Coordination meeting between the co-chairs of the EHEA working structures

Venue: Flemish Ministry of Education and Training, Koning albert II-laan 15, BE – 1210 Brussels, room 1B03

November 5th, 2024

Minutes of meeting

List of participants

Name	Country
In person	
Belgium – Flemish Community/TF on Future of Bologna Co-chair/Outgoing BFUG co-chair	Liesbeth Hens
Bulgaria/BICG Co-chair	Ivana Radonova
Bulgaria	Yana Yotova-Bakalova
Council of Europe	Marie-Anne Persoons
ESU/TPG D Co-chair	Iris Kimizoglu
EUA/TF on establishing a long-term Secretariat Co-chair	Michael Gaebel
EURASHE	John Edwards
EURASHE	Jakub Grodecki
Eurydice/WG on Monitoring Co-chair	David Crosier
European Commission	Svein Hullstein
France/TPG B Co-chair	Jingchao Shi
Iceland/BFUG Co-chair	Una Strand Viðarsdóttir
Italy/CG GPD Co-chair	Elisa Petrucci
Latvia/TPG A Co-chair	Gunta Kinta
Latvia/TPG D Co-chair	Eliza Daldere
Republic of Moldova/CG GPD Co-chair	Nina Puțuntean
Netherlands/WG on IM Co-chair	Arthur Belle
Romania/WG on Fundamental Values Co-chair	Mihai Cezar Hâj
Romania/Vice-chair/TPG C Co-chair	Cristina Ghițulica
UNESCO/CG GPD Co-chair	Borhene Chakroun
Head of EHEA Secretariat	Horia-Șerban Onița
EHEA Secretariat	Lilia Parhomenco
EHEA Secretariat	Oana Țînțar
EHEA Secretariat	Petrișor Țucă
online	
Austria/WG on Monitoring Co-chair	Helga Posset
Czech Republic/TF on establishing a long-term Secretariat Co-Chair	Michal Karpisek
Moldova/WG on IM Co-chair	Rodica Crudu
Ukraine/WG on IM , TF on Future of Bologna, TPG B Co-chair	Maryna Mruha

Germany/WG on IM Co-chair	David Akrami Flores
Holy See/Outgoing BFUG Co-chair	Melanie Rosenbaum
Poland/Incoming BFUG Co-chair	Maria Bołtruszko
France/TPG C on QA Co-chair	Sophie Guillet
Armenia/TPG C on QA Co-chair	Varduhi Gyulazyan

Meeting starts at 9:43 CET.

1. Welcome and introduction

The representative of the Belgium-Flemish Community welcomed the participants as hosts of the meeting. The Icelandic Co-chair and the Vice-chair welcomed participants and set the stage for the day. They congratulated the co-chairs for volunteering to take up the responsibility of chairing a working structure. The introduction continued with a tour de table.

2. Overview and adoption of the agenda

Documents: [Agenda of the meeting](#)

Proposed action: Adopt the agenda

The Icelandic co-chair presented the agenda, which was adopted without comments.

3. Presentation of BFUG procedures and relevant documents for the working structures

Documents: [Coordination meeting between co-chairs_HU_IS__3_1_Work Programme](#)
[Coordination meeting between co-chairs BFUG_HU_IS_ 3_2_RoP-BFUG](#)
[Coordination meeting between co-chairs_HU_IS_3_3_ToRs Secretariat](#)
[Coordination meeting between co-chairs_HU_IS_3_4_Guidelines for minuting](#)
[Coordination meeting between co-chairs_HU_IS_3_5_ Presentation](#)

Proposed action: Take note of the presentation

The head of the EHEA Secretariat presented procedures pertinent to working structures, outlining the responsibilities of the co-chairs and the Secretariat, deadlines for reporting, provisions related to the BFUG and the Board and proposed timelines for organising meetings of the working structures.

Upon a question from the EUA, the Head of the EHEA Secretariat answered that while usually the Secretariat would prepare social media posts for the meetings of each

working structure, this would happen when appropriate, as for some working structures which focus on internal matters there may not be an interest to communicate externally.

