".
- The report needs more focus.
- Chapter 4, which will contain the core messages for the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, needs to flow from the earlier chapters of the document.

Discussion on issues

(A) What kind of cooperation/regulation do we need at European level? Who does what? What are the different responsibilities at the various levels?

Introduction

Some delegations argue that it would be wrong to equate the existence of new legislation with progress. On the other hand the Sarajevo meeting advocated the drafting of a mobility code and the issuing of a statement by ministers to redefine the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in a system defining higher education as a public good. Those are tools that could be defined as "soft law instruments" which (re-)define the governance of the system. The BFUG is asked to take position on this issue.

Discussion

There was general consensus that no new regulation is needed at European level. The focus should be on implementation of Bologna, which is a shared responsibility of governments and other stakeholders, the academic community in particular. There is an evolution to a European landscape of autonomous higher education institutions. Roles and responsibilities of actors are changing, higher education institutions have to take more responsibility now, e.g. for recognition. Autonomy of institutions does not exclude responsible action by governments and accountability of the institutions.

The issue of what should be done at which level is not an issue that needs a general answer. Which ambitious goals and targets will be set depends on the (concrete) actions.

(B) European dimension

Introduction

One delegation asks to include a reference to the "European dimension" in higher education. This concept was already included in the Bologna Declaration. However, it has not been properly defined. Is the European dimension the distinguishing characteristic(s) of European higher education? If so, what is this characteristic? Is it multilingualism, is it the collaborative system of the Bologna Process, is it the broad research basis of most HEIs, or is it a system of values? Are we therefore talking about the "identity" of European higher education?

Discussion

In the approaches of the delegations to the issue two main trends could be distinguished:

- (1) Some delegations did not see the need to try to define the European dimension. It can be seen as the "raison d'être" of the Bologna Process, it is present in each action line of the Bologna Process, but its nature is difficult to define and would risk to be limiting rather than promoting cooperation.
- (2) Other delegations agreed with the elements mentioned in the issue paper and added more elements, i.a. social dimension, public responsibility, democratic values, research-based higher education, intercultural dialogue, diversity of languages and educational traditions, participation of students as actors of change, a "diversity able to communicate and cooperate"... In other parts of the world, the Bologna Process is perceived as a successful example of regional cooperation.

(C) Link between higher education and research

Introduction

There have been repeated references to the need for a closer link between higher education and research. The inclusion of the third cycle into the Bologna Process, the definitions underpinning this cycle and the increasing concern with the status of early stage researchers are signs of this link. However, one delegation argues that the link between higher education and research needs to be further strengthened. Is the argument one which calls for schemes to facilitate joint research projects among the HEIs of the 46 Bologna countries? The BFUG is asked to further define the concept.

Discussion

Research is a crucial topic in the context of the Bologna Process. It is i.a. directly connected with the issue of mobility and the position of young researchers/doctoral candidates.

One of the characteristics of European higher education is its connection with research, regardless of the type of higher education institution.

This vision on the nexus between higher education and research requires a broad definition of research, including the more applied forms of it.

The link between the EHEA and the ERA should be reinforced. We should, however, not ignore that the geographical scope of the ERA is much narrower than that of the EHEA, despite the openness of the EU research programmes to neighbouring regions.

(D) What do we mean by moving from structure to practice, to content, to substance?

Introduction

The general argument goes that the first ten years of the Bologna Process have been devoted to structural reforms and that the next stage will have to be devoted to actually reforming the curricula. Curricular reform is the responsibility of the institution and the various programmes are said to reflect the diversity of the institutions. Does this mean

that there is no room for European cooperation in this area? If so, should the subject then be mentioned at a European ministerial conference?

At the same time programmes leading to the awarding of diplomas related to the regulated professions (whether nationally regulated or through the directives, or through both) are not based on the principle of programme diversity. How does this affect the "movement from structure to practice/content/substance"?

Moreover the Sarajevo meeting proposed the introduction of subject descriptors. Will this proposal lead to greater convergence of programmes at the expense of diversity? What is the link between subject descriptors and qualifications frameworks?

