



Ministry of Science, Innovation  
and Higher Education



**MEETING OF THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP**  
**Copenhagen, 19 March 2012, 10.00 - 20 March 2012, 13:00**  
**University of Copenhagen, Ceremonial Hall**

**Draft Outcome of Proceedings**

**Participants list**

<b>Country / Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>
Albania	<i>Apologies</i>
Andorra	Jordi Llombart
Armenia	Mher Melik-Bakhshyan
Armenia	Gayane Harutyunyan
Austria	Gottfried Bacher
Azerbaijan	Azad Akhundov
Belgium/Federation Wallonia Brussels	Chantal Kaufmann
Belgium/Flemish Community	Magalie Soenen
BFUG Secretariat	Ligia Deca
BFUG Secretariat	Viorel Proteasa
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Aida Durić
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Petar Maric
Bulgaria	<i>Apologies</i>
BUSINESSEUROPE	<i>Apologies</i>
Council of Europe	Sjur Bergan
Croatia	Jasmina Skocilic
Croatia	Luka Juros
Croatia	Ana Gorsic
Cyprus	Despina Martidou-Forcier
Cyprus	Christos Pouioukkas
Czech Republic	Vera Stastna
Denmark	Lena Brogaard
Denmark	Helle Damgaard Nielsen
Denmark	Ditte Teresa Mesick
Denmark	Jacob Fuchs
Education International	Jens Vraa-Jensen
ENQA	Maria Kelo
ENQA	Achim Hopbach
EQAR	Colin Tück

Estonia	Põllo Helen
EURASHE	Andreas Orphanides
EURASHE	Patrick Blondé
EURASHE	Stefan Delplace
European Commission	Frank Petrikowski
European Commission	Adam Tyson
European Students' Union	Allan Päll
European Students' Union	Magnus Malnes
European University Association	Michael Gaebel
European University Association	Lesley Wilson
EUROSTAT	Lene Mejer Dil
EUROSTUDENT	Dominic Orr
EURYDICE	David Crosier
Finland	Maija Innola
Finland	Birgitta Vuorinen
France	Yves Vallat
France	Francois Gorget
France	Hélène Lagier
Georgia	Ekaterine Chikhladze
Georgia	Nino Svanadze
Germany	Kathleen Ordnung
Germany	Birger Hendriks
Germany	Peter Greisler
Greece	Vasileios Papazoglou
Holy See	Friedrich Bechina
Hungary	<i>Apologies</i>
Iceland	<i>Apologies</i>
Ireland	Laura Casey
Italy	Marzia Foroni
Kazakhstan	Gulnar Balakayeva
Kazakhstan	Fatima Zhakypova
Kazakhstan	Aktolkyn Kulsariyeva
Latvia	Rauhvargers Andrejs
Liechtenstein	Helmut Konrad
Lithuania	Jolanta Spurgiene
Lithuania	Jolanta Navicleaite

Luxembourg	Germain Dondelinger
Luxembourg	Claude Schaber
Montenegro	Predrag Miranovic
Montenegro	Biljana Misovic
Netherlands	Marlies Leegwater
Norway	Tone Flood Strøm
Norway	Toril Johansson
Poland	Maria Boltruszko
Poland	Bartłomiej Banaszak
Portugal	Maria de Lurdes Correia Fernandes
Romania	Lazăr Vlăsceanu
Romania	Luminița Nicolescu
Russian Federation	Victor Chistokhvalov
Serbia	Mirjana Vesovic
Slovak Republic	Peter Plavcan
Slovenia	Stojan Sorcan
Spain	Rafael Bonete
Sweden	Selma Memic
Switzerland	Francois Grandjean
"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	<i>Apologies</i>
Turkey	Saban Calis
Turkey	Ercan Lacin
Ukraine	Anatolii Garmash
UNESCO	Peter J. Wells
United Kingdom	Pamela Wilkinson
United Kingdom/Scotland	Alex Young

### **Presentation of Bologna with Student Eyes and discussion with the BFUG**

ESU representative presented the key findings and conclusions of the publication "Bologna with Student Eyes". The BFUG took note of the presentation.



