Draft Minutes of the Thirty-seventh Meeting of the EQF Advisory Group Brussels (BE), 4-5 October 2016

Introduction

Forty-nine representatives from 32 countries and representatives of social partners and stakeholder organisations attended the thirty-seventh meeting of the EQF AG. In addition, representatives from the European Commission, Cedefop, the European Training Foundation, the Council of Europe, and external experts to the Commission attended. In total, 69 individuals participated in the meeting.

COM chaired and opened the meeting. The agenda was accepted. There were no comments to the minutes from the thirty-sixth meeting of the EQF AG on 14-16 June, and the minutes were adopted.

COM reminded the participants about using the AGM system for registration. Shortly, the AGM system will replace the e-mail system used so far for circulating invitations and other documents relevant for the EQF AG meetings.

COM also informed the participants about changes in the rules on setting up Commission expert groups. According to Commission Decision C(2016) 3301 of 30.05.2016, all governmental experts must be civil servants or public employees. Any members of the group not meeting this obligation will have to inform COM so that the issue can be dealt with bilaterally. In addition, social partners must be registered in the Transparency Register if they are to remain members of the expert group. Only the organisation has to register, not individuals.

1. Relevant developments in European cooperation in the field of education and training and employment

Information on the latest developments as a follow-up on the last meeting (14-16 June 2016) (cf. Note AG37-1).

COM continues carrying out voluntary technical support visits to countries willing to create or adapt their national qualifications databases and linking them to the European portal. The outcome of a visit is a report taking stock of the current situation. So far, COM has visited 10 countries. Three more visits are planned for the coming weeks. Countries interested in a visit can inform COM of their interest.
COM launched an online consultation process with MS on ESCO’s English final draft. The consultation was closed on the 9 September 2016. The consultation focused on two main questions:

- Is ESCO fit for the purpose (mappings between the national qualification systems and ESCO)?
- Will ESCO improve the exchange of information?

A second phase of the consultation will be launched at the end of the year. It will cover the occupations and skill/competence pillars in all EU official languages.

Comments: (reactions from BE and FR)

- It is important to note that the notion 'overall positive feedback' on the 'fit for purpose' should be understood in a narrow sense, i.e., linked to the question 'do you think a mapping will be possible'.
- Participants requested more information about the online consultation process, especially the webinar, and the outcome of this process
  - COM: 13-14 countries participated in a webinar on 27 September 2016 organised by COM. All minutes are available.

Council of Europe:

- Turkey: Developments in Turkey are worrying and have clear implications for the country's education system - including higher education. A number of lawyers have been to Turkey to investigate whether the Turkish decrees live up to European standards.
- The Lisbon Recognition Convention's Section VII asks the parties to promote the process of recognition of qualifications of refugees even if the qualifications are not documented. This issue is still very high on the agenda, and there is political pressure from the secretary-general to develop a supplementary legal text to address this issue. The process of drafting the supplementary text will start by the end of October.
- In September, a meeting was organised of the national correspondents of the QF EHEA. The main focus was to review the actual implementation of the QF EHEA and the application of the learning outcomes approach. A report from this meeting will be circulated.
- The recognition of the qualifications of refugees was also on the agenda at the ENIC-NARIC annual meeting, which took place in Amsterdam on 19 – 21 June 2016. Countries that have received the most refugees within the last couple of years shared good practice examples. Another issue discussed at the meeting was diploma mills. It is a massive problem and difficult to stamp out. Moreover, quality assurance of the work conducted in the network and the global convention of recognition of HE qualifications were on the agenda at the meeting.
- Diploma supplement: The working group had met in Tirana. The status is acceptance from all members that the DS is a joint tool between the CoE, UNESCO and the Commission. The group will have a thorough look at the user guide chapter by chapter. This work is in progress. In addition, coherence should be attained between the user guide and the other tools, such as ECTS, to avoid the introduction of new tools that are in conflict with existing tools.
**Information from Presidencies**

SK briefly informed about the main focus points of the Slovak presidency (*cf.* ppt):

The key topics in the field of education are:

- The New Skills Agenda for Europe – Council negotiations (Skills Guarantee, EQF, Europass)
- Fostering and Developing Talent
- Modernisation of Higher Education
- Digital Skills

**2. REFERENCING**

**Overview of national developments related to the implementation of the EQF**

*Note AG37-02* provides an overview of national developments related to the implementation of the EQF.

COM thanked the participants for all the updates and feedbacks it had received on the national developments. It is important that countries submit changes and inform COM on a systematic basis.