Discussion

There was agreement that curriculum development is the competence of higher education institutions and that the academic community is to be mobilised in the first place.

The discussion concentrated on the sensitive question whether in the context of qualifications frameworks, subject-related descriptors have to be defined at European level. There was no consensus among the participants on how far governments could or should go in assisting higher education institutions in defining learning outcomes at curriculum level.

Some feared too much intervention from the government's side, which could hamper creativity and further development.

Others pointed to the fact that initiatives have been taken already, e.g. in the context of the TUNING project, and/or stressed the necessity of involvement of all stakeholders and of establishing a link between the definition of learning outcomes and a solid quality assurance system including a supportive role of governments for institutions to incorporate changes, considering various levels of descriptions of learning outcomes.

(E) How to guarantee fair recognition?

Introduction

One delegation argues that recognition for academic purposes is the responsibility of the higher education institution. While this is undoubtedly the case, the question still is how to guarantee fair treatment during the application process and how to guarantee fair decisions. Ultimately the answer to this question also sheds a light on the issue of the selection of students.

Discussion

There was consensus among the participants that recognition is a crucial issue for the creation of the European Higher Education Area, cf. agenda point 5.

The legal framework is in place (Lisbon Recognition Convention) but there still is a gap between the overall policy considerations on the one hand, and attitudes and practices on the other, which influence the treatment of the individual seeking recognition.

(F) Role of higher education institutions to promote the social dimension of higher education

Introduction

The definition given to the social dimension is one that includes all provisions needed for having equitable access into, progress and completion of higher education. Comments made to the text suggest softening this definition through a lesser focus on successful completion. The question ultimately is to define how prominently the social dimension should feature on the agenda.

Discussion

Delegations confirmed the necessity to pursue the goal set for the social dimension as defined in the London Communiqué "We strive for the societal goal that the student body entering, participating in and completing higher education should reflect the diversity of

our populations. We therefore pledge to take action to widen participation at all level on the basis of equal opportunity”.

Lack of (comparable) data, should not prevent us from widening participation and defining measurable objectives.

(G) Status of third countries

Introduction

There is consensus now that there can be “A Bologna Policy Forum” in the margins of Bologna ministerial meetings with participants from EHEA countries and countries that have expressed their interest in the Bologna Process but are not party to the European Cultural Convention. The question still is whether countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Partner Country or any other term which reflects their strong interest, without suggesting that membership is within reach.

Discussion

The discussion focussed on the proposal of the European Commission that a kind of special status could be given as a symbolic gesture or some kind of acknowledgement towards countries outside the geographical scope of the European Cultural Convention that want to copy the Bologna reforms.

No agreement was reached on this proposal. Most delegations questioned the relevance and feasibility of granting such status. In the discussion the following main issues were raised. What would be the criteria for such status? No relevant criteria have been found yet. Who would decide on the granting of the status? What would be the added value if every non-European country could acquire it by simply expressing their interest in the Bologna Process?

The idea of organising Bologna policy fora with a wider range of countries was welcomed, as well as the set of concrete steps for international cooperation proposed by the global dimension working group. The hosts will provide more information on the practical arrangements and invitations at the next meeting of the BFUG.

(H) Benchmarks

Introduction

BFUG is asked to define what action lines should be subjected to benchmarking and what the benchmarks are. One benchmark that has been suggested is the one of 50% of the graduate population having been mobile by 2020.

Discussion

The discussion focussed on the concrete question whether we need benchmarks for *mobility*.

Some delegations voiced the opinion that better data on mobility were needed before realistic benchmarks could be set. Others preferred targets at national level, rather than a European benchmark, because of different situations across the EHEA.

Those delegations in favour of benchmarking pleaded for a more realistic target for mobility, and for including both incoming and outgoing students. Another suggestion made was to benchmark the number of joint degrees.

It was observed that if the option should be taken to introduce benchmarking in the Bologna Process, not only mobility could be taken into account, but the social dimension, too. Benchmarks setting realistic targets can be used as incentives to move forward and they can also show the progress made.

