

## FINAL REPORT BY THE WORKING GROUP ON MOBILITY

This report gives an account of work undertaken by the Working Group on Mobility in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR). This report focuses on core ideas and recommendations emerging from discussions, especially when drafting the EHEA Strategy for mobility.

Considering the provisions of the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, the decision of setting up a separate Working Group (WG) on Mobility was endorsed by the BFUG in its meeting in Brussels held on November 30 / December 1, 2009, at the proposal made by the WG “Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process” after its first meeting held in Luxembourg on November 4, 2009. During the same BFUG meeting the ToR of the new Mobility WG have been approved by setting the following purposes and / or outcomes for this WG:

- *To contribute to the discussions in the working group “Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process” on development of a precise definition of the benchmark mentioned in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué;*
- *To identify problems related to the balance of incoming and outgoing students and identify examples of good practice;*
- *To assess the structural, legal, financial and other obstacles to mobility of students and staff and to identify possibilities for action for Ministers and stakeholders in order to improve mobility;*
- *To draft an EHEA Strategy for mobility, for adoption by Ministers in 2012, based on the collection of good practice on mobility and with the purpose of stimulating further efforts in the area of mobility.*

Through the same ToR the specific tasks have been defined and it was stated that Germany through Peter Greisler will chair the Mobility WG, as well as that the Chair will participate in meetings of the WG on Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process in order to liaise with stocktaking and data collection. Beyond regular meetings and ongoing consultations of drafts, the work of the group has been accompanied by and benefited from several inputs and relevant mobility seminars organised by different stakeholders, e.g. the DAAD seminar „From Imbalanced to Balanced Mobility in the EHEA – Current Challenges and Perspectives for the Future” in March 2011 and the workshop “Exploring the possibilities of an internet-based admission system for studies in the EHEA”, organised in the course of the Working Group’s work, in November 2011.

The main outcomes of the WG meetings can be summarized as follows:

The Mobility WG had its first meeting in Berlin on January 13, 2010.

On this occasion, the main points discussed and decisions adopted were:

- Credit mobility shall be taken into account starting from one credit;
- Both diploma and credit mobility shall be included in the indicator;
- The data collectors shall clarify the definition of origin of students included in the indicator;

- It is important to have data both on inward and outward mobility, while the target indicator should focus on outward mobility;
- On the regional scope of mobility two different areas of destination are relevant for the mobility target: the EHEA and the world, while agreeing that the indicator should include credit and degree mobility within the EHEA, and credit mobility within and outside the EHEA;
- To include mobility during the first, second and third cycle;
- Short (2-year) programmes should be included if they are recognised by the government of the country;
- For the indicator only mobility during the programme the student is completing should be taken into account;
- Mobility within joint degree programmes should be counted;
- The group discussed supplementary indicators and decided that:
  - The indicator on socio-economic background is relevant, but other issues such as gender, disabilities, migrants, should be included as well;
  - An indicator that measures the balance between inbound and outbound mobility is considered necessary;
  - The need for data on staff mobility is underlined.
- A first Work plan 2010-2012 was drafted while considering that another input for drafting the Mobility strategy would be to develop a questionnaire to the BFUG members on mobility obstacles, good practice examples for increasing mobility and for encouraging a balanced flow of mobility;
- A first discussion on the issue of balanced mobility has been held.

In line with the first provision of the purposes of the ToR (i.e. *“To contribute to the discussions in the working group “Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process” on development of a precise definition of the benchmark mentioned in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué”*), the Chair of the Mobility WG presented the results of this first Mobility WG meeting to the WG „Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process” during its meeting held on January 21, 2010 in Luxembourg.

On this occasion, he particularly stressed the need to ensure that the work within the Bologna process to define the mobility benchmark is coordinated with the development of a mobility benchmark in the EU context, in order to avoid developing two different benchmarks.

During the next BFUG meeting held in Madrid on February 18-19, 2010, Luxembourg (as Co-Chair of the Reporting WG) and Germany (as Chair of the Mobility WG) presented the benchmark indicator for measuring progression towards the 20% target of international student mobility defined in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, as proposed by the Reporting WG and the Mobility WG.

The Mobility WG came together for its second meeting in Berlin on May 12, 2010.