**Comments: (reactions from LU and NO)**

- NO has submitted its referencing report for upload on the LOQ Portal, but the report has not been uploaded yet.
  - COM: A mistake. Will be done very shortly

Kosovo will present its referencing report to the EQF AG meeting in December. KY, RO and SK have also announced the presentation of pending issues of their referencing reports at the EQF AG meeting in December. Finally, IS will present an update of their referencing report (tbc).

**Referencing report of Liechtenstein**

LI presented their referencing report to the EQF AG (*cf.* ppt).

The LI school-system is very similar to the Swiss system, and LI works closely together with Switzerland on education – especially on VET. LI has agreements on HE with Austria, Germany and Switzerland, where students from LI are treated on an equal footing with their nationals.

LI decided to develop a comprehensive NQF in 2011. Like Austria, they use the so-called V-model. Levels 1-5 are considered general education. Levels 6-8 are either of a vocational or academic nature. Every year, two out of three pupils leaving secondary school in LI year decide to pursue vocational training. There are no VET-schools in LI, and a VET qualification obtained in LI is identical to a VET qualification obtained in CH. LI has chosen to take over the Swiss descriptors.

A very important feature of the educational system in LI is that there are no dead ends. All pathways are open to everybody.
After the introduction to the background of the NQF the educational system of LI, the 10 referencing criteria were addressed.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from, Cedefop, Council of Europe, AT, DE, FR, LI)

- The group thanked LI for a clear and concise report. Overall, the 10 referencing points have been met.
- Participants questioned the notion of 'an integrated framework', as what has been described in the referencing report are actually two separate frameworks.
- More information was requested on the links between VET and HE.
- General school education is currently not included. More information is requested on the reason behind this choice.
  - LI is currently awaiting developments in neighbouring countries
- Criterion 3: Well-covered: More information was requested on how the development of learning outcomes in general education is integrated.
- Criterion 4: More information was requested on what kind of progress has been made to level concrete qualifications.
- Criterion 5: Clarification was requested on how QA links to learning outcomes.
- Criterion 7: Some participants argued that the report would have benefited from including the comments from the international experts involved in the allocation process.
- Criterion 10: Clarification was requested on whether levels and logos will be included on certificates?
  - Logos and levels will be included on the diploma supplement.

In conclusion, COM congratulated LI for a clear and transparent report. COM made a few concluding remarks:

- Overall, the 10 criteria have been met.
- The social partners have been involved.
- NQFL is closely interlinked with Switzerland. The pragmatic approach and close cooperation with Switzerland are welcomed
- More information on the link between the different systems would be welcome.
- More information about the issue of self-certification was requested.
- LI was invited to submit the finalised version.

State of play of the work on horizontal comparisons

PL presented the progress made by the horizontal comparison working group (composed of PL, HU, IT, LV, NO, SE, UK (Scotland), Cedefop and COM (cf. ppt)). The general aim of the group is to improve further the way EQF levelling takes place by piloting and testing a methodology for the comparison of levelling decisions and sharing experiences on existing strengths and weaknesses.
For the pilot of the horizontal comparison, the group has developed a fiche and agreed to compare two qualifications relevant in all countries of the pilot group, i.e., the CNC operator and the mechanical engineer.

Preliminary conclusions of the working group:

- The fiche is an efficient tool for gathering and ordering data and making comparison of context information.
- It is important to include context information.
- Learning outcome comparison is possible.

The most important outcome of the work so far has been the process itself - the gradual refining of the terminology and instruments to improve transparency. A draft final report of the work will be sent to the EQF AG around 1 December.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from COM, Council of Europe, IE, FR, HU, IT, NL, UK)

- Clarification was requested on why the issue of finance is included in the comparison?
  - To show that it is possible to compare all qualifications regardless of the provider.
- The participants acknowledged that context information is valuable, but more information was needed on whether this context information is used for evaluating the learning outcomes;
  - Context information is not used to compare the learning outcomes. Context information is only used to explain differences or gaps.
- Some participants requested more information on the notion of information about the actual qualification;
  - This means reviewing the learning outcomes to identify how a qualification is typically described
- Clarification was requested on why stricter standardisation is not necessary
  - Strict standardisation means very strict vocabulary and a very strict fiche. It is not necessary to make either the vocabulary or the fiche stricter to be able to compare.
- Some participants noted that HE qualifications are probably easier cases due to the Bologna process.

