

## **MEETING OF THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP**

**Madrid, 18-19 February 2010**

### **Draft outcome of proceedings**

#### **Welcome and introduction to the meeting**

The Chair (Rafael Bonete, Spain) welcomed the participants of the BFUG meeting. Apologies had been received from Georgia, UK/Scotland, and Ukraine.

#### **1. Information by the Spanish Presidency**

Juan José Moreno-Navarro, Director General for University Policies, informed the BFUG about the priorities of the Spanish Presidency of the European Union in the field of education:

1. Placing education at the heart of the EU2020 strategy.
2. Strengthening the social dimension of education.
3. Key competences - developing new skills for new jobs.
4. Internationalisation and modernisation of higher education.

For more details and related events, see his PowerPoint presentation:



Education Priorities -  
Spanish Presidency

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

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_2a [draft agenda]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_2b [draft annotated agenda]

The agenda was adopted.

#### **3. Outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting, Brussels, 30 Nov. –1 Dec. 2009 and minutes of Board meeting, Madrid, 28 Jan. 2010**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_3 [draft outcome of proceedings]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_3b [Madrid Board draft minutes]

The BFUG approved the outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting in Brussels and took note of the minutes of the Board meeting in Madrid.

#### **4. Application for membership by Kazakhstan**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_4a [application procedure]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_4b [application letter]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_4c [national report]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_4d [application review]

The Council of Europe introduced the four documents and reminded the BFUG of the accession criteria: (a) being party to the European Cultural Convention and (b) commitment to the goals and values of the Bologna Process, to be demonstrated through the national report.

As for the last round of accessions in 2005, the Council of Europe had been asked to review the application for Bologna Process membership.

Kazakhstan had applied for accession to the Cultural Convention in April 2009, after which the member countries of the Council of Europe had been asked whether they had any objections. By the given deadline of October 2009, which gave countries ample time for consultation at national level, no objections had been made. The Committee of Ministers then decided to also consult the two countries party to the Convention but not member countries of the Council of

Europe. It was expected that by the deadline of 19 February 2010 none of the two countries would object and the Committee of Ministers meeting on 24 February 2010 would then invite Kazakhstan to join the Cultural Convention. The first criterion would thus be fulfilled.

Concerning the second criterion, the application letter and the national report indicate that Kazakhstan is committed to the Bologna Process principles and action lines and that serious efforts have been made to implement them. At the same time, it is also clear that a lot of work still needs to be done in most areas – in the discussion, several BFUG members specifically mentioned the area of student participation.

Nevertheless, the BFUG agreed that there was sufficient reason to accept the application and that advice on implementing the Bologna reforms could be provided, if Kazakhstan so wished.

Having assessed Kazakhstan's application for membership of the Bologna Process, the BFUG therefore decided the following:

- If Kazakhstan on February 24, 2010 is invited to join the European Cultural Convention, the BFUG will advise the Ministers to accept Kazakhstan as new participating country of the Bologna Process / the European Higher Education Area, once Kazakhstan has ratified the European Cultural Convention by depositing its instrument of ratification.
- With a view to possible future applications the criteria for membership of the Bologna Process / the European Higher Education Area, will be reviewed at the BFUG meeting in August 2010.

## **5. Independent assessment of the Bologna Process**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_5a [overview & conclusions]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_5b [detailed report]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_5c [case studies and appendices]

The European Commission reminded the BFUG that the document with executive summary, overview and conclusions of the Independent Assessment (BFUG\_ES\_20\_5a) would be printed and submitted to the Ministers. The two other volumes belonging to the Independent Assessment, the detailed report and the case studies and appendices, would be finalised by the end of February and made available online (at the websites of European Commission and CHEPS as well as at the Bologna website) in advance of the Ministerial Conference. Finally, Barbara Nolan stressed that the report, contracted by the European Commission on behalf of European Commission and BFUG, was an *independent assessment*, not the view of the BFUG or the European Commission.

The BFUG took note of the documents and the explanation given by the European Commission.

The Netherlands welcomed the evaluation as rich and informative report but also stressed the need for studies showing the impact and accomplishments at the level of higher education institutions. EUA confirmed that the Trends report to be published in March 2010 would provide such information.