BWSE BFUG 19 04  
12.pptx

## **Welcome address**

Thomas Bjørnholm, Vice Rector of the Copenhagen University welcomed the participants and conveyed his message regarding the way forward in the EHEA. In his speech, he emphasised that a better sense of community, transparency and comparability is needed, since the second decade of the Bologna Process is understood as focused on in depth implementation. In this context, he underlined that more emphasis on results and evaluation is needed. In the field of Social Dimension, where less concrete results have been achieved so far, increased efforts are required. Employability and mobility also require continuous focus and removing the existing obstacles. The Vice-Rector expressed his satisfaction that these themes feature high on the agenda of the BFUG meeting.

### **1. Information by the Chairs (Denmark & Azerbaijan)**

The Danish Chair suggested postponing the thematic session on the link between research and education for the Cyprus BFUG meeting (28-29 August 2012). The BFUG welcomed the proposal.

### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

The BFUG was notified on apologies received from Bulgaria, Hungary and Business Europe. The agenda was adopted with minor changes in the order of agenda points.

### **3. Minutes of the BFUG Board meeting, Baku, 21 February 2012 and draft outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting, Copenhagen, 18-19 January 2012**

The Baku BFUG Board minutes were endorsed and the Copenhagen I BFUG outcome of proceedings were adopted by the BFUG with no comments.

### **4. 2009-2012 BFUG Work plan – reports of the BFUG WGs/networks**

#### **4.1. Social Dimension WG**

The Spanish WG Chair introduced the report outlining the fact that the comments from the BFUG have been taken into account in the version submitted for adoption.



SD WG report  
presentation.ppt

**The BFUG Chair concluded that the Social Dimension WG report is adopted.**

#### **4.2. International Openness WG and the IPN**

The IO WG Chair, Luminița Nicolescu introduced the changes to the IO WG report after the comments received from the BFUG and the IO WG meeting in Rome. She said that the WG concluded that all the tasks outlined in the IO WG Terms of Reference have been fulfilled. The report includes recommendations for the BFUG and for the Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué, as well as for the BPF Statement.

Main points made by the IO WG Chair were:

- The Bologna implementation report did not cover the implementation of the 'EHEA in a global setting' strategy, so policy recommendations were difficult to make in the context in which the situation at the national level is not known. A full survey should be conducted for the 2015 Ministerial Conference and a possible advancement of the internationalisation work should be considered with its results in mind;
- More coordination with other groups dealing with internationalisation matters is needed: Mobility, Recognition, QA, QF etc. One possibility is a future joint group on mobility and internationalisation;
- A new concept for the BPF should be developed in the future by the IO WG, while its implementation should be done by another group or structure, as decided by the BFUG Chairs;
- More thematic events at practitioners level should be organised between BFFs, under the BPF umbrella, in full cooperation with the non-EHEA countries;
- the EHEA Recognition Manual should be used to enhance international recognition;
- The ministers should commit to continue the implementation of the 2007 strategy, to support events to take place between the BPFs under this frame, to find a more effective way to deal with international promotion or to seize this direction of activity and to welcome and support ASEM work.

The following comments were received:

- The part of the recommendation saying 'identify the areas for future action' when talking about coming back to the 'EHEA in a global setting' strategy should be deleted, as this would raise questions about the activity of the WG, which is not the case. This conclusion should read 'We should return to the EHEA Strategy [...]' and

stop here, without the end. Similarly, the conclusion about the IPN should read 'The IPN will not continue its activity' and full stop;

- New recommendations regarding the EHEA strategy on international openness should be based on data and more can be done only when the necessary data is available;
- This is a report to the BFUG, it should be published on the conference website, with a disclaimer saying that the reports reflect the view of the WG members and not that of the BFUG as a whole. The same applies for other WG reports and their recommendations should not be understood as commitments of the ministers;
- The IO WG report recommendations regarding the future of the group should not be taken as agreements in future discussions;
- Concerns were raised about the publicity of the report.

The IO WG Chair clarified that indeed the report is drafted for the BFUG, not for the Ministers directly, and it reflects the activity of the WG. Related to the policy relevance of the report, the WG Chair underlined that no future policy recommendations are advisable without the data to confirm the situation at the national level. Finally, when talking about the various points included in the 2007 'EHEA in a global strategy', the BFUG was asked what the IO WG and the IPN should focus on when it comes to EHEA information provision and promotion. Before any progress is made, answers should be provided to the WG.

**As a response to the concerns about the publicity of the report, the BFUG Chair concluded that the WG reports should be published on the EHEA website, with the disclaimer suggested. The IO WG was adopted by the BFUG, with the comments from the European Commission to be incorporated in the conclusions and recommendations sections of the report.**

#### **4.3. Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process WG**

At the suggestion of the Chair, the BFUG divided the discussion in two parts: the report was firstly discussed and then the Executive Summary.

