



EUROPEAN
Higher Education Area

STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON RECOGNITION IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

Rīga, Latvia, 28-29 April 2011

Organised by the Latvian authorities
with the support of the Council of Europe

REPORT BY THE GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

by Kevin GUILLAUME,
Ministry of the French Community of Belgium



INTRODUCTION

Recognition has been at the heart of the Bologna Process since its inception in the late 90s. If we make the exercise of counting the occurrences of the term “recognition” in the ministerial declarations and communiqués since then, recognition was mentioned more than 60 times. Beyond the textual evidence of the importance given by the European ministers to the recognition topic, many achievements have shown how recognition might be considered both as an operational objective and an instrument to pursue other operational objectives, which would enable the full implementation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

The Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region, known as the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC), and its complementary documents is certainly a cornerstone of the EHEA, providing a common and agreed legal basis for recognition in the region, while also being the only binding text of the EHEA. In the last two decades, various instruments have been developed, adopted and implemented at the European, national, regional and institutional level aiming at facilitating fair recognition of foreign qualifications and/or study periods abroad. Those instruments are amongst others, the ENIC and NARIC networks, the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), the Diploma Supplement (DS), the overarching and national qualifications frameworks (QFs), etc.

Despite those many achievements, fair recognition remains a problematic issue that needs further commitment of European countries, governments, institutions and other stakeholders. As showed in the analysis of the 2007 National Action Plans for Recognition (NAPs)¹, despite the signature and/or ratification of the LRC by most of the EHEA countries, *there are still legal problems to implement the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and its subsidiary texts in those countries that have not amended their legislation adopting the above principles*. Basically, the interpretation of the LRC and its complementary documents results in a strong variation of the recognition procedures and criteria amongst the countries, impeding fair and transparent recognition amongst the EHEA.

Although the Ministers, gathered in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve in 2009, did not point out recognition as a specific policy area to be considered by the BFUG during the period 2009-2012, a working group (WG), chaired by Professor Andrejs Rauhvargers (Secretary General of the Latvian Rectors’ Conference), was established in 2009 with the objective of making policy recommendations on recognition, which would be submitted to the ministerial conference in 2012 in Bucharest. The intention of WG Chair was to gather policy-makers (more specifically BFUG representatives) with “practitioners” (ENIC and NARIC national representatives) and, of course, stakeholders’ representatives. It would thus allow confronting issues linked to the daily practices and implementation of the LRC and other recognition instruments with policy developments linked to other dimensions of the EHEA.

In this perspective, the WG decided to organise a stakeholders’ conference, *aimed at gathering views of various groups of stakeholders on the most important aspects that have impact on recognition practices such as national legislation. The views of stakeholders will then be mounted into the recommendations that the BFUG working group will produce.*

¹ The full version of the analysis of the 2007 NAPs for recognition is accessible here: http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/qualification/Analysis_of_2007_RecognitionNAPs.pdf.

The stakeholders' conference on recognition was organised by the Latvian authorities², with the support of the Council of Europe³. It took place in the Hotel Riga on 28 and 29 April 2011, during one and half day. All the materials for the Conference were prepared by Andrejs Rauhvargers, in close collaboration with the WG members. The conference was attended by a hundred participants coming from around 30 EHEA countries and representing ENIC and NARIC centres, ministries, higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies, students' unions, European and international organisations.

The conference included plenary sessions, experts' panels and five parallel working groups held in two sessions during the first afternoon. The content was closely linked to the mandate of the WG on recognition. During the plenary and panel sessions, stakeholders' organisations and national experts discussed the importance of recognition within the EHEA, the achievements and challenges ahead, the implementation of the LRC principles at national level as well as the issue of recognition in a global context. Each working group was invited to discuss specific issues, based on a non-exhaustive list of prepared questions and under the moderation of a designated chair. The discussions, outcomes and proposals of each group were then presented by each rapporteur and chair to the rapporteur general.

AIM OF THIS REPORT

As mentioned above, the main objective of the conference was to gather views, opinions, suggestions, etc. from the various stakeholders, dealing on a regular basis with recognition, in order for the WG to come up with concrete proposals for the next ministerial Communiqué to be adopted in 2012 in Bucharest. However, more than ten years after the signature of the LRC and many higher education reforms in Europe, with a special focus on recognition issue, it would be legitimate to ask ourselves what innovative commitments we could suggest to our ministers, to our institutions, and to the stakeholders' organisations. And would it be worth it?