The Austrian Vice-Chair asked the Commission and the consultative members preparing reports for the Ministerial Conference to inform the Secretariat when the various reports could be put online.

## **6. Preliminary information on reports to be submitted to the Ministers**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_6a [Focus 2010 – draft report]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_6b [ESU contribution to ministerial conference]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_6c [EI contribution to ministerial conference]

Eurydice presented the main results of the Focus 2010 report prepared for the Ministerial Conference in Budapest and Vienna and thanked the BFUG members for contributing to the report, which would be finalised shortly after the meeting. The report shows the need to see the emerging EHEA in the overall context of rapidly expanding higher education systems, public funding constraints and Bologna reforms, and calls for better and more coherent data to inform policy and European cooperation. For more details, see the PowerPoint presentation:



Various BFUG members thanked Eurydice for having provided them with an excellent report. In response to a request from Croatia, Eurydice offered to make the completed questionnaires from the different countries available to interested BFUG members, but stressed that such "unprocessed questionnaires" would not be user-friendly.

EUA related that the results of the Focus report were similar to the conclusions of the Trends 2010 report. EUA particularly stressed the need to look at the Bologna Process in a much broader context (economic crisis, demographic changes, modified funding etc.) and confirmed Eurydice's conclusion that the concepts of social dimension and lifelong learning are seen and dealt with differently from country to country.

ESU pointed to some discrepancies between the Eurydice report and the ESU report, according to which the situation was less rosy, especially with regard to the financial situation of students (due to changes in tuition fees; grants being replaced by loans; loss of part-time jobs; loss of financial support within families because of the economic crisis etc.).

EI criticised that academic staff, even though crucial for implementing the Bologna Process, was virtually absent from the Eurydice report.

ENQA congratulated Eurydice for a report that filled a gap in reporting on quality assurance in Europe and informed the BFUG about issues being discussed within ENQA, namely questions concerning the independence of agencies and the purpose of quality assurance.

EURASHE confirmed that "EURASHE's 10 commitments for the European Higher Education Area in 2010", based on input received from EURASHE members, would be available before the conference.

ESU explained that its report prepared for the Ministerial Conference "Bologna at the Finish Line" would be different from the "Bologna With Student Eyes" reports prepared for previous summits in both content and methodology. Based on input received from questionnaires completed by member unions, interviews with important stakeholders and a review of existing publications, "BAFL" looks into the evolution of the Bologna Process and the different action lines as well as the influence of other processes on the Bologna Process. A second ESU input for the Ministerial Conference will come from students themselves: an ESU team went to a couple of locations in Europe and filmed students (not student representatives) expressing their views on Bologna for the documentary called "Faces of Bologna". Quality, social dimension and mobility are among the topics covered by the interviews.

BUSINESSEUROPE welcomed that the ESU report would cover also the issue of employability and stressed the need to look more closely into the impact of the Bologna Process in the future.

EI reported on a survey conducted among 34 staff unions from 26 European countries. One of the main criticisms raised was a lack of support for the implementation of the Bologna reforms, which had led to more administrative work. In general, the staff complained about deteriorating working conditions. The survey also identified a need for capacity building between West and East to properly implement the Bologna reforms.

EUA confirmed that the dissatisfaction among academic and administrative staff, which could be considered the "heroes of the reforms", was a "ticking time bomb" and – if not addressed – could lead to major problems. As one of the issues to be addressed, EUA particularly mentioned the question of student services, for which more staff was needed due to the Bologna reforms.

The Council of Europe stressed the value of having reports from different points of view and suggested that a comparison be made (after the Ministerial Conference in March) between the different reports to see where there are differences in perceptions, where additional efforts might be needed to better implement the European Higher Education Area.

## **7. Budapest Vienna Declaration**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_7a [comments on BVD draft 2]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_7b [BVD draft 3]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_7c [briefing note for decision by the Ministers]

- After a paragraph-by-paragraph discussion and several adjustments to the text, the BFUG approved the final draft of the Budapest Vienna Declaration.
- In order not to burden the Declaration with the rather technical details of the co-chairing, the permanent website, and the procedure for deciding on the host(s) of the 2015 ministerial conference, the BFUG also agreed on a briefing note to be put forward by the BFUG members (individually) to their Ministers, allowing the Ministers to approve those issues without having a concrete reference in the Declaration.