The Group aims at developing a mobility strategy for the Ministerial Conference in Bucharest in 2012 that will tackle all provisions specified in its ToR. This strategy shall contain proposals on how mobility of students and staff can be improved and how the 20 percent target in the Leuven Communiqué can be reached.

With this aim in mind, the group discussed mobility obstacles and possible ways to overcome those obstacles. In particular the following areas were addressed:

- financing of mobility (including portability of grants and loans and improved information on funding possibilities);
- recognition;
- language issues;
- curricular obstacles;
- legal and administrative obstacles;
- motivation and information.

For some of the subjects, members of the WG agreed to produce more in-depth information as well as suggestions for action by the next meeting. The WG was aware of ongoing discussions and work in other WGs and networks, particularly in the WG on Recognition and NESSIE, and concluded that it will be necessary to exchange and cooperate with these groups.

The WG also discussed the draft questionnaire that will be sent to all Bologna countries, once approved by BFUG. The draft questionnaire included questions on mobility obstacles, on national mobility targets, strategies and measures to improve mobility. Furthermore it dealt with the concept of balanced mobility.

During the same meeting in May 2010, the WG also dealt with the subject of balanced mobility. Members of the group agreed that despite the fact that the Leuven Communiqué mentioned balanced mobility, presently there is little clarity on terminology, on background and reasons for imbalances and on aims. With the answers to the questionnaire, the Group decided to try to develop some basic understandings in this area. Only in a next step it will be possible to discuss potential national and international targets as well as measures.

Regarding the mobility target in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué and its relation to the EU-benchmark on mobility, several consultations between the Mobility WG's Chair and the European Commission have taken place. So far, an agreement could be reached on almost all dimensions of the mobility target.

As the WG's main goal is to develop an EHEA mobility strategy for the Ministerial Conference in Bucharest in 2012, as decided with the Reporting WG, the mobility part of the BFUG Reporting questionnaire had been launched earlier than the other parts (few days after the Alden Biesen BFUG meeting), so that to have enough time to finalise the draft EHEA mobility strategy and submit it for the BFUG comments and endorsement. Countries have been asked to check and, if necessary, to update their answers when the questionnaire of the Reporting WG is distributed.

Through its Chair, the Mobility WG reported to the BFUG members on the occasion of their meeting held in Alden Biesen on August 24-25, 2010.

On this occasion the Mobility WG's Chair emphasised the importance and the time constraints related to collecting the answers to the questionnaire on student and staff mobility.

During the debates and in reaction to concerns raised by United Kingdom, Peter Greisler agreed to amend the preliminary remarks section of the questionnaire so that it was made clear that BFUG, in the ToR for the Mobility WG, called for the drafting of an EHEA Strategy on mobility.

After the BFUG meeting in Alden Biesen (24-25 August 2010), the Mobility WG had its third meeting in Budapest on November 4, 2010, where the members received inputs from:

- Academic Cooperation Association (**ACA**), which presented the preliminary results of their ongoing study titled „*Trends in European student mobility, Main findings of the forthcoming*

*study on "Mobility developments in higher education" (EURODATA II)*", financed by the European Commission (DG Education and Culture), which covers 32 countries (all EU countries plus other five from outside EU);

- Andrea Herdegen (Germany), who introduced the preliminary results of the BFUG questionnaire on student and staff mobility; based on the 30 responses available at the moment the data was interpreted (the return rate of the filled in questionnaires was about 65 %);
- EUA, EI and ESU, which presented their joint input paper "Disincentives for Mobility".

Starting from the first two mentioned inputs, the WG had in Budapest on November 4, 2010, a first debate focused on the following issues:

- the very diverse national mobility strategies and the internationalization of mobility;
- the social context and the perception of mobility obstacles, depending on the target group;
- staff mobility;
- the importance of quality of higher education within the mobility debate;
- the general actions to be supported, taken in or considered further in drafting the EHEA mobility strategy;
- balanced mobility and situations in which it is difficult to achieve.

The WG agreed on the main ideas to be used for drafting the EHEA mobility strategy and also agreed on an updated draft Work Plan.

