

4th Working Group on Internationalisation and Mobility (WG on IM) Meeting

29th – 30th of April 2026

UAS Technikum Wien, Höchstädtplatz 6, 1200 Vienna, Austria

Minutes of the meeting

List of participants

Country	Name	Last Name
Andorra	Jordi	Llombart
Armenia	Arpine	Arakelyan
Armenia	Ofelya	Zakaryan
Austria	Christina	Raab
Austria	Stephan	De Pasqualin
Belgium – Flemish Community	Ruth	Lamotte
Belgium - French Community	Adriana	Gonfroid
Business Europe	Regina	Aichner
Croatia	Loredana	Maravić
Czech Republic	Roman	Klepetko
ENQA	Elena	Cirlan
ESU	Arno	Schrooyen
ESU	Franziska Sophia	Knogler
EURASHE	Ulla	Preeden
European Commission	Mia	Wallin Hansen
EUA	Michael	Gaebel
Finland	Kaisu	Piironen
France	Antonio	Neves
Georgia	Nino	Kadagishvili
Germany (Co-Chair)	David	Akrami Flores
Germany	Max	Dietrich
Greece	Nikolaos	Karaiskos
The Holy See	Melanie	Rosenbaum
Hungary	Bianka	Paulovics

Ireland	Sheena	Duffy
Italy	Maria Antonietta	Ciclista
Latvia	Martins	Sabovics
Malta	Philip	Vella
Netherlands (Co-chair)	Arthur	Belle
Norway	Niclas	Lindahl Trosdahl
Poland	Anna	Jurkowska-Zeidler
Romania	Ligia	Deca
Romania	Nicoleta - Cristina	Popa
Slovenia	Božidar	Grigić
Switzerland	Rahel	Hollenstein
UNESCO	Noah	Sobe
United Kingdom - Scotland	Shannon	Stowers
Ukraine	Alla	Rybalko
Ukraine (Co-Chair)	Maryna	Mruga
Head of EHEA Secretariat	Horia	Serban Onita
Member of EHEA Secretariat	Lilia	Parhomenco

Albania, Cyprus, Education International - ETUCE, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova (Co-chair), Montenegro, San Marino, Spain, United Kingdom did not attend the meeting. Azerbaijan, Liechtenstein, Slovakia and Türkiye sent their apologies.

The meeting started at 9:09 CEST.

1. Welcome by the host and adoption of the agenda

Documents: [WG on IM 4 CY NO 1 Agenda](#)
[WG on IM 3 DK LI 1 Minutes 30-31.05.2025](#)

The meeting started with welcome remarks from the Austrian hosts, recalling the successful peer learning activity organised prior to the WG meeting. The WG Co-chairs thanked the hosts for their support and welcomed everyone to the meeting, which had been the most attended WG meeting so far. They noted that the WG arrived at half of its mandate and started moving towards more concrete results, with important decisions expected to be taken during this meeting. With no remarks, the agenda was adopted as proposed.

Regarding the 3rd meeting minutes, the EHEA Secretariat pointed out to minor changes regarding the Holy See's excused absence and informed about Andorra's suggestion to note in the minutes that the WG agreed with the suggestion to use the terminology from the indicators for the Principles and Guidelines on social dimension referring to 'strategies or major policy documents' when describing top-level policy documents. The EHEA Secretariat added that the request was compliant with the recording and the suggestion was incorporated accordingly.



2. Updates from the EHEA Secretariat and Feedback from the BFUG Landscape

Documents: [WG on IM 4 CY NO 2 Discussion Paper on IM Acti on Plan 24.02.2026](#)
[WG on IM 4 CY NO 2 Draft EHEA Action Plan on I&M V2.0 March 2026](#)
[WG on IM 4 CY NO 2 Draft Note on Terminology V2.3 March 2026](#)

Updates from the EHEA Secretariat

The EHEA Secretariat provided an update on recent developments within the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) and the broader European Higher Education Area (EHEA) agenda. It was noted that two BFUG meetings had taken place since the previous WG meeting. The EHEA Secretariat gave updates from each working structure and informed about the overall implementation of the BFUG Work Programme. With regard to monitoring activities, participants were informed about the ongoing data collection process for the Bologna Process Implementation Report 2027, including the chapter dedicated to internationalisation and mobility. An update was also provided regarding the public consultation on the de facto implementation of the fundamental values of the EHEA. The consultation remained open and accessible through the EHEA website and social media channels.