The introductory speeches given by Gita Revalde (Head of Department of Higher Education, Latvian Ministry of Education and Science), Ligia Deca (Head of the Romanian Bologna Secretariat) and Andrejs Rauhvargers (Chair of the Recognition Working Group) gave us a straightforward answer. While many essential steps have been achieved, fair recognition is still not the common currency of the EHEA. There is still a need to build, or at least to consolidate, the bridges existing between higher education systems because of protectionist attitudes that we can find both at micro and macro levels.

Therefore, I believe that this conference is a first strong message to policy-makers in general since it has placed back recognition at the centre of the Bologna Process, despite the fact that recognition was not addressed in a specific paragraph, but linked to other political priority, in the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué. Unfortunately, the composition of the audience, largely dominated by ENIC and NARIC centres, reflects a tendency to consider recognition as a technical theme. Policy-makers might think that once the LRC is signed and ratified – and hopefully implemented in the national context, fair recognition is guaranteed. However, recognition is a transversal issue which has impact and is impacted by other policy developments like mobility, internationalisation, qualifications framework, etc. ***Recognition is at the core of the development and the consolidation of the EHEA, while at the same time being essential for the continuing***

² The Latvian Ministry of Education and Science, the Academic Information Centre and the Rectors' Conference

³ Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education; Directorate General IV – Education, Culture and Cultural Heritage, Youth and Sport

implementation of the Bologna Process. And thus, recognition should remain a high-priority on the European political agenda.

If this conclusion was clearly supported by the chairs, speakers and participants, the question remains to know what messages we should bring to the WG, to the BFUG and later to the ministers. And that is rightly what the report seeks to do by presenting the key messages from the discussions held between the various stakeholders about recognition within the EHEA and with other parts of the world. The report highlights the main arguments, explains specific issues and suggests possible solutions. It follows the sequence of the plenary, working group and panel sessions. A particular accent is given to the working group sessions as it has permitted participants to have in-depth discussions, to come with practical examples, to explain good practices and to make proposals and/or recommendations. My intention is not to report exhaustively the presentations and discussions done during the conference, but rather I will attempt to provide a synthetic analysis of the issues raised and present it in a coherent and structured way.

STAKEHOLDERS' VIEWS ON RECOGNITION

The panel included experts from the main stakeholders' organisations⁴ and was structured and moderated by Mr Jean-Philippe Restoueix (Council of Europe). Participants were asked to reflect on the important aspects of recognition from their stakeholder's position as well as on the contribution of their organisations to enhancing fair recognition in the EHEA. It is obviously difficult to report the rich discussions and contributions of the stakeholders' panel. However, a number of opinions and insights were identified including:

- Fair recognition is essential for the implementation of the Bologna Process and the consolidation of the EHEA. It has gained more and more importance since we are confronted with globalised and interconnected higher education systems where mobility has become an intrinsic characteristic.
- Important achievements regarding recognition have been reached in the last two decades. However, many challenges remain ahead, especially within higher education institutions as pointed out in various stakeholders' reports. Those challenges are closely linked to protectionist attitudes, academic and cultural traditions and other exogenous factors.
- Internationalisation of higher education implies a clear vision on recognition. Therefore, higher education institutions should include the issue of recognition in their internationalisation strategies.
- Stakeholders' representatives agreed that the existing tools facilitating recognition should be better used. However, this implies consciousness of staff in higher education institutions. Therefore, a specific focus should be given on the "education" and on rising awareness of staff concerning recognition in the EHEA and in the rest of the world.

RECOGNITION AND QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK⁵

The working group explored the implications of QFs developments on recognition practices. Since the adoption of the Bologna Overarching Higher Education Qualifications Framework and the European

⁴ More precisely, the panel comprised Anja Trier Wan (Business Europe), Sandra Kraže (European Association of Institutions in Higher Education), Rafael Llavori (European Association of Quality Assurance in Higher Education – ENQA), Bert Vandenkendelaere (European Students' Union – ESU) and Howard Davies (European University Association – EUA)

⁵ The working group was chaired by Niamh Lenehan (National Qualifications Authority of Ireland) and reported by Jean-Philippe Restoueix (Council of Europe).

Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning, many developments have rapidly taken place at national level. While very few countries had their NQFs developed and implemented in the last two or three years, the situation has substantially changed and we can expect that a majority of the EHEA countries will have their NQFs defined, implemented and referenced against the two above mentioned European overarching frameworks from 2012 on. The development of QFs has obvious implications on recognition. The working group was thus asked to discuss the potential benefits as well as the potential challenges and issues that may arise from a too optimistic vision on the interaction between recognition and QFs.

From the discussions, I would like to draw a conclusion that might seem evident but that should be once again underlined: ***QFs are transparency tools that will contribute to fair recognition but certainly not imply automatic recognition.*** As clearly demonstrated through practical cases presented by the participants, QFs mainly provide information about the positioning of a qualification to a specific level within a national system, which is also referenced to an agreed overarching framework. However, as the levels of a QF are described in generic terms, an assessment of the foreign qualification is still needed. Another important element brought by QFs to enhance fair recognition is the focus on learning outcomes. It will facilitate a comparison no longer based on the content, courses, study hours, etc. but a recognition of the competences, skills and knowledge acquired abroad by an individual, as defined by the LRC. But some challenges have already appeared concerning the referencing of qualifications at levels which are not commonly agreed upon⁶. Credential evaluators should thus be very careful when such situation happens and find ad-hoc solutions with their national authorities as well as with their foreign partners. Finally, trust is an essential prerequisite for an efficient use of QFs in recognition. Trust in the NQFs and their referencing to overarching QFs but also trust between the authorities responsible for NQFs and those responsible for recognition.

RECOGNITION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE⁷

The link between recognition and quality assurance has been discussed in many occasions and for some years now. Indeed, it is essential for credential evaluators to be informed about the quality of the higher education system where a foreign qualification was awarded. However, the working group did not discuss the “traditional” issue concerning this axiom. Instead, it was suggested to share views on how to use internal and external quality mechanisms to improve the quality of recognition practices within higher education institutions.

The main message for the working group was that ***internal and external quality assurance mechanisms should enable to review the quality of recognition practices within higher education institutions***, in the light of the LRC. In this perspective, it was suggested to amend the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) and include formally the issue of the quality of recognition practices. Indeed, as showed by the analysis of the NAPs for recognition, the autonomy of HEIs is regularly used by the competent authorities to justify the difficulties to implement LRC principles at all levels. That’s why, participants made this strong suggestion to include recognition in QA procedures and mechanisms. Furthermore, the participants reiterated the importance to foster close cooperation between ENIC and NARIC centres and quality assurance/accreditation agencies (QAAs). The project⁸ by the European Consortium for Accreditation about joint degrees and

⁶ The example of the current discussions amongst German competent authorities about position the *Abitur* (upper secondary school leaving certificate) higher than level 5 of the EQF was mentioned.

⁷ The working group was chaired by Rafael Llavori (ENQA) and reported by Christoph Demand (ENIC-NARIC Austria).

⁸ The different outcomes and publications produced in the framework of the project mentioned, can be downloaded here: <http://www.eacaconsortium.net/main/documents/publications>.

programmes was considered as an example of cooperation between QAAs and ENIC and NARIC centres. As mentioned in the concluding remarks and responses to the general report in the morning of the second day, the use of internal and external quality instruments to improve the quality of recognition should be analysed very carefully. QAAs have seen their missions broaden. From exclusively reviewing externally the quality of institutions and programmes, most of the agencies are now asked to also review indicators concerning social dimension, lifelong learning, internationalisation, etc. So, if there was a clear consensus that the quality of recognition practices of the higher education institutions should be guaranteed, then the first task should be careful exploring of the feasibility and potential mechanisms