The Austrian Vice-Chair explained that the content of the briefing note would not be discussed by the Ministers in Budapest and Vienna but that the Chairs would make a reference to it during the conference. The BFUG members were asked to seek the approval of their Ministers before the conference and to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible in case there were any problems.

## **8. Budapest/Vienna Ministerial meeting & Second Bologna Policy Forum**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_8a [draft programme]  
 BFUG (ES) 20\_8b [conference handbook]  
 BFUG (ES) 20\_8c [BPF registrations]  
 BFUG (ES) 20\_8d [BPF document]

The Hungarian Vice-Chair advised the participants of the Bologna Ministerial Anniversary Conference to be at the Parliament as early as possible, as the security controls might take some time. The participants were also encouraged to carefully read (and take seriously) the instructions of the conference handbook.

The Vice-Chair explained that in Budapest, due to the constraints of the meeting room, the Heads of Delegations would be seated in two rows. Not all Ministers would thus be able to sit in the front row and those in the front row, on the other hand, would be separated from the rest of the delegation (and have another Head of Delegation sitting behind him or her instead).

The Austrian Vice-Chair informed the BFUG that on 11 March (from 3pm onwards) a demonstration would be held in Vienna, with a march from the train station to the city centre, under the motto "United against cutbacks in education and welfare". This manifestation would then be followed by a counter summit until 14 March, organised by protesting students and staff.

With a view to the expected demonstrations, the Vice-Chair strongly recommended the use of the shuttle buses from the hotels to the evening event and back and reassured the BFUG that every necessary security measure would be taken.

The Austrian Vice-Chair also asked the BFUG members to check if their Ministers would be ready to give interviews to media representatives, for instance during the festive evening event, where there would be a special information desk for media representatives. She explained further that on Friday, 12 March, a public space would be offered in a different part of the Imperial Palace to enable a dialogue between the interested public, demonstrating students and Bologna Process experts.

For the Bologna Policy Forum on 12 March, 20 Ministers from non-EHEA countries have confirmed their participation. The BFUG had been asked to provide information on planned follow-up activities but very little input was received. The first draft of the 2010 Bologna Policy Forum Statement was then presented and submitted to comments.

- After some adjustments to the text, the BFUG approved the draft Bologna Policy Forum Statement and agreed to send it to the contact persons of the Bologna Policy Forum delegations not represented in the BFUG.

## **9. 2012 Report on the Implementation of the Bologna Process - draft outline and timetable**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_9a [draft outline of contents]  
 BFUG (ES) 20\_9b [timeline 2012 Report]  
 BFUG (ES) 20\_9c [draft minutes of WG Reporting]

The two chairs of the WG Reporting, Latvia and Luxembourg presented the work done by the WG Reporting and the data collectors so far to prepare the production of one joint report on the implementation of the Bologna Process for 2012. The report will include both quantitative data and qualitative analysis and will bring together work previously done in separate reports

by Stocktaking, Eurydice, Eurostudent and Eurostat. For reasons of sustainability of data collection as well as comparability of data, Luxembourg stressed the need to stick to the indicators once they have been agreed. In 2012 and 2015, not all data might be available for all countries but by 2020 there should be a complete dossier. The data collection will require further resources, for Eurostat, Eurostudent etc. but also for national statistical offices and BFUG members.

BFUG will be asked to decide in a later stage whether or not to use the scorecard format for the 2012 report. The content of the chapter on mobility will largely be defined by the benchmark indicator (see agenda item 10 below). At the BFUG meeting in August, the BFUG will be asked to approve the indicators, the structure of the report and the questionnaire.

EI criticised that the characterisation of higher education in the EHEA in chapter 1 referred to the number of HEIs, the number of students, and to funding, but did not mention staff at all. Following-up on this, the Netherlands and Greece supported the inclusion of staff in the data collection for chapter 1. The two chairs of the working group took note of this request, indicating that information on members of staff might be difficult to get and that the data collection would put an extra burden on higher education institutions. Romania suggested a research project on the academic profession led by Kassel University as possible source of information.