(I) Classification and ranking in relation to transparency and QA

Introduction

“Institutional diversity should be made transparent.” BFUG is asked to express its opinion on whether new transparency tools like the development of typology or specific European

ranking instruments like the ones developed by CHE/Bertelsmann Stiftung should be supported.

The Chair introduced the issue and pointed out that classification should be understood as the French "classification", which is distinguished from "classement" (ranking).

Discussion

Most delegations stressed that ranking is a sensitive issue, and called for caution to avoid perverse effects. If a new kind of classification (typology) is to be developed in the context of the Bologna Process, it should be observed that it will be a costly exercise in a field where we have little expertise. On the other hand, other delegations argued that existing rankings will not disappear and it could be worthwhile to consider how we can influence the perception of our higher education institutions. Better typologies could contribute to more parity of esteem for HEIs with different profiles, allowing students, staff and other higher education stakeholders to make more informed choices by making quality higher education visible.

Several delegations doubted whether it would be possible to develop a typology without creating a ranking effect.

The BFUG looks forward to the French Presidency conference to be held on 13-14 November 2008 (initially in Nice, now confirmed for Paris) on indicators for international comparisons, where the issue of "mapping" universities will also be discussed.

It remains an open question whether and if so, how, the issue of classification of higher education institutions should find a place in the future discussions on European higher education within or outside the Bologna Process. In particular more clarification is needed on how classification relates to the European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance. The discussion will be continued under Czech Presidency, which plans a mini-seminar in conjunction with the BFUG meeting in February, to provide information by experts on what classification entails.

(J) Tuition fees and diversification of funding

Introduction

The challenges facing the HEIs in the future are such that additional funding is required to meet the rising costs. In this context a number of trends can be identified, such as movement towards competitive funding, movement towards output oriented funding, an increase of non public income made possible by institutional autonomy and in some cases the introduction of student fees. BFUG is asked to state its opinion on the funding issue.

Discussion

Several delegations showed reluctance to mentioning the issue of tuition fees in the Bologna Beyond 2010 report. In general, the Bologna Process should refrain from prescribing how to obtain additional funding for higher education.

10. Work programme 2007-2009: information on activities of working/coordination groups and on Bologna Seminars

10.1 Mobility

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_10.1 [mobility CG update]

BFUG took note of the update presented by Gayane Harutyunyan (Armenia), chair of the mobility coordination group.

The working group supports the introduction of benchmarks for mobility of European students, for students coming from countries outside the EHEA, and for the number of joint programmes and will refine its proposals for such benchmarks. The group also calls for a more consistent data collection.

10.2 Student support network

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_10.2 [student support network update]

BFUG took note of the written information.

10.3 Social dimension

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_10.3 [social dimension CG update]

BFUG took note of the update document presented by Efstathios Michael (Cyprus), chair of the social dimension coordination group. BFUG is invited to the seminar in Budapest on 10 and 11 November. Countries were reminded to involve students (and other stakeholders) when preparing their national strategies on the social dimension.

10.4 Data collection

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_10.4 [data collection WG update]

The BFUG took note of the update document. The Secretariat informed that it had been present at a Eurostat meeting which decided to start incorporating data on enrolments in the Bologna structure in UNESCO, OECD and EU statistical data. Germain Dondelinger (Luxembourg), chair of the working group praised the good cooperation between Eurostat and Eurostudent as well as the great availability and flexibility of Eurostat. He stressed that data collection was a long-term endeavour that would not be completed in 2009. The effect of better definitions will be visible in future statistics that will only be available in the years to come.

10.5 Lifelong learning / European Universities Charter on LLL

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_10.5 [LLL CG update]
European Universities' Charter on Lifelong Learning

Ann Mc Vie (UK-Scotland), chair of the coordination group, presented the report and announced the seminar to be held in Amsterdam, 10-11 December 2008.