Defining „balanced mobility“ was another discussion topic. The Mobility WG participants tried, without reaching a final conclusion, to come closer to an appropriate definition with a view to the EHEA mobility strategy. The main ideas advanced were:

- we should prioritize learning mobility, not cultural exchange;
- even if there are specific imbalances, mobility itself is good and therefore should not be restrained;
- where imbalances exist we should look into the reasons. Depending on the size and duration of imbalances we should aim for a more balanced mobility inside the EHEA;
- regulations which limit mobility are very dangerous. Only awareness and capacity building in the home countries can sustainably reduce brain drain;
- demographic changes, mainly in the Western European countries, have to be considered;
- the EHEA is not the only player in international mobility; some traditional European destination countries compete with North America and Asia. The issue is how to increase the attractiveness of all EHEA countries;
- estimating the magnitude of the brain drain phenomenon is difficult;
- quality assurance of higher education in the destination country is very important;
- more should be done to improve the chances for being employed when coming back (professional recognition).

The WG's intention was to provide a longer paper on mobility for the BFUG consideration and eventually a short paper for the EHEA Ministers to receive their endorsement within the 2012 Bucharest Ministerial Conference.

After the Budapest meeting, DAAD and the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research formulated the first draft Working paper for the EHEA mobility strategy that has been circulated within the Mobility WG for feedback on the 28th of January 2011.

Based on WG members' feedback and more filled in questionnaires received from additional countries, a second draft was prepared and circulated among the Mobility WG members on March 16, 2011.

Through its Chair, the Mobility WG reported to the BFUG members on the occasion of their meeting held in Gödöllő on March 17-18, 2011.

On this occasion, the Chair of the Mobility WG noted that the main goal of the WG was to develop an EHEA mobility strategy for the Ministerial Conference in Bucharest in 2012 and that a draft of the document would be available for the next BFUG meeting in Cracow.

Other major points highlighted by the Chair were:

- There is a need to implement national/international mobility strategies with measurable indicators;
- In addition to the quantitative target, a target for balanced mobility inside the EHEA may also be deemed necessary;
- Since imbalances can be useful for both parts, the partners are the ones who should find the reasons and solutions for these imbalances;
- The EHEA countries are also encouraged to strive for more balanced mobility of the EHEA with countries outside the EHEA;
- Measures not to have additional barriers for studying abroad should be taken by member countries;
- The BFUG members, alongside the European Commission, should check if the regulations for professions are being followed;
- Increased mobility should be achieved through improved information on study programmes. A forum where universities and students can correspond with each other on this topic should be created;
- Numerous issues decided upon can only be implemented by HEIs and all HEIs should become aware of the existing possibilities in global educational cooperation. In accordance to their profile, the HEIs should be encouraged to adopt and implement their own strategy for internalisation and the promotion of mobility;
- HEIs should be encouraged to pay attention to the mobility and international competence of their staff;
- It is important to think about students who, for various reasons, cannot be academically mobile, so it is desired to enable all students to have an international experience at home (internationalisation at home).

The fourth meeting of the Mobility WG took place in Berlin on March 29-30, 2011, in conjunction with the DAAD seminar „*From Imbalanced to Balanced Mobility in the EHEA – Current Challenges and Perspectives for the Future*”.

The main objective of the fourth WG meeting was an in-depth discussion of the Working paper for the EHEA mobility strategy. For this discussion the group received two inputs.

The first input presentation included the first results from the fourth Eurostudent survey on mobility obstacles (*with the title “First glance at preliminary data from EUROSTUDENT IV on the potential for and obstacles to short-term mobility”*) and showed:

- the potential of the EUROSTUDENT data for better understanding the issues behind temporary mobility;
- that financial insecurities (specifically, the expected financial burden of a period abroad) continue to be a major barrier to mobility in almost all European countries.

The second input presentation on quantitative results came from Eurostat (*with the title “Statistical indicators on international student mobility - Targets in balanced mobility and inbound mobility”*) and showed some results of quantitative analyses of official statistics relating to the proposed definition of balanced mobility. The main finding was that the number of countries with balanced mobility is rather low, and that only very few countries combine balanced mobility with a high degree of inward and outward mobility.

The overall discussion that followed was focused on:

- whether a definition was needed or not for “imbalanced mobility” within the draft Working paper;
- whether “imbalanced mobility” was bad or not.