The Latvian Co-chair of the TPG A suggested that the EHEA Secretariat works with the organisations co-chairing working structures and other interested parties to support the visibility of the working structures and ensure coordination. The Icelandic Co-chair added that posting official messages on social media (as opposed to individual posts) about the working structures should be coordinated with the EHEA Secretariat, to ensure consistency.

The Latvian Co-chair of the TPG A further asked if the list of co-chairs was disseminated to the members, with the head of the EHEA Secretariat clarifying that the information is available on the website. Upon a question from the Latvian Co-chair of TPG A, the head of the EHEA Secretariat answered that databases with the e-mails of the members of EHEA working structures would not be shared with the co-chairs, considering the General Data Protection Regulation, and the communication with members should happen via the Secretariat, as mandated by the Rules of Procedure, to ensure that mailing lists are updated and communication is centralised. However, when organising meetings, email addresses will be communicated when requested for practicalities (e.g. booking travels). The Icelandic Co-chair added that the EHEA Secretariat had so far been very responsive, and communicating through the Secretariat ensures everyone remains informed.

4. Presentation and discussion of the ToRs for each working structure

Document: *Draft ToRs – compiled*

The Icelandic Co-chair emphasised the importance of clear outcomes and inter-group collaboration and suggested including schedules and deadlines (e.g., meeting plans) in ToRs or as an annex.

4.1 ToRs of the Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process

Document: Draft ToRs WG on Monitoring

The Eurydice Co-chair of the WG on Monitoring presented the draft ToRs, thanking the Secretariat for their support. He stressed that the main goal is delivering the 2027 Bologna Process Implementation Report (BPIR). The group should also discuss future monitoring efforts, including a reflection on the need to reconsider current monitoring methods. The importance for the group to have strong links with the other working structures was emphasised, especially the Working Group on Fundamental Values. The Eurydice Co-chair of the WG on Monitoring also underlined that they would define the main focus of the next report within the group and through the connections with all the

other working structures, reporting to the BFUG and making proposals for the nature and content of the BPIR.

The Icelandic BFUG co-chair proposed setting meetings earlier than 6 weeks before the BFUG, to be able to feed into the Board meetings, and determining specific tasks for each meeting with associated deadlines. The Eurydice Co-chair of the WG on Monitoring replied that usually they create a plan for delivering the report, which includes such a schedule, adding that the plan could be discussed at the first WG on Monitoring meeting and included as an annex to the ToRs.

EUA asked when and how the ToRs could be updated, considering a revision to be needed only when major changes or delays are detected, and inquired about the frequency of the meetings, asking whether stipulating 2 meetings per year in the ToRs would be constraining for the cases when more meetings are needed. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair confirmed that ToRs should be revised only when major changes occur, while for this WG deciding on the focus of BPIR 2027 may be such a change. For the number of meetings, she clarified that the ToRs are a framework and some groups, especially task forces, may need more meetings within a shorter time period, while still considering the objective of keeping the work efficient. She also added that the rule of 2 meetings per year should apply to in-person meetings. The Head of the EHEA Secretariat stated that the co-chairs of working structures should distinguish between meetings, where all members are expected to attend, and peer learning activities, where knowledge is shared and only those interested attend.

The Vice-chair suggested adding as a contribution to mobility in the ToRs the BPIR chapter on internationalisation and mobility, while also proposing organising webinars to present the BPIR and preparing content for social media posts. Eurydice confirmed that they offer several presentations about BPIR in a demand-driven approach and that they support the idea of breaking down information in a way adapted to the social media context.

The Council of Europe made the case for focusing in the monitoring work on core commitments, recalling the interest expressed by the Council of Europe members for a leaner process. She added that BPIR could benefit from including other sources on European higher education policy and stressed that the monitoring is linked very clearly to what we want to learn about the Bologna Process, following the main goals and paying attention to emerging challenges. Eurydice confirmed this had been on the agenda of the WG, concomitantly considering the overburden of collecting too much information from member states, which makes the process unsustainable in the long run and puts member states in a difficulty of answering questions in an evidenced-based manner. As such, the Eurydice Co-chair of the WG on Monitoring recalled that there are some choices for the future that need to be made.