THE EUROPEAN AREA FOR RECOGNITION MANUAL

As explained by Lucie De Bruin (NUFFIC, Dutch ENIC-NARIC) in the morning of the first day, despite the achievements in the last decade, many challenges remain in order to guarantee fair recognition. The outcomes of previous projects lead by the ENIC and NARIC centres have shown that the central issue concerns the lack of consistency in recognition practices amongst the EHEA countries. In this perspective, the NUFFIC is coordinating a two-year project, with the financial support of the European Commission and in cooperation with other NARIC centres, whose main results will be the publication of the European Area for Recognition manual (EAR). The EAR manual will pursue several objectives: to provide shared recognition standards and guidelines for all ENIC-NARIC centres, based on the LRC principles; to build bridges between theory and practice; to reach an agreement amongst the centres about the best practices, etc. The manual consists of various chapters, analysing specific issues linked to each step of the recognition procedures. From the testing phase and the on-line survey amongst the centres, it has appeared that a large majority of the respondents agreed with the best practices suggested. However, it has also shown the persisting gap between the best practices and the actual practices, especially when it concerns refugees, non-traditional learners, learning outcomes and QFs.

Considering the importance of this tool for the recognition practitioners as well as policy-makers, two working groups⁹ were asked to discuss the EAR manual, with a focus on specific chapters, and thus provide ideas for its further improvement and development. The participants were unanimous: ***the European Area for Recognition manual is an essential tool, compiling agreed best practices for recognition and also putting legal principles in very practical terms. Therefore, it was suggested to ask the Ministers to endorse the EAR manual at the Bucharest Conference in 2012.*** Nevertheless, we should be careful and not too optimistic about the impact of the EAR manual. As rightly mentioned by Lucie De Bruin, the manual is not an absolute response to the challenges of recognition in the EHEA. I believe the EAR manual does offer an incentive, or even a facilitator, for those countries that still have to implement the LRC principle within their national context, by offering practical tools, guidelines and standards for the daily work of the recognition community.

A last issue raised by the participants concerns the users of the EAR manual. If indeed it is first directed to the ENIC and NARIC centres, it could and should also be used by other recognition actors. However, as mentioned by some participants during the working sessions, practices within higher education institutions might be even more diverse in comparison to ENIC and NARIC centres. It was thus suggested to possibly adapt the EAR manual for a proper use by higher education institutions.

⁹ The working groups were chaired by Lucie De Bruin (NUFFIC) and Carita Blomqvist (National Board of Education, Finland) and reported by Jenneke Lokhof (NUFFIC).

RECOGNITION OF STUDY PERIODS¹⁰

More than 24 years after launching the Erasmus programme and thus the use of a credits system, one could wonder why recognition of study periods by higher education institutions is still an issue. Unfortunately, as demonstrated in the last publications of ESU, students suffering from non-recognition or just partial recognition by their home institution of the credits earned abroad are a reality. The working group was asked to discuss this reality and suggest solutions to guarantee fair recognition of study periods.

Although formal instruments organising credit mobility do exist and are used by institutions, the main issue leading to partial or non-recognition of study periods is certainly due to the lack of trust between higher education institutions, according to the participants. Flexibility, focus on learning outcomes, personalised study paths, etc. are crucial elements to foster fair recognition. Nevertheless, this implies a strong organisational structure for mobility within higher education institutions. Various organisational models have been envisaged by the participants, all of them offering advantages and disadvantages. I believe that a one-fits-all model should not be privileged and the specificities of each higher education institution should be taken into account when organising the recognition of study periods. However, ***higher education institutions should also include the issue of recognition as an integrative and central element of their internationalisation strategy.*** Next to the structural reference and the inclusion of recognition policy within the internationalisation strategy, it was also suggested that clear standards and guidelines, defined at the institutional level, should be defined and spread amongst all staffs. In this perspective, and joining the proposal made during the working session on the EAR manual, it was underlined that this manual could also be an essential tool for higher education institutions.

RECOGNITION OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS¹¹

Within the EHEA, we can observe that two systems are actually applied when dealing with recognition of qualifications for professional purposes, in case of non-regulated professions: the Directive 2005/36/EC, that applies to European Economic Area and European Free Trade Association countries and associated countries, defines a general system for professional recognition while the LRC should be implemented, and thus applicable, to all countries of the EHEA that signed and ratified the convention. While it was foreseen by the organisers that the working group would mainly discuss the conflicting situations that might appear between QFs development and the level system used in the Directive 2005/36/EC, the working group focused the attention on the (lack of) alignment between the Bologna Process and the Directive, as well as the automatic recognition for sectoral professions.