**The report** was introduced by the Luxembourg WG Co-Chair. The Co-Chair underlined the intense communication process with the EHEA countries and the efforts laid by all parties. Further on, he stressed that:

- the WG worked on the assumption that data was accurate, validated and endorsed. This was not the case in several situations, which delayed the report;
- the report is a snapshot of the situation as of late 2011. If updates were included in the report, it would affect severely the comparability of data;
- following that, amendments were accepted only if they were referring to the period up to late 2011 and if the comments made could be substantiated.

Eurydice gave an overview of the various rounds of comments asked at different points in time from the BFUG members and thanked for all the help provided. He outlined the process of drafting the report and the involvement of the BFUG members in each stage. He clarified that the comments received to the second draft of the implementation report, sent out before the March BFUG meeting, were expected to deal with spelling mistakes or any factual/ technical errors. The comments related to the content of the report should have been sent beforehand, in the previous round of consultations. He further noted that the national reports are a record of the public information received. If things need to be changed or clarified, an annex to the national report can be published on the EHEA Website.

The following comments were made:

- this implementation report is the best which was ever prepared;
- the fact that the report represents a snapshot at the end of 2011 has to be clearly outlined;
- the introduction should include a list of the contributing countries. Two countries have not submitted information for the present report and this was considered to be demotivating for the rest;
- the scorecard should be renamed 'Bologna indicators' to improve the readability of the report;
- few countries found that the scorecard indicators do not reflect properly the situation. It was proposed that the BFUG discusses the scorecard indicators in depth before the initiation of the upcoming reporting exercise, in order to avoid such situations.

Other specific comments were received:

- Self-certification implies sending the report to the QF WG or to the BFUG Secretariat and not just to the EQF Advisory Board, which has an impact on the number of countries listed as dark green for this indicator;
- Turkey reaffirmed that their comments to indicator 5 remain valid, as the perspective currently painted by the report downplays the situation in Turkey, and called for a correction to be made.

A number of comments were in favour or against allowing for adjustments if the situation changed since the end of 2011. The Luxembourg Co-Chair stressed that in order to build a coherent and factual report, a balance should be achieved between the need for including the most recent information and the capacity for effective communication with the 47 EHEA member states.

The Latvian Co-Chair further clarified that the WG already discussed the new scorecard indicators and will come back on this issue. On a technical note, he said that the situation on the indicator dealing with NQFs will be remedied, as it was a technical error.

Some countries inquired what happened to the comments they sent and some used the opportunity to reaffirm them. EURYDICE replied that not all the comments were responded directly due to time constraints, but this will be done soon after the meeting.

**The BFUG Chair concluded that the Report on BP implementation is adopted (without the Executive Summary) and thanked the drafting team.**

The Luxembourg Co-Chair introduced **the Executive Summary**. He stressed that the Executive Summary is meant to enable ministers to draw points for the Communiqué. The recommendations in the end are not to be included in the text to the Ministers, as they are addressing the BFUG.

The following comments were received:

- On page 2, the text should highlight increased, decreased and stable higher education budgets;
- On page 9, recommendation 4 – the text on the 5% mobility target should be adapted to what will be agreed in the Communiqué discussion;
- On page 8, the first paragraph dealing with balanced mobility, other issues that are relevant for the topic should be added, such as: different number of study places, different entrance prerequisites etc.;
- On page 9, the second recommendation, delete “traditional”; at 2.c, related to the revision of the ESG to add “where this is not the case” as in many countries QA systems already reflect LO and QFs;
- On page 4, par.3, the reference to direct progression from the second to the third cycle: apart from the reasons listed, there is also the need for job security. Masters degrees are considered to enhance job security;
- On page 5, research is not excluded in QA within all EHEA countries and wording should be adjusted accordingly;
- On page 5, par. 1, last sentence, the text regarding the Bergen Communiqué is not accurate and should be adjusted;
- On page 7, regarding lifelong learning, it should be added that the recognition of prior learning contributes to increasing access;
- On paragraph 6, the phrasing should be changed to “men were less likely...”;
- On page 1, it should read ‘EUROSTAT, Eurydice and EUROSTUDENT’.

