

**Thematic Peer Group B on
the Lisbon Recognition Convention
3rd Meeting**

29th of January 2026

Online

Minutes of the meeting

List of participants

Country/Institution	First Name	Last Name
Andorra	Mar	Martínez Ramírez
Armenia	Gayane	Harutyunyan
Austria	Hannah	Pesek
Austria	Karin	Giese
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dženan	Omanović
Bulgaria	Kostadin	Tonev
Bulgaria	Vanya	Grashkina
Council of Europe	Alessandra	Ricci Ascoli
Denmark	Allan Bruun	Pedersen
EQAR	Aleksandar	Šušnjar
ESU	Katariina	Järve
EUA	Helene	Peterbauer
EURASHE	Jakub	Grodecki
European Commission	Agnieszka	Jelnicka
France (Co-Chair)	Jingchao	Shi
Georgia	Anna	Kamladze
Georgia	Salome	Abramishvili
Germany	Tim	Maschuw
Greece	Vasilis	Charalampopoulos
Holy See	Melanie	Rosenbaum
Hungary	Gabor	Meszaros
Italy (Co-Chair)	Chiara	Finocchietti
Italy	Emanuela	Gitto
Italy	Giacinta	Ratto Vaquer
Italy	Marianna	Tardioli
Latvia	Baiba	Ramina
Latvia	Rūdolf Aleksandrs	Strods
Latvia	Solvita	Silina
Liechtenstein	Belgin	Amann
Lithuania	Aurelija	Valeikiene
Malta	Graziella	Debattista
Netherlands	Bas	Wegewijs

Country/Institution	First Name	Last Name
Netherlands	Jenneke	Lokhoff
Norway	Dag	Hovdhaugen
Poland	Hanna	Reczulska
Republic of Moldova	Rodica	Isac
Romania	Cristina	Goțiu
Romania	Adrian	Iordache
Romania	Gianina	Chirazi
Romania	Veronica	Murariu
San Marino	Remo	Massari
San Marino	Monica	Cavalli
Slovakia	Lucia	Hustavova
Slovenia	Sabina	Zajc
Sweden	Ernst	Lindqvist
Switzerland	Stella	Krepp
Türkiye	Canan	Ünvan
Ukraine (Co-Chair)	Maryna	Mruga
Ukraine	Tetiana	Vahina
UNESCO	Leila	Loupis
Bologna Implementation Coordination Group	Maria	Kelo
WG on Monitoring and Implementation	David	Crosier
EHEA Secretariat	Irina	Duma

Albania, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Montenegro and the United Kingdom – Scotland were absent.

1. Welcome remarks and introduction to the meeting by TPG B Co-Chairs

The Ukrainian Co-Chair welcomed all participants to the 3rd TPG B on LRC meeting, dedicated to the topic of automatic recognition, and briefly went through the proposed agenda. The TPG B members approved the agenda with no further comments.

2. Automatic recognition: evidence from the monitoring exercise

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 2.1 Presentation](#) (Allan Bruun Pedersen, President of the LRC Convention Committee Bureau)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 2.2 Presentation](#) (David Crosier, BFUG Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process Co-Chair)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 2.3 Presentation](#) (Agnieszka Jelnicka, European Commission)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 2.4 Presentation](#) (Katariina Järve, European Students' Union)

Following the presentations delivered by the four speakers on the monitoring exercises related to the implementation of automatic recognition across the EHEA, as well as the students' perspective on automatic recognition, the Ukrainian Co-Chair opened the floor for discussion.

Germany noted their progress from 2020 to 2024 in fully recognising Erasmus+ learning periods abroad, remarking however that the country was still placed last among the European Union member states. The European Commission clarified that the national context should also be

taken into account when comparing data between countries and across years, also mentioning that the exact numbers would be checked before publication.

Switzerland emphasised the complexity of their higher education institutions in implementing automatic recognition, mainly because of the incomplete information provided by other HE systems.

The Netherlands pointed out the general progress made in terms of automatic recognition across European countries. However, he noted that countries should have quality assurance systems compliant with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Higher Education (ESG), as well as national qualifications framework referenced to the Qualifications Framework of the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA), in order to be eligible for automatic recognition. Thus, automatic recognition may not be possible because of the missing quality assurance and qualifications frameworks requirements. David Crosier noted that the Bologna Process Implementation Report aimed at finding whether automatic recognition was in place in the EHEA countries which meet the conditions for automatic recognition. Allan Bruun Pedersen added that the key issue was that not all countries had actually implemented all the Bologna tools necessary for applying automatic recognition. He also informed that in the upcoming period, the Lisbon Recognition Convention Bureau would investigate which are the substantial differences between countries, as perceived by the EHEA members, which prevents them from automatically recognizing qualifications.

Lithuania asked for further details regarding the discussions held or planned to be held with the ministers for higher education as a follow-up from the monitoring exercises. The European Commission mentioned that discussions had taken place in various bodies of the EHEA, the European Union Council, as well as Council of Europe bodies.