It was underlined that the Directive had established two parallel systems, i.e. the automatic recognition for sectoral professions and a general system of recognition for regulated professions, both systems based on comparability elements such as number of training years, study hours and, in a less extent, competencies, etc. and a overarching qualifications reference to a five-levels grid (based again on number of educational years); while in the Bologna framework, the European ministers adopted the LRC and general principles for fair recognition and introduced common structural elements, such as the three-cycle structure, the qualifications frameworks, the credits system, the definition of programmes in terms of learning outcomes, etc. As discussed by the participants, the Bologna Process has pushed higher education towards a student-centred learning

¹⁰ The working group was chaired by Jānis Vētra (Higher Education Council, Latvia) and reported by Ms. Simone Schwanitz

¹¹ The working group was chaired by Mr Howard Davies (EUA) and reported by Ms. Gayane Harutyunyan (ENIC-NARIC, Armenia)

dynamics, which therefore permits diversity in the curricula amongst the EHEA, while the Directive is mainly based on minimal training requirements, which therefore implies more standardization of specific HE programmes. In this particular situation, we see however that most of the EHEA countries have implemented national/regional reforms in line with the Bologna Process, although inconsistent at some point with the Directive.

As this reality has appeared more and more clearly, the European Commission has launched a process aiming at reviewing and modernising the Directive in the light of the developments and the establishment of the EHEA, has brought an important attention from various sectors: professional bodies, ministries, higher education institutions, ENIC and NARIC centres, etc. From the discussions held in the working group, a consensus appeared underlining the necessity of ***an alignment between the Directive and the Bologna Process***. The use of different descriptors of levels (the five-levels grid in the case of the Directive; the three-cycle structure and the Bologna Overarching Higher Education QF for the Bologna Process) as well as the non-inclusion of commonly shared “Bologna instruments” within the Directive (such as cycle, credits, learning outcomes, etc.) can create confusing situations, by which some qualifications are reformed according to the three-cycle structure agreed upon in the EHEA while others remain unchanged or expressed in study hours or years to be in conformity with the Directive. Furthermore, it is essential to increase the awareness of professional sectors about the EHEA developments at national but also at EU level through a closer cooperation between the competent directorates within the European Commission.

RECOGNITION AND LEGAL ASPECTS¹²

Despite the fact that almost all EHEA countries have ratified the LRC and ministers have reiterated at several occasions that the LRC principles are an essential prerequisite for fair recognition, the analysis of the NAPs demonstrated that there are still legal problems to implement those principles and that several countries have not amended their legislation in the spirit of the LRC. The national experiences shared by the panellists, showed that behind the work of reviewing and/or redrafting national legislation, a bigger challenge should be addressed and it concerns the ***change in attitudes amongst all stakeholders and actors taking part in recognition***. Therefore, consultation, dissemination and communication are crucial elements in order to make fair recognition a reality in every part of the higher education system.

In this perspective, it should be re-affirmed that ***reviewing national legislation, in line with the LRC principles, is an essential prerequisite in order to allow a real change in the attitudes, approaches and procedures for fair recognition. To do so, a national working group should be established for reviewing the legislation, proposing amendments. It should involve the relevant ministry, ENIC and NARIC centre, higher education institutions, students, quality assurance agencies and QF responsible authorities in the view of developing ownership feeling amongst the stakeholders***. However, as explained by the panellists and following an audience’s intervention, the particular national and systemic contexts should be carefully considered when reviewing and adopting new legislation for recognition. The example of appeal procedures was presented, as it has appeared that in some countries too formal appeal procedures might have a counter-effect and hinder fair recognition. Therefore, fit-for-purpose implementation mechanisms, in particular for appeal procedures, should be foreseen when reviewing national legislation. Finally, as mentioned above, information about the new or amended legislation should be provided to all the actors involved in recognition.

¹² The panel was moderated by Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvian Rectors’ Conference) and comprised Allan Bruun Pedersen, (Danish ENIC-NARIC) and Gunnar Vaht (Estonian ENIC-NARIC).