A series of comments tackled what was considered by the speakers as being inappropriate definitions within the report. The Luxembourg Co-Chair replied that the report uses the existing definitions of Bologna Process action lines, as described by the various Bologna Process Communiqués, and that data collectors cannot change these official definitions.



A number of comments dealt with the structure of the Executive Summary. Two options were made available: one that offers a transversal reading, from the perspective of the student experience and one that offers a summary of the chapters, in the order they appear in the text. Arguments were brought in favour of both. The Luxembourg Co-Chair replied that the present version was the structure preferred by the Reporting WG.

**The BFUG Chair concluded that the authors will take into account the textual comments received. The Executive Summary including the transversal questions was preferred and endorsed by the BFUG.**

#### **4.4. Transparency Tools WG**

The BFUG Chair introduced this agenda item. He informed the BFUG of the absence the TT WG Chair, Noël Vercruyssen, Flemish Community of Belgium, motivated by important domestic legislative negotiations. The report was presented by Viorel Proteasa, the BFUG Secretariat responsible for the WG.



Transparency  
Tools.pptx

The following comments were received:

- The matrix prepared by the WG on the transparency function of the Bologna tools should be annexed to the report;
- The seventh recommendation should be rephrased in a more positive way;
- The report reflects the ambiguity around the term "transparency instruments";
- The report lays too much emphasis on rankings and classifications compared to Bologna tools;
- The report fails to ask the following questions about rankings: Are they reliable? Are their methodologies sound? Do they measure what they claim and is what should be measured included in their measurements? Are they meaningful? Is it meaningful to be number 25 or 35 on the list? Is taking a position on rankings part of the public responsibility for HE?
- The report should indicate the link between quality and purpose of higher education;
- The assertions on the popularity of rankings should be revisited and grounded on evidence;
- The report does not address the costs of databases compared to their benefits;
- The term "democratisation" was debated, with both favourable and unfavourable opinions expressed.
- The report should be shorter and more concentrated.

A few speakers asked the report to recommend that rankings are not used as basis for policy decisions. It was said that other important conclusions should be also taken forward: TT are a collection of tools with different purposes and the tools should serve the students' needs by being user-driven.

Some speakers expressed discomfort with the fact that they were given the chance to comment only during this last BFUG meeting before the Ministerial Conference and had not seen the report in its entirety beforehand. Several speakers welcomed the report and found it useful to inform political decisions.

It was further noted that the issue of transparency should be discussed across WGs: QF, recognition, the E4 etc. and common principles/ guidelines should be found.

**The BFUG Chair concluded that the report is endorsed, with some amendments to be done according to the feedback given and the recommendation to reduce the text on classification and rankings.**

## **5. EHEA Mobility Strategy**

The BFUG Chair asked Lene Mejer (EUROSTAT) to make a presentation on data needs for EHEA with regard to learning mobility.



EUROSTAT\_learning  
mobility data collectio

EUROSTAT underlined the need for communication between policy makers and statisticians with regard to gathering data according to the definition agreed in the Bologna Process. EUROSTAT will propose to make mobility tables mandatory following a revision of European Commission regulation 88/2011. She reminded that many countries do not provide the needed data. Other EHEA countries are covered by OECD (Russia) and UIS-UNESCO (10 countries). 2012 and 2013 are years for testing the quality of data collection. In 2014 the data collection is to become 'obligatory', based on a gentleman's agreement. A manual will provide all necessary details and will be available in the summer of 2012.

The German WG Chair introduced the revised EHEA Mobility Strategy. He stressed that it is important for data collection to be organised according to the political goals.

On the mobility strategy, the following comments were received:

- Extending data collection is costly and may not be affordable for the moment;

- Setting additional targets may divert attention from targets to which countries previously committed to;
- A single accreditation procedure at the EHEA level for joint degrees is not possible. A rephrasing of the text was proposed by Austria and will be included by the WG Chair;
- Point 8 should be reduced in length, perhaps by cutting bullet points 1 and 2;
- Credits should be also counted and mobility periods of less than 15 ECTS/ 3 months should be recorded;
- Several other linguistic comments were made and taken in by the WG Chair.

The Mobility WG Chair accepted the textual comments and the amendment on taking into account national requirements when using external quality evaluations from EQAR listed agencies. He further said that the 5% inward mobility target is realistic and the possibility for adding it should be left open for 2015. He further responded that mobility for less than 15 ECTS is already covered by the data collection.