- The BFUG then approved the themes for the 2012 Report on the Implementation of the Bologna Process and the timeline for preparing it.

## **10. Mobility benchmark**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_10a [input from data providers]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_10b [timeline mobility benchmark]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_10c [mobility benchmark summary]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_9c [draft minutes of WG Reporting]

Luxembourg and Germany 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 WG Reporting and the WG Mobility.

Mobility will be defined as physical mobility. Distance learning via Internet will not be measured. The data collection for the benchmark will result in a "snapshot picture", showing the mobility of graduates of a given year, including both credit and degree mobility. As a result, if a student is mobile during the first cycle but not during the second, he or she will be counted as mobile graduate when obtaining the first cycle qualification but not again upon completion of the second cycle.

To measure degree mobility (which will cover the European Higher Education Area only), the data collectors will not look at the nationality of a graduate but rather at the country of prior education.

For short-term mobility, study periods and placements will be included in the benchmark, as long as the graduate received at least 1 credit for the period abroad when returning to the home institution.

Several BFUG members stressed the need to include data on short-term mobility during the third cycle in the benchmark, possibly using a minimum duration as criterion rather than ECTS, which is not widely used in the third cycle (and even where used is often limited to course work, thus excluding the research work).

With reference to the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, data on students from non-EHEA countries moving to a country within the EHEA will be collected but not included in the 20% benchmark.

To conclude, Luxembourg agreed to discuss with the data collectors the feasibility of including data on short-term mobility during the third cycle. Germany confirmed that both issues (short-term mobility during the third cycle and inbound mobility) would be dealt with by the WG Mobility. Germany also stressed the need to ensure that the same benchmark indicator would be adopted for the EU and for the European Higher Education Area.

## **11. The EHEA in a global context**

Document: BFUG (ES) 20\_11 [WG International Openness ToR]

### **a. EHEA Information and Promotion Network**

Document: BFUG (ES) 20\_11a [EHEA IPN draft ToR]

The terms of reference for the EHEA Information and Promotion Network were approved.

#### **b. Providing expertise on Bologna Process and EHEA outside the EHEA countries**

Document: BFUG (ES) 20\_11b [Providing expertise on BP and EHEA]

As both options for providing expertise on the Bologna Process and the EHEA outside the EHEA countries (database versus ad-hoc arrangement) were supported by a number of BFUG members, the BFUG agreed on the following compromise:

- Whenever a request comes in, the Secretariat will send it to the entire BFUG. The information submitted by the BFUG members in response to the call will be forwarded to those looking for expertise but it will also be collected by the Secretariat, thus forming the start of a list. After a while, the arrangement will be evaluated to see whether it works or a more sophisticated arrangement would have to be found.

Slovenia informed the BFUG that the Euromed Ministerial Meeting would be held in Slovenia on 25-26 April 2010. When Spain, Slovenia, France and Egypt sent the invitations for the ministerial conference, they asked countries to nominate a higher education expert to prepare the document for the ministerial conference. The first meeting of the group of experts took place in Brussels on 2 February 2010, where a lot of countries were represented by their permanent representatives. The experts present supported the establishment of a permanent working group, as already envisaged under Slovenian Presidency in 2008. The next meeting of the group will take place in Alicante on 4-5 March and Slovenia expressed the wish that all Ministers should appoint somebody, ideally somebody involved in the Bologna Process. The document to be adopted by the Euromed Ministerial Meeting would be very much along the lines of the Bologna Process, addressing issues such as quality assurance, recognition and joint degrees.

In response to a request from EUA, Slovenia explained that the working group preparing the document included only representatives of the EU-27 countries, plus Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Turkey. Slovenia supported the idea of involving EUA, once the permanent working group had been established.

#### **12. BFUG representatives as observers to the EQAR Register Committee**

Document: BFUG (SE) 19\_7\_rev. [Election procedure]

The BFUG agreed on the following five observers to the EQAR Register Committee for the period 1 July 2010-30 June 2012:

- Czech Republic, to be represented by BFUG member Lenka Pospíšilová;
- Denmark, to be represented by BFUG member Helle Otte;
- Greece, to be represented by BFUG member Vasileios J. Papazoglou;
- Slovenia, to be represented by BFUG member Janja Komljenovič;
- Turkey, to be represented by BFUG member Ömer Demir.