WG members were informed about ongoing discussions concerning the revision of the ESG and the ECTS User's Guide, with the approval of both revised documents anticipated at the BFUG meeting in Dublin, followed by formal adoption by ministers at the Ministerial Conference. The Secretariat underlined the close interrelation between these documents and the action plan currently under development. The EHEA Secretariat further explained the coordination efforts related to terminology alignment across Bologna Process documents. Finally, the Secretariat presented the newly launched EHEA and reminded members about the EHEA newsletter.

Updates from the WG co-chairs

The Dutch WG Co-chair gave updates on the activity of the 2 sub-groups, as well as the discussions from the BFUG meetings. He pointed out that the draft Note on Terminology had been presented at the BFUG meeting in Copenhagen. BFUG members positively welcomed the progress achieved on the Note on Terminology, reflected on what should be in the Note (descriptive elements) and in the Action Plan (normative elements) and highlighted the importance of ensuring coherence with terminology used across other Bologna Process documents and frameworks. Following the BFUG meeting, the document was further revised by including the incorporation of the UNESCO definition of intercultural competences. The revised draft remained open for written comments.

Although no formal deliverables had initially been planned for the March 2026 BFUG meeting, the Dutch WG co-chair informed that the Working Group prepared a short discussion paper in order to gather strategic feedback from BFUG members on key elements of the future Action Plan. The discussion paper presented in March focused on three main topics: mobility targets - noting different EHEA/EEA targets currently in place; balanced mobility and the geopolitical dimension to internationalisation and mobility, including different approaches for mobility within EHEA and between the EHEA and other regions.



Regarding the mobility targets, the Dutch Co-chair pointed out that BFUG members generally agreed that priority should be given to removing barriers to mobility and a qualitative approach to internationalisation rather than revising numerical targets, yet the majority supported the existing 20% target. Furthermore, he noted that several delegations also highlighted the importance of distinguishing between degree and credit mobility, considering different approaches and targets per study cycles, and strengthening staff mobility. On balanced mobility, BFUG members agreed on a definition combining both qualitative and quantitative dimensions and emphasized the need to move beyond purely quantitative approaches and instead promote more open and attractive higher education systems through the removal of mobility barriers. Concerning the geopolitical dimension, BFUG members stressed the importance of maintaining values-based international cooperation.

The Holy See recalled two additional points which had been raised in the BFUG, namely whether in-country mobility between different federal states or language regions could also be counted towards the mobility target and, supported by Austria, also the possibility to establish separate targets per study cycle, considering the discussion at the BFUG meeting in Strasbourg in 2022 showing the very different mobility situation depending on the study cycle. The Dutch Co-chair replied that the first proposal would complicate measurement and would rather be valuable for national authorities themselves, while on the second matter the 20% mobility target was cumulative, covering the overall mobility percentage without differentiating between the cycles.

Andorra stated that, in line with the ToRs, the Action Plan should focus on providing concrete recommendations to member states for achieving balanced, green and inclusive mobility, and inquired about the status of the Action Plan in relation with the Communiqué. In response, the Dutch Co-chair clarified that in the BFUG just certain things had been discussed, due to lack of time, in order to have an overall guidance for specific topics. On the second point, the EHEA Secretariat pointed out that the Draft Structure for the Iași-Chișinău Communiqué mentions the Action Plan as an annex.

The Dutch Co-chair introduced the revised draft Action Plan, informing the group that the draft Action Plan would be open for a round of written comments until the 15th of May. He highlighted that the Sub-group focused on having a complete document, even if that meant having more commitments. The Action Plan was divided into two sections - internationalisation and learning mobility, with the part on removing barriers to learning mobility still underdeveloped. The Dutch co-chair opened the floor for discussions and preliminary feedback.

Greece emphasized the important role of higher education institutions in promoting mobility and suggested that the text should be more specific in providing recommendations to HEIs to integrate mobility opportunities into study programmes and curricula, particularly regarding staff mobility.