**The BFUG Chair concluded that the EHEA Mobility Strategy is adopted with the comments made.**

## **6. 2012 Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué – Draft 3**

The BFUG Chair introduced the third version of the Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué and asked for general comments. The version presented already incorporated some of the comments received in writing, the ones that were in line with the initial text.

On a general note, it was said that:

- This version is a net improvement of the previous one. It is shorter, more concise and politically punchier;
- There still is some duplication between the general text and the priorities.

Following that, the Communiqué was discussed chapter by chapter. The rephrasing and wording changes can be followed in the annex, with track changes. The more general comments made can be found below.

On the section “Investing in higher education for the future”:

- It should be explicit that all sources means both public and private;
- This section should emphasise the public responsibility also in terms of financing;
- The crisis affects heavily the aging population too, not only the young;
- Youth unemployment is a transversal problem, it cannot be dealt with only by higher education ministers.

On the section “The EHEA yesterday, today and tomorrow”:

- Governments should also be thanked;
- The order of the political priorities should be quality for all, employability and then mobility. It was agreed that this would be reflected in the structure of the Communiqué;
- A reference to the European Parliament resolution regarding the Bologna Process was suggested;
- Completion of the transition to the three cycles should remain a priority;
- Definition and evaluation of the learning outcomes is an important aspect of qualifications frameworks implementation.

On the section "Enhancing employability to serve Europe's needs":

- Long term employment should be emphasised, as well as knowledge instead of science;
- "Salzburg II" recommendations and the Best Practice Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training should be properly referenced;
- It was suggested to add a paragraph on common principles for Master studies in the EHEA. It was agreed that this issue enters the BFUG debate at a stage when it is too late for a ministerial discussion;
- ECTS should be linked to both student workload and learning outcomes;
- The paragraph on EQF reference level raised debates. It was agreed that even though the formulation sounds rather technical, it is a political matter. A new phrasing will be proposed by the Danish Chairs in consultation with Germany, the European Commission and the Council of Europe;
- The ECTS Users Guide needs to be updated by the BFUG;
- There are updates that should be included in the paragraph on the revision of the EC Directive on professional qualifications. It was agreed that the European Commission will provide a text proposal.

On the section "Providing quality higher education for all":

- The equity and quality aspects of higher education should be both reflected in the phrasing of the first paragraph;
- Recognition of prior learning should be added as a means to foster equitable access;
- Progress on the social dimension should be monitored and evaluated;
- The paragraph on ESG revision was debated. The compromise reached consists of the extension of the revision to the scope of the ESG. In terms of process, the E4 group will prepare the initial proposal in cooperation with Education International, BUSINESSEUROPE and the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) and will submit it to the BFUG.

On the section "Strengthening mobility for better learning":

- The inclusion of recognition within quality assurance procedures should be made explicit;
- The mobility imbalances should be addressed in an additional paragraph.

On the section "Improvement of data collection and transparency to underpin political goals":

- The need of common indicators to reference against has to be acknowledged;
- The EHEA Peer Learning Initiative should first go through a pilot phase of in depth discussion by the BFUG. It was agreed to reflect this idea in the text.

It was agreed that the section "Setting out priorities for 2012-2015" should be synchronised with the amendments made above. It was agreed to add:

- A reference to the Implementation Report;
- A reference to knowledge alliances;
- A reference to supportive working environment for the teaching staff.

**All these comments were debated and the text of the Communiqué represents the agreement reached within the BFUG. It was agreed that the adjustments not operated during the BFUG meeting due to time constraints will be done by the Danish Co-Chairs, after bilateral or multilateral consultations, where this was the case. The BFUG will then receive the final version of the Bucharest Communiqué by e-mail in due time before the Ministerial Conference.**

## **7. Bologna Policy Forum Statement – Final Draft**

The BFUG Secretariat introduced the BPF Statement and underlined that this version of the BPF Statement was already sent to the National Contact Persons and no feedback was received, although the previous version prompted some positive feedback.

The document was discussed and amendments to the text were made. A track changed version is annexed.

The main points made in the discussion were:

- The ASEM work on an initiative to build a new recognition framework based on the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) is relevant, but lacks important elements;
- The LRC should not be mentioned, because there is more than one recognition convention. It was underlined by the Recognition WG Chair that the other recognition conventions are mostly outdated and not in line with the LRC principles;
- The list of thematic events under the BPF umbrella should be transformed into an annex and a deadline should be given for new events to be included before the BPF.