#### **13. Recommendation 1892 (2009) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe "Contribution of the Council of Europe to the development of the European Higher Education Area"**

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_13a [Recommendation CoE Parl. Assembly-EN]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_13b [Recommendation CoE Parl. Assembly-FR]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_13c [Memorandum by Andrew McIntosh]

By way of introduction, the Council of Europe explained that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe is made up of members of national parliaments and that the Recommendation 1892 presented to the BFUG is the position of the Assembly and not of the Council of Europe as such, which is to be decided by the Committee of Ministers. Before taking a decision, the Committee of Ministers normally consults the relevant Steering Committee, in this case the Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research (CDESR). Most points of the Recommendation had received broad support from the CDESR Bureau as well as within the Council of Europe Secretariat, which is reflected in the draft opinion that will be submitted to the CDESR. However - following the recommendation of the Bureau - there will be no draft opinion on the question of the future arrangements for the Bologna Secretariat. At its meeting

on 24-25 March, the CDESR will formulate an opinion, which the Council of Europe was not in a position to anticipate.

In exchanges with the Parliamentary Assembly, the Council of Europe Secretariat and the CDESR Bureau had underlined that there was no wish among the countries participating in the Bologna Process to change the existing arrangements and that even if the idea of a permanent secretariat came up, it would not automatically need to be placed within the Council of Europe.

The Vice-Chairs informed the BFUG that they had recently been approached by Lord McIntosh on this issue and that Austria and Hungary shared the view that there was no need to change the existing organisational structure, as the Ministers had clearly stated in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué.

Romania, which as host of the next Bologna Secretariat had also been approached recently, supported the position of Austria and Hungary and stressed that such issues should generally be discussed by the BFUG and decided by the Ministers in the framework of the Bologna Process, not of the Council of Europe.

Several BFUG members stressed the constructive and supportive role played by the Council of Europe in the Bologna Process, which should not be jeopardised by taking over the Bologna Secretariat and the related obligation to act impartially. Apart from that, the BFUG unanimously agreed that there was no need for action concerning the Bologna Secretariat, as the Ministers had just endorsed the existing organisational structure as fit for purpose. The Chair was asked to communicate this decision to Lord McIntosh and the BFUG members were asked to inform the respective members of the CDESR accordingly.

Concerning the other issues raised by the Recommendation, ESU proposed to take them up at a later BFUG meeting and both EI and ESU criticised that the staff, as major driver of the Bologna reforms, was not mentioned by the Recommendation at all.

The Austrian Vice-Chair informed the BFUG that Lord McIntosh, as representative of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, would attend the Ministerial Conference as observer, while Doris Pack (Member of the European Parliament), who had also been invited, would not be able to come.

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

Documents: BFUG (ES) 20\_14a [EQAR update]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_14b [NQF Synthesis February 2010]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_14c [ESU update]  
BFUG (ES) 20\_14d [EI update]

The BFUG took note of the information provided by EQAR, Council of Europe, ESU and EI.

The Council of Europe confirmed that the work on qualifications frameworks was ongoing and that most countries were reasonably on track. There was, however, also some reason for concern, as some countries had not provided any information on the state of development of their national qualifications frameworks.

The Council of Europe announced that the second meeting of national correspondents would be held in Dublin on 16 April 2010, a day after the conference on qualifications frameworks organised by Ireland.

#### **15. Next BFUG meeting, Alden Biesen, 24-25 August 2010**

The next BFUG meeting was confirmed to take place in Alden Biesen, Belgium, on 24-25 August 2010. Detailed practical information as well as the meeting documents will be circulated before the summer.

In the context of the Belgian Presidency of the European Union, the Flemish Community of Belgium will organise a conference on mobility in Antwerp on 5-6 October 2010, which could be opened up to the Bologna Policy Forum partners and also address mobility on a global scale.