Supported by EUA and Austria, ENQA raised concerns regarding the number of commitments included in the document, with the suggestion (supported by Finland) to bring secondary commitments into main ones. Supported by EUA, ENQA also noted that the existing principles appeared to focus primarily on HEIs and proposed including stronger references to the role of national authorities in removing barriers to learning mobility and international cooperation. In addition, ENQA suggested revising the table on systemic challenges and gaps related to learning mobility, which was considered to interrupt the flow and structure of the document. In response, the Dutch Co-Chair clarified that the draft already distinguishes between barriers to



learning mobility and barriers to internationalisation. Regarding the table, it was noted that the format had been retained from the first draft, while remaining open to further discussion and possible revision.

ESU suggested better linking international cooperation with fundamental values and barriers to mobility to achieving inclusive mobility. Furthermore, they proposed better emphasising the structural issues for achieving green mobility and how to tackle them.

Participants expressed further views on the nature, structure, and level of ambition of the draft Action Plan. Supported by EUA, Slovenia raised a question regarding the nature of the Action Plan, noting that the current draft appeared closer to a strategic statement than an operational action plan. He suggested including more concrete elements, such as targets, timelines, and a clearer distinction between short-, medium-, and long-term actions, in order to better reflect its status as an Action Plan. The EHEA Secretariat recalled that strategic-level direction had already been reflected in the Strategy adopted by the Bucharest Communiqué and thus the mandate was to develop an action plan as a follow-up.

Supported by Austria, EUA further suggested distinguishing between commitments, noting that some appeared more operational and related to benchmarks and policy goals, while others remained highly general in nature and closer to a 'code of conduct'.

Supported by Austria, the Holy See proposed focusing on less commitments but making them more precise and SMART targets including the status quo, the target and how to reach it. They considered that the political commitments and targets should not be conditioned by the data which can be monitored in the present. They urged to be more operative and less strategic and announced their intention to join the sub-group on the Action Plan.

Romania noted that a significant number of commitments from the draft Action Plan already exist within the Bologna framework. She recalled additional existing commitments from the 2012 Mobility Strategy which had not been followed through, such as the inward mobility benchmark, particularly for students from outside the EHEA. In this context, Romania suggested building on the existing ministerial commitments and working to make them more measurable, concrete and attractive, without narrowing the content of the existing draft Action Plan.

Austria suggested also considering what to be included in the Communiqué as a contribution from the WG. They suggested including the commitment on stakeholder engagement (*commitment 5*) in the first one and emphasised the importance of numerical targets for incentivising implementation. Furthermore, Austria noted that the complexity and diversity of internationalisation cannot be adequately measured through a single mobility target, such as the existing 20% benchmark. In this context, Austria suggested that the operationalisation of the Action Plan should rely on a broader and more diverse monitoring toolbox. Furthermore, they suggested paying more attention to the internationalisation of learning outcomes and the impact in study programmes.

In response, the Dutch Co-Chair underlined the importance of developing a strategic vision for the period after the 2027 Ministerial Conference, including how to measure internationalisation targets, as well as a toolbox to support the implementation by public authorities and HEIs. He noted that the action plan could include commitments on how it should be followed-up after its adoption in 2027.

The EHEA Secretariat reflected further on the level of detail and coherence of the draft Action Plan, noting the distinction between three complementary outputs of the Working Group: contributions to the Ministerial Communiqué, the Action Plan itself, and the Working Group report. He observed that the current draft contains differing levels of detail across themes. Particular reference was made to transparency and information-sharing, where existing Bologna commitments and recognition frameworks already provide a more developed basis. ECTS recognition was also identified as an area that appears insufficiently addressed in comparison with its broader importance. He further suggested to include clear follow-up and monitoring mechanisms in the Action Plan for national milestones and strategies. Finally, caution was expressed regarding the identification of barriers to mobility which are only relative frictions in nature. He cited academic calendars as an example, given that substantial mobility had historically taken place despite differing calendars, which could unintentionally create additional justifications for limited mobility rather than encourage practical solutions.

Greece suggested calling on the Commission to facilitate inclusive and balanced mobility through administrative and financial measures. EUA suggested to focus on internationalisation equally as for mobility and keep all existing content from the Action Plan either in the document or in a separate report. He also noted that for mobility targets the group may want an appendix for the technical details.