## **8. Selection of observers from the BFUG to the EQAR Register Committee**

The BFUG Secretariat introduced the suggested procedure, which implies to postpone the elections for the next BFUG meeting in Cyprus and to prolong the mandate of the current observers. The practical effect of the prolongation would be minimal, as there are no EQAR meetings scheduled until August, when the observers are to be elected.

**The BFUG endorsed the proposal.**

## **9. Information on the preparations for the 2012 Bucharest Ministerial Conference and Third Bologna Policy Forum**

Romania introduced recent updates and the BFUG Secretariat introduced the progress on the received confirmations of participation for the Ministerial Conference and the Bologna Policy Forum.

Education International offered assistance for receiving an answer from remaining delegations.

A delegation asked for ministers to be able to speak in the first panel.

**The Chair concluded that they will look into the matter together with the Romanian hosts and if they do not come up with a solution it means that the programme is too difficult to change at this stage. However, ministers can have statements post-adoption of the Ministerial Communiqué in front of all the MC and BPF delegations.**

The BFUG Chair presented the proposal for procedural follow-up on the EHEA accession: Belarus will not be invited to the Ministerial Conference, as there will be no item on the Bucharest Ministerial Meeting agenda regarding the Belarus application, and there will be no mentioning within the text of the Bucharest Communiqué regarding the application for EHEA accession from Belarus, in line with the BFUG recommendation from January 2012. This is the procedure that will be followed, which means that the EHEA membership will remain the same.

**The BFUG members endorsed the outlined procedure.**

## **10. Information on the preparations for handover of the BFUG Secretariat and presentation of the EHEA archive**

The BFUG Secretariat presented the EHEA archive and invited BFUG members to test it and highlight technical errors, if any.



EHEA archive.ppt

The BFUG Secretariat was thanked for this initiative and all their work. The BFUG Secretariat announced that the official handover will take place on 28 June 2012 in Yerevan, Armenia.

### **11. Updates from EC, consultative members, EQAR (written contributions only)**

**The BFUG took note of the written contributions.**

### **12. 12. Next BFUG meeting, Cyprus, 28-29 August 2012 and next BFUG Board meeting, Sarajevo, May 31th, 2012**

Bosnia-Herzegovina announced the BFUG Chairs handover and the BFUG Board meeting taking place on 30 May and 31 May, respectively. The other events were also mentioned, namely:

- a conference in October 2012 on one of the two possible topics: "Doctoral studies - challenges and perspectives"/ "Strengthening of entrepreneurship at universities and linkages with business";
- a conference in July/September 2012, on the topic of EHEA and synergy with European Research Area (ERA), with focus on mobility.

Cyprus introduced the priorities of the Cypriot EU Presidency, as well as the events for the second semester of 2012.



EDUC\_CYPR.ppt

### **13. Any other business**

The BFUG Secretariat introduced the briefing prepared for the heads of delegations on the proceedings of the Ministerial Conference and the Bologna Policy Forum and asked for feedback from the BFUG.

The BFUG Chair introduced the members' turnout to BFUG meetings as a point of information. He stressed the importance of having all countries participating in the process and present at BFUG meeting as essential for having a successful cooperation. He further invited the BFUG members to collect information on the reasons for the low attendance of some countries and suggested to come back on the matter in the Cyprus BFUG meeting.

The BFUG Secretariat informed the audience on a request from the Holy See to change the BFUG chairing order, so that they chair together with Italy in the first semester of 2013 and Greece with Iceland in the second semester. All four concerned EHEA members have agreed to this solution. The proposal was accepted by the BFUG and the co-chairing order will be changed accordingly on the EHEA website.

The BFUG Chair invited Dominic Orr to present updates from EUROSTUDENT project. Currently there are approximately ten countries which have signed the contract or are in an advance phase, close to signing it. Some of these countries are new to the project. There are still some approvals to obtain from the European Commission, but the project is expected to start in the first week of April 2012. The EUROSTUDENT representative said that they expect more countries to join after the funding from the European Commission is secured, so the total number of countries expected to be part of the project amounts to 25-30. The kick-off workshop will take place in Berlin, on 24-25 May 2012.

**Finally, the Danish Co-Chair thanked all the BFUG representatives for their participation and valuable input, contributing to a successful meeting and as preparation for the upcoming Ministerial Conference in Bucharest. He also thanked the Bologna Secretariat for its hard and valuable work during the last two years and the continuous extremely professional support provided to the chairs.**