#### **16. Any other business**

The Chair bade farewell to Darinka Vrečko who had chaired the BFUG in the first half of 2008 and represented Slovenia for several years. He thanked his Spanish collaborators, the Vice-Chairs, the Secretariat, and all participants for the constructive work and closed the meeting.

## List of participants

Country / Organisation	First name	Last name
1. Albania	Arjan	Xhelaj
2. Andorra	Enric	García López
3. Andorra	Mar	Martínez
4. Armenia	Gayane	Harutyunyan
5. Armenia	Mher	Melik-Bakhshyan
6. Austria	Gottfried	Bacher
7. Austria	Barbara	Weitgruber
8. Belgium/Flemish Community	Noël	Vercruysse
9. Belgium/French Community	Kevin	Guillaume
10. Belgium/French Community	Chantal	Kaufmann
11. Bologna Secretariat	Marlies	Leegwater
12. Bologna Secretariat	Cornelia	Racké
13. Bologna Secretariat	Françoise	Bourdon
14. Bologna Secretariat	Sara	Demény
15. Bologna Secretariat	Sabine	Neyer
16. Bologna Secretariat	Magalie	Soenen
17. Bosnia and Herzegovina	Petar	Maric
18. Bulgaria	Svetomira	Apostolova-Kaloyanova
19. BUSINESSEUROPE	Henning	Dettleff
20. Council of Europe	Sjur	Bergan
21. Croatia	Luka	Juroš
22. Cyprus	Efstathios	Michael
23. Czech Republic	Lenka	Pospíšilová
24. Czech Republic	Věra	Šťastná
25. Denmark	Mette Juul	Jensen
26. Denmark	Helle	Otte
27. Education International	Monique	Fouilhoux
28. Education International	Jens	Vraa-Jensen
29. ENQA	Emmi	Helle
30. ENQA	Achim	Hopbach
31. Estonia	Heli	Aru
32. ESU	Ligia	Deca
33. ESU	Andrea	Blaettler
34. ESU	Robert	Santa
35. EUA	Michael	Hörig
36. EUA	Lesley	Wilson
37. EURASHE	Stefan	Delplace
38. EURASHE	Andreas	Orphanides
39. European Commission	Sophia	Eriksson Waterschoot
40. European Commission	Barbara	Nolan
41. Eurydice	David	Crosier
42. Finland	Maija	Innola
43. Finland	Birgitta	Vuorinen
44. France	Chantal	Manès
45. France	Yves	Vallat
46. Germany	Birgit	Galler



<b>Country / Organisation</b>	<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>
47. Germany	Peter	Greisler
48. Germany	Birger	Hendriks
49. Greece	Vasileios	Papazoglou
50. Holy See	Friedrich	Bechina
51. Hungary	László	Csekei
52. Hungary	János	Csirik
53. Iceland	Hellen	Gunnarsdóttir
54. Ireland	Laura	Casey
55. Italy	Marzia	Foroni
56. Latvia	Andrejs	Rauhvargers
57. Latvia	Gita	Revalde
58. Liechtenstein	Helmut	Konrad
59. Lithuania	Rimvydas	Labanauskis
60. Luxembourg	Germain	Dondelinger
61. Malta	Joachim James	Calleja
62. Malta	Philip	Von Brockdorff
63. Netherlands	Susanne	Feiertag
64. Norway	Toril	Johansson
65. Norway	Tone Flood	Strøm
66. Poland	Ewa	Annusewicz
67. Portugal	Sebastião	Feyo de Azevedo
68. Romania	Remus	Pricopie
69. Romania	Lazar	Vlasceanu
70. Russian Federation	Victor	Chistokhvalov
71. Serbia	Vera	Dondur
72. Serbia	Mirjana	Vesovic
73. Slovenia	Janja	Komljenovič
74. Slovenia	Darinka	Vrečko
75. Spain	Rafael	Bonete
76. Spain	José Ginés	Mora
77. Spain	Juan José	Moreno Navarro
78. Spain	María José	Vieira
79. Sweden	Myrna	Smitt
80. Switzerland	Silvia	Studinger
81. Turkey	Ömer	Demir
82. Turkey	Armağan	Erdoğan
83. UNESCO	Peter	Wells
84. United Kingdom	Peter	Baldwinson