3. Decision Slot I: The Mobility Benchmark

The German Co-chair set the scene for the discussions by presenting the existing outward mobility target that 20% of graduates had an in-person mobility experience of over 15 ECTS. He pointed out that the potential inward mobility target, mentioned in the 2012 Strategy, had not been followed-up upon. He contrasted the EHEA target with the 2024 EU target of 23% mobile students with an in-person or hybrid mobility target of over 3 ECTS. The German Co-chair pointed out that the Commission would propose a methodology for measuring the number of mobile students. The three questions for the WG were: i) whether to align the EHEA target with EU's target, ii) whether to consider additional national targets, acknowledging different starting points and contexts, and iii) whether to define inward mobility targets at EHEA level (from outside) or at national level (from in or outside EHEA).

The Holy See, EUA and Romania recalled previous BFUG discussions supporting the existing EHEA mobility target, with the Holy See suggesting to focus on identifying effective measures to achieve them instead. Austria highlighted the methodological complexity of measuring mobility and noted that national results may vary depending on the categories included in reporting, such as ISCED level 5 programmes. Supported by Germany, Belgium-French Community and the European Commission, Austria expressed the view that short-term mobility should be included within the calculation of the mobility target in line with the EEA target. Regarding qualitative dimensions of mobility and internationalization, Austria suggested working in the next cycle on developing a qualitative indicator for monitoring internationalisation.

EUA suggested improving the methodologies used for measuring mobility, as some traineeships were not counted, and supported setting subtargets per sector with 20% as a composite target. He pointed out that apart from mobility targets, the WG should consider how to have better approaches to internationalisation and mobility, and drew attention to the commitment that all students should have international experiences. EUA recalled the example from the PLA the day before with courses marked for internationalisation and a requirement to have a number of ECTS credits from these courses to gain international exposure. EUA considered that a higher

benchmark could include international experiences which are not mobility but of similar value or a combination of smaller mobility and internationalisation at home experiences counting a relevant number of ECTS credits. In reply, the Holy See pointed out that when it was asked what would be the threshold for meaningful internationalisation at home, the institution from the example raised by EUA said the threshold should be at least 30 ECTS from 'internationalised classes'.

Slovenia mentioned that mobility and internationalisation targets should remain separate. Romania suggested focusing on how to better measure valuable internationalisation and mobility experiences in a more complex world than in 2009. She pointed out the need to clarify what we want to measure, by whom and how before deciding whether we want additional benchmarks, as well as specify what data we want to collect, e.g. on blended mobility, virtual cooperation, ECTS linked to internationalisation competencies.

The European Commission noted that data collection challenges should not limit efforts to expand internationalisation opportunities and the existing ambition. Supported by Belgium-French Community and Austria, they pointed out that newer versions of mobility had been instrumental for a more inclusive mobility. The EHEA Secretariat emphasised that certain aspects of internationalisation, particularly the objective that all students should benefit from international experience, are difficult to measure in practice unless they are embedded more systematically within study programmes. He pointed out the potential role of the ESG in ensuring that all students have international experiences. Regarding mobility targets and supported by Slovenia, he referenced previous discussions from the BFUG where support emerged for combining a target for physical mobility and a target for wider/more inclusive approaches.

EUA argued that the Action Plan could provide a useful framework for supporting institutional actors who are already working on these issues through stronger guidance from the EHEA level. Supported by Slovenia, EUA stressed the importance of establishing sufficiently clear and commonly understood definitions and agreeing on how to measure internationalisation beyond mobility. EUA stressed the importance of clearly communicating that, although the 20% benchmark should be maintained, it should not be understood as the sole indicator of successful mobility within the EHEA.

Slovenia pointed out that 15 ECTS were deemed necessary for counting the mobility experience based on the exposure required to immerse themselves in the host country. They recognised the added value of the new types of mobilities but argued for a different treatment and recalled that they were already considered for the commitment that all students have an international experience. Slovenia suggested working on rewriting learning outcomes to ensure international and intercultural competencies and that all study programmes have such kinds of learning outcomes.

Romania underlined that one of the main challenges remains defining international competencies. As an example, reference was made to study programmes such as international relations, where institutions could claim that all students already acquire intercultural competences by default. Romania therefore stressed the need for additional time to develop clearer methodologies, indicators, and targets capable of capturing internationalisation in a meaningful and coherent manner, and proposed a matrix of what we want and what we can measure. EUA and the Holy See believed that work on this topic could start during this cycle, including through benchmarks that could be politically agreed first, while methodological details would be developed subsequently. On a different note, the Ukrainian Co-chair proposed

looking at the higher-order purpose leading to monitoring I&M and determining whether through existing policies such purpose is met.