The Holy See proposed adding deadlines in the ToRs, for example when the draft report would be sent to the BFUG, the deadline for the BPIR questionnaire and when the BFUG should decide about the focus of the report.

The Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values suggested comparing data across several BPIR reports to analyse the impact of the Bologna Process and reiterated that there should be close communication between the WG on Monitoring and the WG on Fundamental Values, with the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair adding that information from the Monitoring Report prepared by thethe WG on Fundamental Values should feed into BPIR.

4.2 ToRs for the Working Group on Fundamental Values

Document: *Draft ToRs for the WG on Fundamental Values*

The Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values presented the main goals and the outcomes of the ToRs, outlining the three key deliverables: comprehensive framework and monitoring tool with indicators, implementation report after the first round of monitoring and report on enhancing knowledge sharing. He also stated the intention to apply for a project to support the work of the working group. The first meeting would be held on the 6th of December, where dissemination of specific issues would also be discussed.

The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair inquired about the timeframe for the deliverables of the group, with the Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values responding that the framework should be presented in the next BFUG, while the two other reports would be presented closer to the Ministerial Conference.

Belgium-Flemish Community inquired about how to ensure all timeframes of the ToRs are aligned, in order not to overburden the BFUG. The Head of the EHEA Secretariat responded that they would create a GANTT diagram for deliverables and for topics of discussion for the BFUG meetings, stating they already received a request from ENQA to discuss the ESG revision process in the next BFUG meeting.

The Holy See suggested including in the ToRs the preparation of the transfer of monitoring to the WG on Monitoring, to which the Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values replied there is a need to discuss with the WG on Monitoring on how to integrate Fundamental Values in BPIR 2027, whereas no decision regarding the transfer of monitoring was taken. The Eurydice Co-chair of the WG on Monitoring expressed worries regarding the capacity of the WG on Monitoring to sustainably take over the work on monitoring fundamental values. As a way forward, the Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values added that he had included in the ToRs that the report of the group will include recommendations for future steps of monitoring fundamental values.

UNESCO, supported by the Council of Europe, mentioned that fundamental values should be central to the work of the BFUG, while they could not prevail without an international perspective, as these values are universal themselves. UNESCO suggested incorporating in the ToRs a cooperation in this regard with the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility, whereas all working structures should focus on international matters. Furthermore, he advanced the perspective that all working structures should work on foresight able to capture future trends and on analysing the impact of technology.

The Council of Europe pointed out that while ETINED was mentioned in the ToRs, other useful tools should also be included, such as the Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Values and the Charter for Citizenship Education. She added that policies on values require an intermediate level, where fundamental values are enshrined in fundamental rights which are legally protected, referencing the ECHR jurisprudence on academic freedom. In this sense, Council of Europe expressed that while values are subjective, rights are tangible. The Romanian Co-chair of the WG on Fundamental Values thanked the Council of Europe for their active participation in the WG and replied that these content issues would be tackled in the group directly.

ESU recommended connecting the WG to the TF on the Future of Bologna, focusing on future aspects related to de jure/de facto implementation.

4.3 ToRs of the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility

Documents: *Draft ToRs of the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility*

The Dutch Co-chair of the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility introduced the draft ToRs, mentioning that the co-chairs were surprised by the high number of applicants, going beyond 50 delegates. The main task of this new group is to develop an action plan for a more green, more balanced and more inclusive mobility, while also internationalising higher education for the remaining 80% of students that would not be physically mobile. He argued that political objectives related to internationalisation and mobility, including relevant targets, should be operationalised through the action plan. while the group would also foster discussions on the internationalisation strategies of member states. A lot of cooperation with other structures is foreseen in discussing barriers to mobility.