The WG agreed on the next steps and updated its Work Plan and, in this respect, for enabling both the BFUG Board meeting in Armenia (September 7, 2011) and the BFUG meeting in Cracow (October 13-14, 2011) to discuss the draft Mobility strategy, it was agreed that the next Mobility WG will take place in Berlin on August 24, 2011.

During the Reporting WG meeting held in Riga on July 1, 2011, the Chair of the Mobility WG presented the status of the Mobility WG activities and emphasized the next main points:

- the Mobility WG had discussed the draft Working paper of the Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA and the updated version resulted from its next meeting (Berlin, August 24, 2011) would be sent to the BFUG;
- the present version would be circulated to all Reporting Group’s members and to all other Chairs of the BFUG WGs / Networks;
- the next step would be to draft a shorter version that, after being debated during the same meeting on August 24 by the Mobility WG, would be circulated to the BFUG and would possibly be endorsed by the EHEA Ministers;
- with regard to data collection:
  - through this draft the Mobility WG would propose to add a benchmark on incoming student mobility to the existing EHEA benchmark. The benchmark could be phrased as “by 2020, 5% of all students matriculated in the EHEA should have obtained their prior qualification elsewhere”;

- the Mobility WG would provide a list of information that the data collectors should provide in the future, additional to what was collected for the benchmark;
- with regard to the issue of balanced mobility:
  - the Group came to a conclusion for a recommendation to the Bucharest Communiqué, namely: “We strive for open higher education systems and better balanced mobility in the EHEA.” ;
  - the demand for more balanced mobility is focused at degree mobility and it had to be combined with the approach of avoiding the “closed” systems (systems that do not send or receive a lot of mobile students). The WG had also recalled the need to record and analyze the mobility streams systematically, regularly and in accordance with comparable principles. It was argued that this is especially important for degree mobility. These provisions are meant to provide an improved frame for ministers’ decision in the future.

On July 7, 2011, the consolidated draft working paper of the mobility strategy was circulated for comments to all Reporting Group’s members and to all other Chairs of the BFUG WGs / Networks, as well to all members of the Mobility WG.

Then, on August 15, 2011, the first draft mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA – as a more concise version - was circulated to the Mobility WG members with a view to the next Mobility WG meeting that took place in Berlin on August 24, 2011.

During its fifth meeting held on August 24, 2011, the WG agreed that:

- the long version of the Mobility strategy (*the Working paper on the Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA*) will remain just a historical paper hosted on the EHEA website that will cease to be developed and will not be considered for a decision in the BFUG;
- the short version of the Mobility strategy (*draft Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA*) will be put forward at the next BFUG meeting.

Over 200 written amendments to the long and short version, as well as an important number of other amendments advanced on-the-spot have been considered during the Berlin meeting.

In between the debates on the draft Working paper and the short version, the group had a debate on the input document “*Overview of current discussions on key mobility benchmark aspects, situation: 28 July 2010*”, in the context of the recent meeting held on August 23, 2011, with the European Commission representatives and of the two parallel ongoing discussions on the issue of mobility: one having in mind the next Ministerial Conference in Bucharest and the targets set in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué and another on accommodating the issue of the mobility benchmark with the European Commission.

The most controversial point was related to the minimum duration of mobility as most participants were interested to capture data for less than three months and even one credit point, while the limited measurement possibilities could not support this approach. One main idea resulted from the intense debates: the benchmark will only include mobility periods over three months or 15 credit points in the draft Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA, while mentioning the need for further development of data collection that will go beyond the European Commission thresholds and make possible information about mobility periods of less than 15 credit points or three months (going down even to one credit point), as in the point II.2.3 b of the draft Mobility strategy.

The group debates led to the fourth and final version of the Working paper as inserted below.