COM thanked the group for the work so far and asked the group to reflect on a potential continuation of the work.

3. NEW SKILLS AGENDA FOR EUROPE

Detailed presentation of the Commission proposal for the revision of the EQF Recommendation

The Commission explained that the core of the COM proposal for revision will ensure continuity in the processes launched by individual countries to reference their qualifications frameworks and levels to the EQF. Main changes proposed relate to the following areas:

- strengthening referencing and improving its consistency;
• better visibility of the EQF for citizens and employers;
• updating of referencing to the EQF;
• inclusion of the EQF referencing criteria in the Recommendation;
• common principles on quality assurance and credits;
• no reference to international sectoral organisations using the EQF;
• at a later stage, setting up procedures and criteria for comparing the EQF with third country qualifications frameworks;
• with regard to the future governance of the EQF, the Commission proposal refers to the Commission's intention to set up an informal expert group that should provide, e.g., the necessary platform for cooperation between the Commission services, Member States and relevant stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring of the revised EQF Recommendation.

Comments, questions and reactions (AT, Council of Europe, DE, DK, ETUC, FR, IE, IT, LU, NL, PL, SE, FI, UK, UEAPME)

Comments on governance

• Some participants worried that having two national representatives in a group dealing with a very broad agenda will lead to very superficial treatment of each agenda point
• The social partners are mentioned several times in the new recommendation. However, the social partners do not necessarily have the resources to go into the discussions in the new group/dialogue forum if the agenda is very broad
• Some participants worried that the NCPs are not part of the recommendation anymore.

COM said that it highly values the EQF AG expertise, which should be kept under the future platform. The future platform would perform the functions currently performed by the EQF AG. COM further replied that, seen from a European perspective, there is a strong link between the work of the EQF AG and ESCO. It further referred to Europass for which there is currently no expert structure at the EU level. COM clarified that the NCP current tasks are to be continued by MS. It is up to MS to decide how to organize their work.

Comments on quality assurance

• Some participants expressed the opinion that an exploration of the cross-border QA would be welcomed. This is a big issue – especially for MS that are major exporters of qualifications
• Some participants requested more information on the proposed register of which they do not see the added value.
• Some participants questioned the need for the new Annex IV, and to keep the existing Annex III.
• Clarification was requested on what is meant by qualifications referenced to EQF
• The participants argued that qualifications are first and foremost linked to NQFs and that MS are responsible for QA of qualifications referenced to the NQF

COM argued that the idea is not to have an extra set of QA criteria, but that the criteria address the QA of qualifications instead of systems. Keeping the old Annex III would not be sufficient. The biggest differences are that the new Annex IV focuses on qualifications...
and not on systems and goes beyond VET and HE. Private, sector and international qualifications are introduced as well in addition to the current scope of VET and HE qualifications. COM emphasised that 7-8 countries are trying to deal with international qualifications, and that QA principles apply to all qualifications with EQF levels. COM further argued that the register would add transparency – especially for qualifications not covered by national authorities.

Comments on credits

- Some participants expressed not favouring an annex on credits in the context of the EQF. Reasons mentioned were that the EQF and most NQFs are transparency instruments for qualifications whereas credits are a way to build qualifications.

- Some participants suggested that credits could be mentioned in the recitals and that credits could be addressed in separate recommendations.

COM argued that it considers meaningful to include credit systems in the recommendation, and that it would be beneficiary to have credit systems referring to each other. Credit systems are crucial when discussing the mobility between different sectors. COM emphasised that the intention is neither to impose a credit system on the national qualification frameworks, nor to create an additional system on top of ECTS and ECVET.

Other comments

- Some participants reminded COM that the methodology of levelling is a matter of national responsibility. The wording on this point in the recommendation should be reformulated.

- The participants encouraged mentioning PLAs and open methods of coordination in the recommendation for this information process instead of methodologies.

- Some participants reminded COM that existing EU tools related to qualifications are also related to non-EU tools. As a consequence, the link to non-EU stakeholders needs to be considered in the new governance structure as well.

COM replied that it is not the Commission’s intention to develop top down methods for levelling qualifications, but to support Member States in their work.

Commission proposal for a revision of the Europass Decision

COM presented its proposal for a revision of the European Parliament and Council Decision on Europass adopted on 4 October 2016 (cf. ppt.).