The Icelandic BFUG co-chair inquired how the group could disseminate the work on mobility earlier than the end of the cycle, as mentioned in ToRs, and suggested creating a smaller drafting group for the deliverables, supported by Eurydice. The Romanian Vice-chair stated that the work of the new group should better be delineated in two parts – screen the area and the barriers to mobility and then develop the action plan. She suggested adding a glossary of definitions (e.g. blended mobility, internationalisation at home) to coin terminology and ensure common understanding.

UNESCO praised looking into different types of mobility, while asking whether the group would have a qualitative or quantitative focus. Supported by Italy, UNESCO pointed out that due to a lack of global dimension and references to key documents such as the Global Recognition Convention, the ToRs appeared to have an EU focus. The Dutch Co-chair clarified the focus would be regional, but also with global and sub-regional perspectives, relevant for the topic of balanced mobility. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair emphasised that the main scope of the group is EHEA, going beyond EU level.

While promoting internationalisation at home, ESU disagreed with the phrasing that considers it a form of mobility and which implies it would be an option for those with fewer possibilities. In the same vein, they considered the focus on sustainability often being misused to limit academic mobility. ESU proposed an alternative phrasing, accepted by the Dutch Co-chair.

The representative from the Belgium-Flemish Community suggested cooperating with TPG C on the quality assurance of joint programmes, while noticing an absence overall of the issue of joint degrees from the ToRs.

Italy raised the issue that internationalisation is a very broad subject, and the group should decide what areas should be tackled in the action plan. The European Commission appreciated the references to the work in Erasmus+ and avoiding duplications in relation to the future report of the Commission on balanced and green mobility.

The Holy See mentioned that in the ToRs there seemed to be a focus on online rather than physical mobility, contrary to the mandate of the Communiqué. She pleaded for a focus on physical mobility, supported by Eurydice, Iceland and the German Co-chair of the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility. The German Co-chair supported references to the global dimension, while highlighting that virtual exchanges support internationalisation being more inclusive for those not mobile, supported by Iceland.

Eurydice noted that the ToRs should clarify that online mobility is actually online learning and they should take into account that countries have different perspectives on mobility and therefore different strategies. Eurydice emphasised that differences between mobility in various cycles should be tackled in the group as well, as distinct policy objectives need to be considered for each cycle.

EURASHE stressed the importance of using clear language, indicating that „regional" has different meanings in different contexts. He put forward the importance of supporting HEIs from different regions of member states to increase mobility and build capacity to handle internationalisation. EURASHE also suggested a link to TPG A, considering the work on learning outcomes and qualification levels, supported by Austria.

The Head of the EHEA Secretariat suggested clarifying with TPG B the focus on the automatic recognition of ECTS, emphasised the particularity of EHEA in contrast with EU in terms of barriers to mobility (no equal movement principle, visa regime, tuition

fees) and reminded about another commitment central to mobility – portability of grants and loans, suggesting that the group also tackles this subject, supported by Eurydice. He also recalled the action plan on mobility adopted in the Bucharest Ministerial Conference, which should be taken into consideration since it provided a structure for barriers, guidelines and support for HEIs.

The Council of Europe inquired about the cross-border provision of higher education and whether the UNESCO-OECD Guidelines are still monitored, which Eurydice confirmed. They also highlighted different trends, for example East Asian HEIs attracting more international students due to demographic decline and asked whether refugee students should also be considered by this group.

The Dutch Co-chair replied to the comments, agreeing with most of them. He disagreed with the perception that the ToRs focus too much on internationalisation instead of mobility, arguing for a balanced approach. He also emphasised that the group would not be able to collect data, and had to rely on other sources, and considered refugee students as outside the remit of this WG.

4.4. ToRs for the Coordination Group on Global Policy Dialogue

Documents: [Draft ToRs for the CG on Global Policy Dialogue](#)

The Italian Co-chair of the CG on Global Policy Dialogue presented the ToRs, specifying that the main goal of the structure would be ensuring dialogue, enhancing cooperation and transparency and consolidating trust with macro-regions, drafting the Global Policy Forum statement and supporting the alignment of tools for recognition and mutual understanding of quality assurance principles. UNESCO affirmed their support for the draft ToRs, adding that the group could reflect on EHEA's contribution to the post-2030 UN Agenda, which will be discussed from 2026 onwards.