The German Co-Chair raised the question of whether the WG should also engage in discussions on the incoming mobility target. The Ukrainian Co-chair supported such a target as a measure of the competitiveness of the EHEA in bringing external talent, while Slovenia inquired whether such targets could be expected at national level without a EHEA target. The Dutch Co-chair considered that inward mobility was included in the balanced mobility, whereas data on inward mobility supports identifying open and attractive systems. In reply, Slovenia argued that increased incoming mobility may also depend on historical factors, while certain actions such as study programmes in foreign languages could certainly influence it. The WG concluded that the incoming mobility benchmark would not be tackled, while the Action Plan should still strongly reference breaking barriers to incoming mobility and explain why this would benefit countries.

Coming back to the target on internationalisation, Romania recalled that the original 20% mobility target had itself been highly ambitious and noted that the political commitment had preceded the development of detailed measurement methodologies. In this sense, the group could propose the target that all study programmes should have an international component, then work in the next cycle on defining how to measure it. In reply, the European Commission recalled that the ministers already agreed that all students should have internationalisation experience. Furthermore, Romania recalled that ESG could be an avenue for supporting the internationalisation of curriculum since the current version does not include any reference in that regard. On a similar issue, the Holy See stressed the fact that the ECTS User's Guide should also be correlated with the ongoing work, emphasising that the current draft of the Guide should not hamper mobility with other regions.

On a different note, Ireland considered it unrealistic to expect all programmes to foster international components, and argued that curriculum is not the only way through which internationalisation can be experienced. Ireland suggested a commitment that countries and HEIs adopt their own internationalisation strategies with targets.

Austria disagreed with having a different target than the EEA as it would create additional reporting burden for HEIs. As the internationalisation of curricula was already reflected in the draft Action Plan, Austria wondered whether more concrete targets could be included, e.g. that by 2034 20% of the study programmes have an internationalised curriculum.

The German Co-chair concluded that, at this stage, the WG would seek to maintain the target of 20% mobile graduates counting at least 15 ECTS. Furthermore, the Group recognised the added value of shorter mobility opportunities and agreed that this should be further reflected in the ongoing drafting of the Action Plan. Finally, the Group agreed to continue exploring how the Action Plan could better capture other forms of valuable internationalisation experiences (e.g. internationalisation at home and the internationalised curriculum), including how such experiences could be defined and, where appropriate, measured.

4. Pillar Workshop: Internationalisation Beyond Mobility

The WG members divided into three sub-groups to discuss the first 5 commitments from the draft Action Plan focusing on internationalisation.

On behalf of Group 1, ENQA reported that the group looked at each of the commitments and their bullet points in order to transform them into SMART goals. As general remarks, it pointed out that the commitments should respect institutional autonomy, the *commitment 5* should be removed (and moved under *commitment 1*) and that the WG should liaise with the ESG steering committee to include internationalisation in the standard on programme design. Furthermore, appropriate attention should be given to mobility windows.

For *commitment 1*, the group suggested to include the collaboration with stakeholders on the development of internationalisation strategies and during the whole policy cycle and expect the internationalisation strategies by 2028. Furthermore, the group suggested that the internationalisation strategies should include measures to remove barriers from implementing Bologna tools and enhance international cooperation.

For *commitment 2*, they suggested using 'promote' instead of 'envision' a holistic and comprehensive perspective of internationalisation. They proposed to highlight the consideration of learning outcomes for all students and move the sentence starting with 'Consequently' to the bullet point below. For the last bullet point - add '*encourage and ask*' (instead of facilitate) HEIs to expand the number of language learning opportunities, deleting the rest of the sentence talking about the number of courses and programmes taught in other languages.

For *commitment 3*, the group suggested a rewording into '*we confirm the value of international cooperation and commit to reducing the barriers to joint learning opportunities, such as (...)*'. They proposed mentioning not only joint programmes and degrees, but also microcredentials. For the bullet points, they proposed deleting the first one and emphasising gaps in the second one by stating '*we are committed to addressing the gaps in the implementation of Bologna key commitments and improve their implementation through strengthened national action plans*', replacing the list of Bologna tools. Regarding the last bullet point, the recognition of EU developments should be mentioned in the introduction, including an accent on the revised Erasmus+ strategy and acknowledging the support of Erasmus+ for EHEA as a whole.