The current framework was set up in 2004. The current proposal is based on articles 165 and 166 TFEU. The objective of the proposal is establishing a comprehensive and interoperable framework of tools, services and information for employment and learning purposes. Since 2004, there has been a significant development in the ways of presenting skills and qualifications and the ways of looking for information. In addition, new and emerging needs of learners, jobseekers and other stakeholders have occurred.

Comments, questions and answers (AT, BE, BL, Council of Europe, ETUC, European Universities, FI, FR, LU, LV, NL, NO, UEAPME)
• Several participants welcomed the proposal as ambitious and very useful
• Other criticised that the proposal was too ambitious and that messages expressed during the stakeholder consultation have not been taken sufficiently on board: in particular the fact that some building blocks (e.g. ESCO) are not operational yet.
• In this context several participants also questioned the European portal’s ability to provide information that is not yet available at national level.
• Some participants worried that the workload from a national point of view will be too heavy and costly. They urged that impact assessments are carried out, including a legal and funding analysis
• Several participants requested a roadmap for the implementation of Europass, as they thought implementation could only be done in stages.
• Some reminded COM that a number of tools are not only EU tools. Consequently, changing these tools will have implications beyond the EU (e.g. the Diploma Supplement).
• The vision of the new platform/portal is employability. However, the vision of education is more than employability (e.g. active citizenship).
• More information was requested on whether the ESCO classification needs to be included if a university issues a Diploma Supplement or a national authority issues a Certificate Supplement.
• Several participants pointed to a translation issues. It is necessary to discuss the English version before it is translated into other languages.
• One participant argued that the pace and quality of a recognition process is important. It is not important to post it. The system works, so there is no need to put all these decisions online as it is too much work for MS.
• Third country nationals are mentioned in the text without a definition. This is a potential problem

COM replied that an evaluation of Europass and stakeholders consultations had been carried out which revealed a need to modernise Europass in order to make it a better and more comprehensive system for end-users. COM further informed that a working group in the context of the Bologna process, with participation from DG EMPL, is discussing the reform of the Diploma Supplement. If there is a new template, this will be reflected in the Europass platform. The Certificate Supplement is also provided by third parties and the use of this will be determined by the Council. COM stressed that the use of ESCO terminology is voluntary. COM further acknowledged that some of the building blocks are work in progress (ESCO).

A first discussion on the Europass proposal will take place on 9 November in the Council (Education Committee). The European Parliament will be involved in a later stage. If all goes according to normal tempo, the proposal should be adopted late 2017.

**Commission proposal for a Skills Guarantee**

COM presented the Commission proposal for a Council Recommendation on a Skills Guarantee, which was adopted as part of the June package of the New Skills Agenda for Europe (cf. ppt).

The outset of the Skills Guarantee is the 64 million low-skilled individuals in Europe. 34 million are employed, but their jobs are at risk. 6.6 million low-skilled individuals are unemployed, and approx. 23 million low-skilled Europeans are inactive. It is a very big challenge to reach this group.
The target group for the Skills Guarantee are adults who have not achieved an upper secondary education and who are not eligible for Youth Guarantee support. The challenges vary across MS and regions. Consequently, MS should define the specific target group in each country.

The Skills Guarantee has three steps:

- skills assessment;
- tailored offer of education and training;
- validation and recognition of the skills individuals already have and the skills they acquire.

Comments, questions and answers (ETUC, Business Europe, IT, SE)

- Generally participants welcomed the proposal but argued that the name (Guarantee) could be misleading. It is not a legal right.
- There was an expression of concern that the proposal does not have a specific budget for implementation.
- EQF Level 4 does not automatically give adequate skills. The level does not mean that people are employable.
- Focus should be on basic skills - especially digital skills are fundamental. This might call for a re-focus.
- It was argued, that keeping a dual perspective on skills is important. It is not only about employability.
- Some participants raised questions about the monitoring issue of the implementation of the guarantee.

COM stressed that the reference to EQF level 4 relates concerns a level of ambition but no obligation for achievement of an EQF Level. The situation varies very much from country to country. COM further said that monitoring is necessary to know whether the pathways are the right ones. On funding COM replied that the ESF could be used for actions implementing the Skills Guarantee.

The Council is currently discussion the Recommendation. The plan of the SK Presidency is to have political agreement on the Recommendation at the 21 November Ministerial meeting.

Agenda items not discussed

The results of the study on feasibility of setting institutional arrangements at EU level to ensure management and QA related to an extended scope of the EQF and of the Call for Proposals EACEA/48/2015 on "Quality assurance at the European level for enhanced transparency and recognition of skills and qualifications" will be presented at the 8-9 December meeting.