Belgium-Flemish Community, supported by the Council of Europe, recommended a stronger focus on regional organizations instead of individual countries, while the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair brought her experience from the OECD Science and Technology Policy Forum, which has connections with other international organisations on policy developments.

The Romanian Vice-chair, supported by the Holy See, inquired how the group will effectively contribute to achieving quality of education and implementing the SDG 4.3, and wondered if it could be useful to name the QA frameworks which are referenced in the ToRs, for example the standards from South America or Asia. EUA emphasized the importance of not duplicating what is already being done in other groups or by other structures globally, and recommended a focus on the specific perspective of EHEA and collaboration between macro-regions.

The Italian Co-chair of the CG GPD replied clarifying that the content of the ToRs was based on the BFUG discussions, adding that in the first meeting of the group a list of structures to be invited for further discussions would be drawn up.

Coordination meeting between the co-chairs_HU_IS_Minutes_02.12.2024

The Holy See considered that implementing SDGs was a task that was attributed to the HEIs in the Tirana Communiqué, additionally requesting a reordering of the main goals, with a focus on the GPF statement, the dialogue between regions and the work on recognition and quality assurance. She also added that CG GPD should look into the state of association for third countries interested to be more involved with the process. The Holy See also called for greater detail on how to involve stakeholders and mentioning other initiatives apart from those of UNESCO, for example stemming from the Council of Europe.

The Council of Europe contributed with recalling a long-lasting request from the Latin American & Caribbeans states to increase cooperation with EHEA, while also clarifying that for the implementation of the SDG the regional coordination for Europe is given to Council of Europe, as confirmed by the Fortaleza Declaration.

EURASHE suggested that the group also engages sectoral regional organisations, for example gathering higher education institutions, exemplifying their cooperation with global applied science and polyethnic universities

UNESCO replied to the previous comments, stating that from their perspective SDGs are not dominating the ToRs, while in any case SDGs should be considered in all the work being done, proposing to keep the formulation in the ToRs as it stood. Furthermore, they recalled that other regions have different ways of collaboration than the European model of EHEA, arguing for flexibility in discussing with other macro-regions.

4.5.   ToRs for the Task Force on the Future of Bologna

Documents: *Draft ToRs for the TF on the Future of Bologna*

The Belgium-Flemish Community Co-chair presented the ToRs, outlining the key outcomes of the TF: identifying the main priorities for the next decade, explore new methodologies and ways of working for the BFUG, improving the potential for success and the impact of the BP. She added that upon previous discussions they would integrate the cooperation with the WG on Fundamental Values, while the Romanian Vice-chair suggested including more transversal topics, with the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair specifically suggesting adding student-centred learning.

The Belgium-Flemish Community TF Co-chair continued by stating that due to the nature of the TF, meetings are foreseen both before and after BFUG meetings. However, they do not have a project supporting the TF, which implies that organising in-person meetings may prove difficult. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair outlined the possibility of liaising with other working structures, funded by supporting projects, to organise activities with them.

The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair suggested looking into the possibility to organise short online meetings before the BFUG meetings, in order to deal with more technical points and allow for more debate in the BFUG meeting itself, while the Czech Co-chair of the TF on establishing a long-term Secretariat, supported by EURASHE and Eurydice, suggested organising events before or after the BFUG meeting on content issues.

Eurydice, supported by EUA, considered that organising discussions about content issues of current concern may be more productive than discussing the future of Bologna up until 2040, as this could prove difficult. In reply, the Belgium-Flemish Community TF Co-chair emphasised that this is a mandate given by the Communiqué, while the discussions should not be limited only to priorities linked to 2040.