Finally, for *commitment 4*, the group proposed to delete 'robust' and rethink the structure of the document so that staff mobility does not come before student mobility. On the first bullet point, the group discussed whether to mention 'skills' or 'competencies'. Furthermore, if some of the aspects of this bullet point would be included in the definition of internationalisation from the Note on terminology, then the bullet point could be removed. The group proposed deleting the second bullet point and mentioning in the third bullet points that the elements for staff mobility should be included in the national strategy for internationalisation. Finally, the last bullet point should be included in the commitment itself and 'European education programmes' should be replaced with '*through mobility and transnational programmes*'.

Andorra reported on behalf of Group 2. They suggested merging commitments (e.g. two and five, respectively three and four) and looking at what other regions are doing to attract international students (e.g. Asia, Arab states). They also noted that some HEIs may be well advanced in internationalisation strategies while others wait for guidance. For *commitment 1*, they considered it more appropriate for a strategic vision. They suggested reflecting on how to ensure interaction between domestic and international students and suggested replacing 'European and international cooperation' with 'European and worldwide/global cooperation'. They suggested having a similar approach in wording the different bullet points and ensuring that all refer to top-level regulation instead of strategies. Furthermore, it should be clarified whether such policies apply to national or institutional level.

For *commitment 2*, the group suggested mentioning European University Alliances as ways to promote inclusive and holistic internationalisation. For *commitment 3*, they noted how internationalisation could also be seen as a tool to build a better market, not only as a goal in itself. The group highlighted that the text could mention issues like tuition fees and visa issues, and include microcredentials as well as references to the Principles and Guidelines for Social Dimension.

Romania reported on behalf of Group 3. As a general comment, they suggested removing *commitment 5* and recalled that the AP should mention that public funding is required in order to sustain these commitments. For *commitment 1* they proposed replacing 'which enhances the quality and accessibility...', which was already in the bullet points, with '*which benefits individuals, HEIs and societies*'. They further suggested linking national and institutional strategies in the second bullet point, notably that institutional strategies should take into account and build upon the goals in the national strategies, and that national strategies should include clear goals and measurable targets considering EHEA goals. They added that national strategies should be evaluated and monitored on a continuous basis.

Regarding *commitment 2*, they proposed revising into '*We envision a holistic and inclusive perspective of internationalisation by comprehensive approaches that integrate international, intercultural and global dimensions into all aspects of HE*' and move the other elements into bullet points. They also considered mentioning financial support to expand the capacity of HEIs and proposed that in the last bullet point 'number of language learning courses' should be changed in '*broadening the offer for language learning*'.

Pertaining to *commitment 3*, the group proposed moving it as a bullet point under *commitment 1* as it talks about implementing Bologna tools. Finally, they suggested splitting commitment 3 in two - one about staff mobility, one about institutional cooperation, including support for joint degrees.

5. Decision Slot II: Geopolitics & Fundamental Values

The Ukrainian Co-chair introduced the session, focusing on how the WG could reflect the changing global context and protection of fundamental values within the Action Plan. She noted that new risks and threats pose increased security concerns. While relevant references to fundamental values appear in the vision, she considered that the topic was less visible in the actions, and insufficient attention was paid to the geopolitical impact. Finally, she added that, when approaching international cooperation, there should be a consideration for HEIs on whether their potential partners respect fundamental values.

In a temporary absence of the UNESCO delegate, the Holy See recalled that UNESCO had earlier distributed their publication of seven guiding principles for international cooperation in their Transformative HE Roadmap, which the WG could refer to. They advised against additional content on this subject if it cannot be pointed specifically to the remit of the group, as other BFUG working structures work on the impact of geopolitics in general.

Spain considered that the subject should be particularly addressed by the WG, noting that as legislation on research security and physical security of students and staff is increasingly common in Europe, HEIs should be recognised as diplomatic actors. In this sense, they contrasted existing science diplomacy policies at European level with the lack of a university diplomacy policy. Supported by Ukraine and Slovenia, Spain suggested introducing an



expectation that HEIs do due diligence for their partners, including whether they respect fundamental values. Slovenia further added that both responsible internationalisation and European and democratic values should be strengthened in the text.