24082011 Working  
paper on Mobility stra

Concerning the draft Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA, the Mobility WG agreed the following:

- to finalize this document during the Berlin meeting;
- clarification for the few open issues (see brackets in the draft strategy) will be delivered in time for the preparation of the Ministerial Conference;
- to ask the BFUG Chairs to introduce the so agreed version as a distinct point within the draft agenda of the next BFUG meeting in Cracow (October 13-14, 2011);
- to accompany its presentation during the Cracow BFUG meeting by a EUROSTAT intervention able to clearly explain the difficulties faced by the data collectors;
- As far as necessary, the WG will be involved by online communication or an extra meeting if the BFUG operates changes to this document. If not, there will be no other Mobility WG meeting until the next Ministerial Conference in Bucharest;
- following the discussion within the BFUG meeting in Cracow, the group drafting the Communiqué may use the Mobility strategy document to make some recommendations for the Ministers or even to include a general ministerial endorsement for the Strategy in the 2012 Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué.

The debates on the draft Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA led to the draft version as inserted below.



24082011 Draft  
Mobility strategy 2020

During the BFUG meeting held in Cracow (13-14 October 2011) the Chair of the Mobility WG presented to the BFUG members the draft Mobility strategy 2020 for the EHEA by highlighting the following main ideas:

- The proposed aim was to strive for more balanced mobility.
- The 20% target decided in Leuven was easy to achieve for some countries, but difficult or even impossible for others; each country should decide what was ambitious and still realistic in the next years and how to make it happen.
- The report includes a recommendation to change the mobility threshold from counting all mobility experiences from the threshold of 1 ECTS credit to including in the benchmark only mobility experiences abroad of min 15 ECTS credits or three months in duration.
- The EU/EHEA benchmarks were synchronized under all aspects, except for point 8, geographical scope.
- The BFUG / countries should try to identify bilaterally solutions for the current imbalances, since the mobility flows were not fully balanced, in case the imbalance proves detrimental.
- Quality assurance tools should be used for promoting mobility in the EHEA

For more information, the PowerPoint presentation from the chair of the Mobility WG as well as two additional presentations made by the European Commission and by Eurostat are available.



BFUG\_PL\_AM\_26\_4. BFUG\_PL\_AM\_26\_4. BFUG\_PL\_AM\_26\_4.  
2\_Mobility\_WG Chair-: 2\_Mobility\_EC 2\_Mobility\_Eurostat



Most of the main opinions expressed during the intense discussions that followed, are summarized below:

- Joint programmes should be flexibly assessed, according to commonly agreed principles.
- Being granted the right to perform quality assessments in EHEA is the incentive without which EQAR cannot become attractive for non-EHEA agencies.
- Staff mobility should be encouraged through incentives and a supportive institutional culture; academic staff members need to be part of the strategy – they act as motivators and multipliers.
- It was suggested the EHEA and EU should consider, while setting a benchmark, whether to include also shorter mobility periods, e.g. two months and ten credits
- The strategy goes too much into delicate issues, so the wording for “more autonomous institutions” could be softened. Setting up a national strategy and campaigns are politically sensitive and it should be up to each country to decide on the matter.
- New ways to improve the quality of mobility should be identified, not only in terms of duration but of services (pre and post-supporting services, language learning etc.)
- The EHEA Mobility strategy is a rather technical document, therefore the BFUG should endorse it and transform it into something appropriate for the ministers.

The Mobility WG Chair thanked everybody for their comments and suggestions while additionally mentioning the following:

- The items in brackets are still to be confirmed.
- Shorter mobility (of less than 15 ECTS/3 months) is important and the BFUG should try to report it, but not as a part of the benchmark.
- The new thresholds should include the three cycles and redrafting will make this idea clearer.
- In regard to the issue of leaving the national regulations aside for joint programmes, this point can be included into the document if everyone agreed with the suggestion.
- Academic staff references are made at number 10, because the measures to incentivise staff mobility are to be taken mainly by the HEIs.
- National strategies for internationalisation and mobility are necessary and needed.

The BFUG concluded that the received feedback on the draft Mobility strategy would be integrated and the consolidated version of the draft Mobility strategy and the Mobility WG report will be re-discussed and hopefully endorsed at the next BFUG meeting.

The Chair of the Mobility Group redrafted the Mobility strategy based on the inputs received from the Cracow BFUG meeting and of the outcome of the workshop "Exploring the possibilities of an internet-based admission system for studies in the EHEA" (Berlin, 18 November 2011). Immediately after then the Mobility WG's members have been consulted on the so redrafted version.