3. Sharing practices at national and international level

Documents: [TPG_B_3_CY_NO_3.1_Presentation](#) (Tim Maschuw, Germany)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 3.2 Presentation](#) (Gábor Mészáros, Hungary)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 3.3 Presentation](#) (Jenneke Lokhoff, The Netherlands)

[TPG B 3 CY NO 3.4 Presentation](#) (Alessandra Ricci Ascoli, Council of Europe)

The French Co-Chair thanked speakers for sharing their findings and practices at both national and international level and especially noted the invitation to attend the online Automatic Recognition Fest on the 12th of March 2026, organised in the framework of the AR2030 project.

4. Introduction to breakout sessions

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 4 Presentation](#) (Chiara Finocchietti, Italy, TPG B Co-Chair)

The Italian Co-Chair presented the results of the survey on recognition and artificial intelligence compiled by members in preparation of the meeting, as well as the guiding questions for the breakout sessions on the use of artificial intelligence in recognition processes aimed at supporting automatic recognition.

5. Breakout sessions on recognition and artificial intelligence (AI)

Participants were divided into three working groups, each tackling the risks to be taken into consideration when applying artificial intelligence in recognition processes, as well as the opportunities of using such tools.

6. Reporting in plenary

Lithuania reported on behalf of the first group, starting with the antagonistic nature of artificial intelligence, able to both enhance and atrophy human intelligence. The group noted the ethical aspects which need to be taken into consideration when using AI for handling the personal data of applicants. At the same time, the excessive use of AI may jeopardize the decision-making processes, especially in the context of constantly evolving methodologies and practices whereas AI is based on past recorded practice. Participants concluded that AI must be constantly monitored by humans, trained and retrained, to ensure the accuracy of information provided and its use. Nonetheless, it was emphasized that further verification of documents submitted for recognition purposes needs to still be conducted, given the fast-paced advancements of the AI which may increase forgeries.

As rapporteur for the second group, Romania noted the participants' interest in exploring the use of AI in recognition processes. They highlighted the need for guidance in using AI tools, while acknowledging that information security standards also need to be complied with. Participants noted that the use of AI in recognition would be primarily subject to the national legislation frameworks, and linked with European legislation in relation to handling personal and sensitive data. They also emphasised the importance of a human based approach, and the possible unethical consequences of relying only on AI when making decisions regarding recognition. Nonetheless, better expertise for using AI was considered necessary before its mainstreaming among practitioners.

EUA reported for the third group, underlining the participants' focus on how AI could be used safely and ethically for recognition purposes, while some having reservations in this regard. The group also emphasised the need for clarifying what type of tasks would include the use of AI, providing the example of using AI tools for regular information gathering. The major risk identified referred to providing access to personal and sensitive data and, therefore, human intervention would be needed in this regard. Another risk referred to the AI's tendency of 'pleasing the users' for keeping them engaged, thus becoming less trustworthy. Paradoxically, in order to train AI for more efficient use, more data has to be provided, thus increasing the risks to data privacy. Moreover, AI could have a potential detrimental effect on the level of expertise of credential evaluators. More specifically, if the recognition processes would be entirely outsourced to AI, the expertise and experience of humans would be jeopardized, in exchange for short-term gains. In terms of opportunities, the group acknowledged the fairly good translation services provided by AI, analysis of large sets of data, or gathering information from various sources. The group concluded that AI could be used in recognition-adjacent tasks, while the decision making should rely on humans who would also have an information provision duty towards the public.

The Italian Co-Chair thanked the rapporteurs for providing the overview of the discussions held in the breakout groups, highlighting the common points raised both in terms of risks and opportunities for using AI tools in the recognition processes at national level.

7. Updates on TPG B workplan, midterm survey and next steps

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 7 Presentation](#)

The French Co-Chair presented the latest developments of the TPG B on LRC's work and invited the group members to attend the upcoming 4th meeting, to be organized in-person in Sevres, France, on the 24th of June 2026 on the foreseen topic of flexible learning pathways. Moreover, further information about the midterm survey on TPG B monitoring has been provided, announcing its launch soon after the meeting.

8. Inputs from the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 8 Presentation](#)

The Bologna Implementation Coordination Group (BICG) EUA Co-Chair presented the aim of the group in ensuring the synergies of the four TPGs and between them and the BFUG.

Supported by the EUA BICG Co-chair, the Holy See raised the point of the connection oftentimes perceived as lacking between the countries' representatives in the TPGs that are not their BFUG delegates, recalling the expectation to then appoint two representatives in each TPG, preferably with one of them being the BFUG delegate of the respective country or a ministry representative. On another note, the Holy See suggested making the surveys available in additional formats to allow the possibility of consultations at national level before submitting the responses.

9. TPG-LRC Plus: umbrella project supporting the institutional activity of the Thematic Peer Group B

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 9 Presentation](#)

As the coordinator of the TPG-LRC Plus, CIMEA presented the project aimed at supporting the activity of the TPG B on LRC in the current working period.

10. Wrap up and conclusions

Documents: [TPG B 3 CY NO 10 Presentation](#)

The Italian Co-Chair recalled the upcoming launch of the mid-term survey to be filled in by TPG B members, addressing the activity of the TPG B so far with a view to identify what worked well and which topics would need to be revisited. She also announced the organisation of the first seminar on automatic recognition, open to all stakeholders and interested parties, to be organised online on the 16th of April 2026.

Finally, the Italian Co-Chair thanked all speakers, rapporteurs and participants likewise, for sharing their experience and expertise.