Lesley Wilson (EUA) introduced the European Universities' Charter on Lifelong Learning which had been prepared on request of the French Prime Minister François Fillon and the Minister of Higher Education and Research, Valérie Pécresse. This Charter was presented at the DGHE meeting in Strasbourg and will formally be presented to ministers at the informal EU Education Council dedicated to the follow-up of the Copenhagen Process, to be held in Bordeaux, 25-26 November 2008, where Ministers in charge of higher education of EU, EFTA and candidate countries will be asked to comment on the Charter.

Discussion

There was consensus that the Charter in its present form is a good basis for discussion on lifelong learning in higher education. Further discussions are, however, needed in the E4 (EUA-EURASHE-ESU-ENQA) group, the LLL coordination group and in the entire BFUG on how to take the Charter forward in the context of the Bologna Process. It was also pointed out that next to the commitments by universities, the Charter suggests commitments by governments and other stakeholders. The discussion at BFUG level will be continued under Czech Presidency.

11. EQAR - State of affairs

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_11 [EQAR update]

Lesley Wilson (EUA) presented an update on behalf of E4. By the first deadline of 3 October, 10 applications, geographically well distributed, had been received. In November, the independent Register Committee will judge these for registration. A new round of applications will be possible in 2009. The European Commission informed BFUG that the start-up support for the register had been extended but that the register was expected to be self-sustaining after 3 years.

12. Information on Ministerial meeting, Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29 April 2009

Document: BFUG (FR) 14_12 [2009 ministerial conference]

The Bologna Secretariat had prepared a new draft programme. Delegations made recommendations for amending the programme, including the timing and content of the different sessions. In particular, they suggested a better balance between plenary and parallel sessions to give more space to discussions in plenary sessions. A few delegations raised concern about the idea of Ministers debating in parallel groups. Nevertheless, the element of providing enough time to each Minister to intervene is considered important. There was also a request for equal treatment of the consultative members in terms of size of the delegation. The hosts will follow this advice, including for the seating arrangement in the parallel sessions, where it is assumed that all delegates in principle follow their Head of delegation. The Secretariat will revise the programme, taking into account the suggestions made. For the Forum with countries outside Europe due consideration will be given to geographical balance.

13. Ministerial conference 2012

The BFUG agreed that candidatures for hosting the next regular ministerial Bologna meeting 2012 should be put forward by 31 December 2008. The Minister of Higher Education should send the application letter (also confirming the readiness to provide a Secretariat) to the Bologna Secretariat who will forward it to the Chair.

14. Updates from EC and consultative members (written contributions only)

Documents: BFUG (FR) 14_a [CoE update]
BFUG (FR) 14_b [EI update]
BFUG (FR) 14_c [EURASHE update]
BFUG (FR) 14_d [EC update]

The BFUG took note of the information by the European Commission (who had provided a written update of 14 points) and by the consultative members. ESU will send its update to the BFUG after the meeting.

A publication on quality procedures, covering 51 quality assurance agencies from all over the world, can be downloaded from the ENQA website. Bruno Curvale has been elected as new ENQA President.

BFUG is invited to participate in the Bologna seminar on quality assurance of transnational education in London on 1-2 December 2008 and in the Quality Assurance Forum in Budapest on 22-23 November 2008.

15. Information by the incoming Presidency: date and place of next BFUG meeting

The incoming Czech Presidency presented the programme for higher education (see slides in annex).

For the drafting of the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué no special group will be created and the existing structures will be used, in order to guarantee the involvement of the BFUG as a whole. The drafting will start from the rewritten chapter 4 of the Bologna Beyond 2010 Report and the comments received by delegations on it.

The next BFUG meeting will be held on 12-13 February 2009 in Prague. It will be preceded by a Board meeting on January 13th for which a "zero draft" Communiqué will be made available. After the Board meeting the first draft of the Communiqué will be distributed to the BFUG for comments/amendments.

16. Any other business

The Chair recalled the deadline for submitting national reports for stocktaking and national strategies for the social dimension: 1 November 2008.

On behalf of the European Commission, the Bologna Secretariat has launched a written consultation on the new users' guide for ECTS. The deadline for comments is also 1 November 2008.

