AG3:

* Adopting commitments when joining the BP
* Implementation sometimes uneven, sometimes not correctly done (see reports)
* Leading to Yerevan: this is threatening the whole process
* Non-implementation: not just undermining process, but cannot be solved without further support
* AG3 delivered parts of current proposals (key commitments were defined, these are fundamental and necessary pre-requisite for fundamental values underpinning the BP). Cyclic procedures adopted in Malta. The majority of delegations that spoke out were supporting the procedure. At least 8 delegations, plus FR, out of them BE, PL and FR.
* Give back necessary credibility and support. Encourage cross-border cooperative support, in line with WG2.
* 2 docs: ToR of KCIG + recommendations
* ToR: facilitating group, having knowledge of implementation, can advise BFUG. Ministerial meeting can approve it and work can start right after – winning time.
* Recommendations short and precise – address that there ar continued problems, this can undermine success EHEA – ministers ask to address this, based on support. Countries should engage – a peer learning exercise, peer support, involving all EHEA countries and stakeholders.
* FR: endorse Yerevan communiqué

Approve the general idea that full impl of key commitments is important by all

But: the best way is to provide a positive role to countries that need it. Welcome reversed peer review. This could identify particular weaknesses and should help support as catch up. Should be supported by COM and countries. Countries should ask for this support. Cannot accept AG3: we have to encourage progress but not stigmatise. No monitoring should be set up without any legal and diplomatic foundations. KCIG as permanent group will raise governance problems in BP. No direct communication of the group with ministers should be foreseen. QA: EQAR should be included. Evaluation should be independent from implementation. Ask AG3 and WG2 n new proposal.

* DE: in favour of cyclic procedure. Background of idea: we want to give a message to countries that we want to keep them in the process, even if we criticise them. If we want students to study in other countries, it is also in the interest of the country that there are some basic rules respected everywhere.

We want to help. All partners profit from peer learning. No punishment, but help. It is not invading a country or introducing sanctions. We see things from different sides. It only works if we describe things clearly. It helps them if we describe the problems clearly. The only sanction: repeating the diagnosis – this makes the country less attractive. This is the sanction in itself. We should find the procedure. Let's start with the proposal we have on the table and try to improve it. We cannot give it back to the BFUG – we have to find a procedure to improve it that works. EQAR is neutral, but better to discuss this question politically. Start with curren proposal and try to improve it.

* DK: fully support the model, as DE. We would be ready to adopt the TR as it is, but open to work on the text and improve it.
* NL: support fully, including ToR. DE already said everything. For NL this is at the heart of BP, a pre-requisite for them to start thinking of new roles ad ways forward with BP. This is moving forward together, no punishment. Work on current proposal.
* IT: substantially support FR. Against cyclic procedure as drafted by AG3. Not a matter o methodological analysis. Voluntary process. Surprised by comments made by IS. Strange discussion this morning? Surprised by this. Could name countries that were in favour of it? Better to postpone discussion when implementation of BP is mature enough.
* BEnl: support the basic starting point. But we need an implementation group to follow up what was agreed in the communiqués. The BFUG meets only once n 6 months and is big. Not enough. Not non-implementation but prpose: foster implementation. KCIG and cyclic procedure too administrative. Peer groups dedicated to one key commitment should be established. QF, QA, recognition – made up by countries that are further with ipl and countries that haven't. One country should coordinate – dialogue, mutual learning, peer learning. KCIG: responsible for the different peer groups and their coordination. Peer groups should start working before end 2018.
* ESU: fully supportive of work AG3 and KCIG. Most students don’t care about BP – only what it brings to them.

Trust: key for students and the BP – that the education they get is high quality and recognised, also outside Europe.

Proposal both firm and concrete.

We should allow ourselves to name those who don't implement.

Cyclical procedure starts with matching then goes straight to the rutes of the issue.

* SE: supports cyclic procedure and ToR and work
* FI: this proposed model is necessary and needed, in favour. We have set goals, we have monitored them, now it's time to help each other to implement. This model could offer that. Start with peer groups as early as possible.
* LT: support for strengthening credibility of BP and support basic idea, but important to put it in positive terms, not punishing. ToR should rephrased – not mention failing but monitor progress. lIst of key commitments should b clearly identified. Fundamental values: should be part of these! Cyclic procedure could be based on current implementation report.
* LI: supports
* PT: implementation, trust – from the beginning of BP. Concerned, but supports FR suggestion. No new body needed. If some pressure should be built in, use peer support.
* HR: support to proposal, even some proposals can be discussed. Surprised why some countries don't support. External review is key in QA – why could we not accept this for systems?
* UK: supports it, also in Gozo already. Similar comments as DE.