RECOGNITION BETWEEN THE EHEA AND OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD¹³

The Bologna Process has integrated the openness of the EHEA to the rest of the world as a policy priority since the London Conference in 2007, where ministers adopted the strategy *The European Higher Education Area in a Global Setting*. In this perspective, it has been repeated at many occasions (and also in other fora, such as the ASEM process) that recognition is a central issue that should guarantee brain circulation instead of brain drain and other forms of imbalanced mobility flows. In the same way, the ENIC and NARIC networks and the co-Secretariat (European Commission, Council of Europe and UNESCO) have been very active in the last years to foster closer cooperation with other regions of the world. In its final report, the working group on the external dimension of the ENIC and NARIC networks showed how the networks are increasingly confronted with other parts of the world, and thus have been more and more active in developing information tools, closer contacts with practitioners and cooperation with other regional recognition conventions. However, the report also concluded that a real political commitment is needed if we want to guarantee fair recognition at a global scale.

From the panel discussions, it appeared that a distinction should be made between “hard” and “soft instruments” in the perspective of fostering fair recognition between the EHEA and other parts of the world. Regional conventions are those “hard” instruments. Under the responsibility of UNESCO, they are powerful instruments that offer an agreed framework for recognition amongst countries and regions of the world. Nevertheless, as we can already see within the European region, legal instruments have their own limitations and do not necessarily imply a real change in attitudes towards fair recognition. Therefore, legal provisions should be accompanied by “soft” instruments, which could create a sphere of trust, information, mutual understanding, etc. Regional and global networking at the level of both practitioners and policy-makers is therefore essential. But it requires political commitments at national, regional and international level, in particular the support of UNESCO.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The report intends to give a brief overview of the lively and rich debates held during the Bologna conference on recognition. As explained earlier, recognition has been omnipresent within the Bologna Process since its very beginning and this has surely permitted important achievements towards fair recognition in higher education. However, there are still challenges and this conference has shown evidence that recognition is still an issue to be considered by policy makers and other stakeholders. Moreover, the recent developments, in particular those around QFs, learning outcomes, lifelong learning, etc. have brought new questions that should be addressed by all the actors in recognition. A large majority of participants have thus called for new (or renewed) and stronger commitments of our ministers and the stakeholders’ organisations at the Bucharest Conference in 2012 that will make fair recognition a reality within the EHEA.

The conference brought important messages that were more extensively presented in this report and are summarised below:

- Recognition is at the core of the development and the implementation of the EHEA. Therefore, recognition should remain a high-priority on the EHEA political agenda.
- QFs are transparency tools that will contribute to fair recognition but not imply automatic recognition. Links between recognition and QFs authorities should be strengthened.

¹³ The panel was moderated by Friedrich Bechina (Holy See) and comprised Bernd Wächter (Academic Cooperation Association), Claudia Gellini (French ENIC-NARIC), Frances Kelly (New Zealand) and Anna Glass (UNESCO).

- Internal and external quality assurance mechanisms should enable to review and consecutively improve the quality of recognition practices within higher education institutions, in the light of the LRC.
- The European Area for Recognition manual is an essential tool, compiling agreed best practices for recognition and also putting legal principles in very practical terms. Therefore, it is recommended that Ministers endorse the EAR manual at the Bucharest Conference in 2012.
- Higher education institutions should also include the issue of recognition as an integrative and central element of their internationalisation institutional strategy.
- Reviewing national legislation, in line with the LRC principles, is an essential prerequisite in order to allow a real change in the attitudes, approaches and procedures for fair recognition. National working groups should be established for reviewing the legislation, proposing amendments and should involve the relevant ministry, ENIC and NARIC centre, higher education institutions, students, quality assurance agency and QF responsible authorities in the view of developing ownership feeling amongst the stakeholders.
- In the current process of modernising the Directive 2005/36/EC, an alignment between the Directive and the Bologna Process principles should be strongly advocated by the national higher education authorities.
- In order to promote fair recognition between the EHEA and the rest of the world, regional and global networking at the level of both practitioners and policy-makers is essential. It requires political commitments at national, regional and international level, and a strong support of UNESCO.

Those messages will be transmitted to the Bologna working group on recognition, which will then prepare recommendations and proposals to the BFUG for the drafting of the Bucharest ministerial Communiqué.