Romania suggested maintaining the value-based internationalisation approach of the EHEA and making the point that internationalisation and mobility are important for academia and people-to-people cooperation irrespective of geopolitics. UNESCO agreed with emphasising the growing importance of the academic diplomacy role and suggested a reference to other purposes of international cooperation, such as advancing fundamental values and promoting adequate protocols for equitable research collaboration.

Upon calls for liaison with the WG on Fundamental Values and the CG on Global Policy Dialogue, the Dutch Co-chair clarified that the working structures were coordinated through the BFUG Board. He expressed differences between the approach of the structures: while the WG on FV defined the values for EHEA, the WG on IM considers how to apply them for internationalisation; similarly, while the CG on GPD focused on communicating with other regions, the WG on IM works on defining EHEA's rationales and goals. The Dutch Co-chair further suggested asking countries to address in their national strategies how they approach fundamental values in relation to students, institutions and countries.

30th of April 2026

6. Integrated Work Stations

The German Co-chair introduced the objective of the session. Members were divided into four groups discussing solutions to systemic mobility barriers by embedding them into action lines.

The first group discussed administrative and legal barriers to mobility. The Holy See reported that the group identified a diversity between national traditions while facing the same global challenges. The group pointed out that an aim was to have a coherent interministerial agreement at national level. Barriers identified by the group included entry and visa regulations, financial burden, locked bank accounts, difficulty in receiving acceptance letters. They emphasised a difference between Schengen, EHEA, and non-EHEA students and suggested starting with the non-EHEA students as they faced the most difficulties. Additional problems included low intergovernmental communication (e.g. between education and migration authorities), lack of language availability and implementation measures. Solutions discussed by the group included: stronger communication between national authorities to arrive at coherent policies; facilitating visa procedures; developing a separate student visa category; permeability and openness for flexible pathways; anti-fraud measures (e.g. no possibility to issue acceptance letters for HEIs which do not retain their students systematically); fighting against prejudices against disciplines and countries; harmonising the requirements regarding access qualifications; access to social benefits, welfare, healthcare, housing during studies; particular approaches for students at risk and asylum seekers; publication of visa process, information for studies and for applications in at least two widely spoken languages.

The second group discussed financial and social barriers to mobility. ESU reported various challenges, such as discrimination in accessing housing, lack of information, financial costs, and discrimination in HE in general. As suggestions, the group proposed: having the status of a student with special needs recognised automatically within EHEA; full portability of grants; being able to exchange accommodation during mobility periods and offering platforms where accommodation can be found while avoiding scams. Furthermore, they suggested dorms

hosting both domestic and international students, availability of mental health services to international students, onboarding supporting services and buddy systems; removal of discriminatory regulations regarding access to work during studies and inclusivity training for staff in HEIs.

The third group discussed academic and curricula-related barriers to mobility. The Czech Republic reported that the group focused on inflexible curriculum design, lack of appropriate ECTS recognition, and lack of mobility windows. They suggested a better implementation of learning outcomes; moving the decision on ECTS recognition at a higher level than an individual professor; embedding mobility windows more specifically and using them for internationalisation at home as well; training for academics on internationalisation of curricula, which the group also suggested to be included in the ESG; promoting staff mobility as enabler for internationalisation. In general, the group emphasised that the policies should not aim for identical programmes through internationalisation, but complementarity and diversity.

The fourth group discussed green and digital mobility. Austria reported a lack of systematic approaches for sustainable mobility and suggested solutions such as national awards to make holistic approaches visible; the group also discussed integrating innovative opportunities (blended, online) in the curriculum design and linking them with physical activities.

7. Any other business and closing remarks

The German Co-chair informed that an in-person meeting of the WG had been scheduled for the 3rd-4th of December 2026 in Prague. The Czech Republic took the floor and invited WG members to the meeting and to the CEEDUCON conference that would take place back-to-back on the 1st-2nd of December 2026. The German Co-chair informed that another meeting would take place in September 2026, either online or in-person, and invited WG members to express their interest in hosting the meeting.

There was no other AOB. The WG co-chairs and members reiterated their appreciation to the hosts from the Austrian ministry and the OEAD.

The meeting closed at 11:50 CEST.