Could those not supporting: should point out concretely what not.

They don't want to throw away the proposal on the table.

* CH: support current proposal, even if there are some improvements could be made
* NO: the beauty of BP is that we are all here and want to achieve same goals together. Transparency is important in moving forward. The power f BP lies with BFUG and ministers – not with such a group which could help with advice
* Russia: support FR. The word control makes her worry.(but those not included in ToR)

E+ can be effective an real tool to support implementation.

Proposal too firm, but acknowledge need of monitoring.

* LU: support to current proposal. Could co-exist wit reverse peer review.
* AT: consensus-driven approach needed – we have to find common ground. No law enforcement agency is needed. Talk about promoting implementation. We do need a body that takes care of the management of this and helps prepare decisions – to present them to BFUG. Postions are approaching towards each other.
* CoE: when ministers launched the process, they were aspirational. In 2003 – they accepted that they need a regular Impl report. There reports show that impl is far from perfect. Next step needed now: recognising that non-impl in some countries undermines the process and its credibility. Commitments are entered into voluntarily, but once made, they are not. Peer learning is very important. But EHEA cannot be built on peer learning alone. Model presented is a reasonable attempt. The new aspect is now: we don't only say that a country does not implement x or y commitment, but also that we are there to support.
* Chair: need for peer support and to start soon, ToR cannot be agreed today and needs to be changed. But we cannot offer delays. Comments and Una and Noel to revise current proposal, to be discussed in next BFUG.
* EQAR: no one suggested changes to monitoring system and impl report. They could not do it themselves. Their focus is QA, could not cover everything, but ready to help.
* ES: concerns about the proposals, support FR, but can work on ToR
* EE: in favour of cyclical procedure
* PL: in Gozo there was no majority – neither in favour, neither against.

Most delegations needed to approach their superiors most probably.

No problem with naming and shaming countries that don't implement. But we should be more open to work further on the procedure and improve it. Eg bureaucratic burden – national action plans would be contra-productive.

Referring to DE: compromise needed. But feels with BEnl proposal. Per review works – better than bureaucracy.

* GR: agrees with FR and IT – basic principle is fine, impl importat. But impl has different dimensions.
* EUA: important for them this topic – if there is a problem with a system, universities suffer. Think carefully about the language of the text to be adopted. Seems to strict and doesn't give the message that it is about improving implementation.
* COM: we all share the same objective – this is clear from discussion. We work on the basis of consensus. We all agree that the impl of key commitments and some aother things are the basis of successful EHEA. Rport 2009: says already that our goal should be implementation – 8 years later we are still there. We have been working for 20 years on the same basis and that was not enough – we need a change!

Peer support and reversed peer review important – but we need to know who is that needs it. We have the monitoring process – we hae to use that for this now. Once that's done, peer groups have to be established very quickly. But also agree Peter: we shoul not be to onice. Friends should tell each other the truth. EHEA is a group of countries working together on the same principles – if the reversed peer review is carried out but we still see no progress, we have to say sg. The question is how we do that. What happens as a result of that, is a political decision. Not oa group or BFUG, but ministers. But we have to advise them. Supports current ToR. Happy to discuss amendments. Agree wth denis: this can't work wthout resources – money and people. In COM we had difficulties to provide funding for peer reviews across EHEA. In 2020+ MFF: we seek to broaden this.

If BFUG invited COM to do this, would help in the internal debates.

* RO: in favor of cyclic procedure. Wording can be changed, but doc to be kept.
* Eurashe: supports cyclic procedure, but not about naming and shaming. Naming and prmoting?
* Holy Sea: consensus needed
* BEfr: support FR – no monitoring police, but a more positive approach needed: how to improve. Work on phrasing – avoid words like "failing".
* IS: Noel and Una not far from each other. The idea of peer support is shared. We have limited time: all invited to send proposals. Next meeting AG3 on 7 Dec in Brussels – David and Noel invited.