In addition, the Chair of the Mobility WG prepared and attached to this version a written proposal called “Line of action regarding the mobility strategy “Mobility for better Learning – mobility strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area” as inserted below.



11-11-28\_line of  
action mobility strateg

During the BFUG Board meeting held in Copenhagen on 30 November 2011, the Chair of the Mobility WG suggested that the BFUG should adopt the EHEA mobility strategy and ask the

ministers to endorse it in the Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué. He also underlined some main points in the strategy, such as:

- The benchmark of students coming into the EHEA as an indicator of the EHEA attractiveness;
- the view that more balanced mobility should be achieved, but not at the expense of high mobility levels;
- The commitments for more freedom of choice between the national quality assurance agencies listed in EQAR and the increase in fair recognition based on a learning outcomes approach.

In the Board discussion, the following points were made:

- A call for a harmonisation of the EHEA and EU benchmarks was already made in the EU context. The benchmark related to higher education now has 15 ECTS or 3 months duration as a threshold.
- It was agreed that the Ministers should endorse the strategy and refer to it as it is currently done in the draft Communiqué.
- With relation to the target for inward mobility it was asked why the 5% threshold was chosen and whether this was an appropriate level.
- The text on social security for academic staff should be adapted to the existing EU initiatives.
- A proposal to revise the EU visa regulations for teachers and students will soon be launched by the European Commission.

The mobility working group chair clarified that the target of 5% EHEA inward mobility is ambitious, because it doubles the current EHEA average calculated at 2.4%. It also stressed that some mobility imbalances can be good and these situations should be raised into discussion. In the field of visa regulations and work permits, it is indeed not only an administrative problem and this issue should be addressed in the internationalisation/ mobility strategies of the EHEA countries. The EU directive was not assessed as an EU centric problem, mainly due to its impact on the use of learning outcome for regulated professions.

It was further argued that the Communiqué should say that the 5% benchmark is only one of the possible indicators for attractiveness. On the reference to the EU directive regarding the recognition of qualifications, it was stated that the revision process is already very advanced. The link of professional recognition with learning outcomes has already been agreed, but the problem now is how to implement it. Perhaps this issue would be a good candidate for a BFUG WG. The revised directive should allow for a process of continuous improvement and this is where the Bologna Process would have a big role to play, especially for the professions which are regulated in some countries and not in others. On the issue of leaving higher education institutions more discretion, it was proposed to perhaps start with the joint degrees.

The BFUG Chair congratulated the group for its work and concluded that the comments made should be taken in by the Mobility WG. The BFUG Board should not commit on the detailed outline of the communiqué at this point but it agrees that the EHEA mobility strategy should be adopted by the BFUG and most likely endorsed by the EHEA ministers as an enclosure of the Communiqué.

After this meeting the Chair of the Mobility WG redrafted an updated version by considering the BFUG Board meeting comments as well as other relevant comments received during the time from the Mobility WG's members.

This new version (of 28 November 2011) - available below - was circulated on 13 December 2011 to the attention of the BFUG members.



11-11-28\_Draft  
Mobility Strategy 202

In line with the Mobility ToR's provisions, all documents circulated to the Mobility WG members have been also circulated to the Reporting WG Co-Chairs.

### Conclusions and recommendations

The five meetings of the Working Group on Mobility clearly demonstrate the importance and the different conceptions of mobility in the EHEA. Especially a close cooperation with other BFUG Working Groups and Networks and with the European Commission have been very useful in this context.

The main task of the Working Group on Mobility was to draft a **mobility strategy “Mobility for Better Learning” by Ministers in 2012**, thereby contributing to the overall goal of successful implementation of the European Higher Education Area by facilitating high quality mobility in higher education at all levels and for everyone as well as ensuring good conditions for mobility:

- The strategy offers a whole array of measures for governmental and institutional actors to further boost mobility. It provides recommendations on how to encourage high quality mobility and on stimulating further efforts in the area of mobility.
- A more precise definition of the benchmark mentioned in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué is proposed and efforts to accommodate the issue of the mobility benchmark with the European Commission have been made.
- In addition, the issues of balanced mobility and mobility obstacles have been analysed and assessed by the WG. Examples of good practice in this context have been referred to in the group's discussions.