EUA suggested organising debates on the second day of the BFUG, while also preparing shorter discussions, allowing for 1-2 topics to be discussed in every BFUG meeting. EUA, supported by the Romanian Vice-chair and EURAHSE, considered that the focus of the group in terms of content issues tackled should remain open and topics brought as they appear. Supported by the Romanian Vice-chair, they also emphasised that the objective to assess the impact of previous Bologna policies may prove difficult without support and adequate resources. EUA also proposed having a one-year plan for content discussions in the BFUG, with the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair adding that this would also allow the BFUG delegations to select second delegates for the BFUG discussions tailored to the topic. Furthermore, the Czech Co-chair of the TF on establishing a long-term Secretariat proposed that the TF draw up a list of topics for debate from which the BFUG could choose.

The Romanian Vice-chair remarked that the ToRs do not include any information on the ways the TF would engage stakeholders from the academic community, despite the wording of the Tirana Communiqué, and suggested that the TF includes details in this regard.

EURASHE, supported by ESU, suggested that sessions at the BFUG should also allow for projects and other groups to propose discussions on emerging topics. The Head of the EHEA Secretariat confirmed that they will liaise with each BFUG co-chairmanship to ensure that draft BFUG agendas incorporate sufficient time for debates, with more efficient reporting allowing to focus on discussions stemming from both this TF and proposed by other working structures. He emphasised that good coordination between the TF and the co-chairs of other working structures is important, including via the BFUG Board meetings, to liaise on who brings what topics into debate at any given meeting.

UNESCO, supported by the Council of Europe, proposed that the TF carries out scenario-building exercises, considering internal and external factors, while collecting input from foresight activities of other working structures, such as from the work of the WG on Fundamental Values.

The Council of Europe recalled previous similar processes of finding new priorities within the Bologna Process, considering that the TF should look at macro-developments in the world, such as the backslide of democracy or reflections on the mission of universities. For this purpose, Council of Europe argued that it should be an inclusive process where all stakeholders are involved.

Upon the question raised by the Romanian Vice-chair, the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair invited the TF to coordinate with BICG and the Secretariat on how to include the remit of future-proofing the development of key commitments in Bologna and possible new tools.

4.6. The ToRs of the Task Force on establishing a long-term Secretariat

Documents: *Draft ToRs for the TF on establishing a long-term Secretariat*

Due to the ToRs already being discussed in the BFUG and no comments having been put forward in the meeting, the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair moved to the next item.

4.7. ToRs of the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group

Documents: Draft ToRs for the BICG
Draft template – TPG Action Plans
Draft template – National Action Plans

The Bulgarian Co-chair of the BICG presented the goals and deliverables of the working structure, outlining the role of the BICG in coordinating Thematic Peer Groups (TPGs), proposing discussions to the BFUG about the implementation of key commitments and refining ways of supporting implementation. She emphasised the introduction in this cycle of the national action plans.

The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair recalled the clear guidelines set for the BICG when it was established in the 2018, which should guide the work of the BICG. The Romanian Vice-Chair emphasised the ToRs need streamlining, with some outcomes or goals that are actually tasks. She mentioned that several aspects need to be clarified in the template for the national action plans, among others including adding enhancing knowledge sharing as mentioned in the Communiqué. Furthermore, the Vice-chair argued for a distinction between the TPG Action Plans and the national action plans, the former not requiring national activities to be included in the TPG Action Plans anymore, supported by Eurydice. She asked for clarification on how the BFUG would monitor the implementation of the national action plans, suggesting that the BICG thinks about the next steps after the EHEA Secretariat receives the plans and uploads them on the website. The remark has been explained in the context of the difficulty of TPGs to motivate countries to report on their actions. The Vice-chair further inquired about how the BICG would assess the effectiveness of peer support, while noting there are no

dissemination activities planned. Finally, as pursuant to the BFUG Rules of Procedure all working structures should have ToRs adopted by the BFUG, and while recalling the agreement between the BICG and the TPGs not to have different ToRs for TPGs, the Vice-chair pointed out that the BFUG is put in a position where they are not able to oversee the activities of the TPGs since only general remarks about TPGs are included in the ToR of the BICG. In this sense, she called for a greater emphasis in the ToRs on the work of TPGs, including the topics they will work on.