Sebastião Feyo de Azevedo (Portugal) presented the outcomes of the Porto Bologna seminar on the development of a common understanding of learning outcomes and ECTS and stressed that further commitment at all level for the correct implementation of learning outcomes and ECTS was needed.

Darinka Vrečko (Slovenia) asked the chair of the social dimension coordination group to clarify (possibly by way of a written note to BFUG), which questions on the national strategies for the social dimension are addressing underrepresented groups and which the entire student population.

The Vice-Chair thanked the French Presidency for the much appreciated hospitality and the advancement of the Bologna Process.

Before closing the meeting the Chair thanked the interpreters and all participants for their contributions. He praised the Slovenian representative for the good basis for advancing the Bologna Process and wished the succeeding Czech Presidency all the best.

List of participants

Country/Organisation	Name
French Presidency (Chair)	Patrick Hetzel
French Presidency (Co-Chair)	Marc Foucault
Albania	Elida Hoxha
Andorra	Enric Garcia Lopez
Armenia	Gayane Harutyunyan
Armenia	Mher Melik-Bakhshyan
Austria	Barbara Weitgruber
Austria	Gottfried Bacher
Belgium (Flemish Community)	Noël Vercruysse
Belgium (French Community)	Chantal Kaufmann
Bologna Secretariat	Marlies Leegwater
Bologna Secretariat	Marie-Anne Persoons
Bologna Secretariat	Cornelia Racké
Bologna Secretariat	Françoise Bourdon
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Petar Marić
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Zenan Šabanac
Bulgaria	Svetomira Apostolova-Kaloyanova
BUSINESSEUROPE	Irene Seling
Council of Europe	Sjur Bergan
Council of Europe	Radu Mircea Damian
Croatia	Luka Juroš
Cyprus	Efstathios Michael
Czech Republic	Jakob Durr
Czech Republic	Věra Šťastná
Czech Republic	Lenka Pospíšilová
Czech Republic	Veronika Horová
Denmark	Helle Otte
Denmark	Torben Kornbech Rasmussen
Education International	Paul Bennett
Education International	Monique Fouilhoux
ENQA	Bruno Curvale
ENQA	Emmi Helle

Country/Organisation	Name
Estonia	Heli Aru
ESU	Bruno Carapinha
ESU	Ligia Deca
EUA	Jean Marc Rapp
EUA	Lesley Wilson
EURASHE	Lars Lynge Nielsen
EURASHE	Andreas Orphanides
European Commission	Barbara Nolan
European Commission	Peter van der Hijden
Finland	Maija Innola
Finland	Birgitta Vuorinen
France	Yves Vallat
France	Hélène Lagier
Georgia	Lela Maisuradze
Germany	Peter Greisler
Germany	Birger Hendriks
Germany	Birgit Galler
Greece	Athanasios Kyriazis
Greece	Foteini Asderaki
Holy See	P. Friedrich Bechina
Hungary	László Csekei
Iceland	<i>Apologies</i>
Ireland	Laura Casey
Italy	Marzia Foroni
Italy	Maria Sticchi Damiani
Latvia	Andrejs Rauhvargers
Liechtenstein	Helmut Konrad
Lithuania	Rimvydas Labanauskis
Luxembourg	Germain Dondelinger
Malta	Joachim James Calleja
Netherlands	Denise Heiligers
Norway	Toril Johansson
Norway	Tone Flood Strøm
Poland	Maria Boltruszko
Poland	Tomasz Saryusz-Wolski
Portugal	Sebastião Feyo de Azevedo
Romania	Mihai Korka
Russian Federation	Victor Chistokhvalov
Serbia	Vera Dondur
Slovak Republic	Gabriela Jančárová
Slovenia	Darinka Vrečko
Spain	Rafael Bonete
Sweden	Myrna Smitt
Switzerland	Silvia Studinger
"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	Nadežda Uzelac
Turkey	Omer Demir
UNESCO-CEPES	Jan Sadlak
United Kingdom	Rachel Green
United Kingdom (Scotland)	Ann McVie
United Kingdom	Peter Baldwinson
United Kingdom (Scotland)	Alex Young