The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair, supported by Eurydice, suggested to clarify the scope of the BICG in relation to TPGs, clarifying the separation between the roles of the two structures. While stressing that data shows a positive impact of BICG along the years, Eurydice, supported by the Belgium-Flemish Community, warned of the tendency in TPGs to debate future developments instead of key commitments, suggesting finding a balance between the two. Eurydice also raised the issue of countries requiring support in implementation not joining the relevant TPGs. Finally, he pointed out that the TPG A should reference the three-cycle system as key commitment, since QFs and ECTS are tools to achieve the commitment.

The Latvian Co-chair of TPG A intervened stating that TPGs are gathering experts with the purpose of sharing ideas, without the capacity to influence national policy, to which the Icelandic BFUG Co-chair replied that on the contrary, those nominated to be part of TPGs should be the ones that are shaping national policy on the key commitments in their member states. The Latvian Co-chair of TPG A also mentioned that through reading the ToRs it is not clear who is preparing the national action plans, by when and who is collecting them. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair clarified that BFUG representatives submit the national action plans to the EHEA Secretariat.

Belgium-Flemish Community advised that each TPG finds mechanisms that are impactful for supporting implementation, giving the example of staff exchanges for the former TPG C. Italy further suggested monitoring the impact of TPGs in supporting implementation, sharing examples from TPG B.

The Head of the EHEA Secretariat mentioned that the consultations for the priorities of the TPGs should normally take place before the deadline for the Erasmus+ projects, to be able to include them in project applications. He suggested agreeing on a deadline with TPG co-chairs by which the TPG Action Plans should be finalised. In relation to reporting, he recalled that the TPG 2021-2024 Action Plans had a section on reporting, which was supposed to be filled in in 2024, but eventually, it did not happen. He also emphasised that the BFUG should agree on a deadline for the national action plans as soon as possible. The Icelandic bfug Co-chair suggested that the BICG Co-chairs and the Secretariat work on reviewing the relevant deadlines to be included in the ToRs.

The Romanian Vice-chair emphasised that the TPGs can draft their Action Plans before the national action plans are submitted, based on the Communiqué, the BPIR, previous reports and surveying the priorities of members. She also added that in the ToRs there is no reference to the future-proofing of the key commitments, which according to the Work Programme should fall under the work of the TF on the Future of Bologna, but

towards which the BICG should contribute. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair suggested that the BCIG co-chairs liaise with the co-chairs of the TF on the Future of Bologna, with the support of the EHEA Secretariat, which could come with a proposal in this regard.

The Bulgarian BICG Co-chair agreed that more consideration of the work of the TPGs should be included in the ToRs of the BICG and that deadlines should be agreed to, with the deadline for TPG Action Plans earlier than the one for the national action plans. She also suggested a stricter approach towards member states not being involved in the peer support process despite the lack of progress in implementing key commitments.

5. **Transversal topics, synergies, areas of common interest and potential overlaps between working structures**

The issue has been tackled along the discussion for the ToRs of each working structure. The Dutch Co-chair of the WG on Internationalisation & Mobility suggested being flexible with the deadline for finalising the ToRs, due to the need to consult the membership of their working structure.

The Head of the EHEA Secretariat proposed sending the documents to the BFUG in two batches, the first one in mid-November and the second one in late November. The Icelandic BFUG Co-chair asked the co-chairs of the working structures to discuss with the EHEA Secretariat in which batch of documents they would submit their ToRs.

6. **Dissemination, enhancing knowledge sharing and reporting**

The issue has been tackled during the previous agenda items. The Icelandic Co-chair reiterated the importance of a coordinated approach on communicating the activities of the working structures, highlighting the importance of liaising with the EHEA Secretariat. She also reminded of the EHEA newsletter and invited co-chairs to contribute.

The Head of the EHEA Secretariat emphasised the importance of communicating clearly with the EHEA Secretariat when documents of the working structures are expected to be submitted to the Secretariat, in order to avoid delaying batches of documents being sent due to waiting for documents which are late.

7. **AOB**

There was no AOB

The meeting ended at 16:40 CET.