4. **Validation of Non-Formal and Informal Learning**

State of play of national developments on the implementation of the Council Recommendation on VNFIL(cf. Note AG37-3).
By adopting the Council Recommendation on validation of non-formal and informal learning, MS have committed themselves to putting in place validation arrangements by 2018. In 2013, the EQF AG agreed that by 2018 each MS should present to the EQF AG a report on the implementation of validation arrangements reflecting its response to the Recommendation (cf. ppt).

There is a lot of input for these reports already:

A tour de table took place during which EQF AG members were invited to share information on validation in their country further to the following questions:

1) What is the current situation regarding validation arrangements?
2) What are the planned measures with (if possible) target dates?
3) What are the major obstacles and/or what are the main needs where the EC can provide support?

Summary of the discussion:

- In the UK the implementation of the Recommendation is getting shape in Scotland. The other parts of the UK do not have an active approach in implementing the recommendation at this stage.
- CH has good procedures for validation and recognition in place, in particular in the area of basic VET. Adults can apply for a relevant qualification after 5 years of experience.
- In SE many possibilities for validation exists. Implementation is decentralised to regional and local actors and involves a large variety of actors including adult learning providers and social partners. Public authorities and stakeholders are together in charge of coordination and government has proposed legislation and a national strategy for 2018. The focus is on building a consensus between the world of education and employment. A current priority target group are immigrants (because of refugees): a fast track procedure exists for professions with high labour demand
- FI: a system was already in place before the Recommendation. Under current law individuals are entitled to recognition of their prior learning as an individual right. Under a new law under preparation it will become an obligation to the provider to recognise prior learning so to avoid individuals to redo subject areas of which they already have the skills. There is a focus on cooperation between education and employment. In higher education many RPL activities focus on refugees. Overall a major issue are resources, which are needed to organise a good validation system.
- SK: a new law is in preparation for adoption in 2018, which will be separate from the law on lifelong learning
- RO: since 2004 a procedure for evaluation/certification of professional competences is in place that is based on occupational standards. The procedure is free for unemployed and there is guidance available. Currently a methodology is being developed to allow skills acquisition up to level 4 of the EQF (so far it's at level 3). Until now non-formal and formal learning have been completely separate; the government tries to open the barriers existing between them.
- PT announced that a new programme on validation is in place that replaces the new opportunities initiative. Report expected in December 2017 or 2018.
- In PL there is a new curriculum in VET with the possibility for validation on the basis of 5 years of prof experience. In higher education all institutions are obliged to have rules on recognition of prior learning. A new law is in preparation on education which will also address validation. Report will presented at a later stage.
- AT: national strategy paper made in which four areas of work have been defined: quality assurance, professionalization, communication and system synergies. Existing validation mechanisms should be put together. Report to the EQF AG planned for June 2018.
- NO: validation is largely in place; craft exams can be passed on the basis of work experience, there is validation at the level of lower and upper secondary school and in higher education validation is mostly used for access, but also for partial qualifications. Plan to report by December 2018
- NL: from 2013-16 a transition a system was in place. Under the new system there will be a labour market oriented path (competences checked against industry standards) and an education path whereby the goal is to assess skills for a qualification. Under the labour market path social social partners negotiate agreements on quality assurance of validation. No concrete date for a report.
- MT: validation is included in the education act. It is related to occupational standards: currently 15 but more planned by 2017. A report is planned but no date fixed yet.
- FYROM: roadmap for VNFIL until 2020 in place. There is a good example in the faculty of mechanical engineering. A main obstacle is quality assurance. No date available for a report.
- HU: there is validation in place in VET and Higher Education. Apart from some small projects, there is no further system in place. No further development ongoing at system level for the moment.
- LU: procedure in place since 2008 for validation for all Qualifications except Baccalauréat. The universities of Lorraine and Luxembourg are carrying out studies on validation. A new law is in preparation. A report can be presented at any moment.
- HR: the purpose of validation is to achieve full integration with the NQF and to achieve the same value for qualifications obtained after validation, underpinned by the same quality assurance. Pilots are going on (EU funding used). A report will be first discussed in the NQF committee and can be presented to the EQF AG in 2017 together with the updated referencing report.
- FR: the law on validation has been recently adapted to increase access to validation. Under the new law required experience has been reduced 3 to 1 year to request validation.
- IE: validation exists and is being implemented, but some challenges are faced. Currently validation is too much focused on accreditation. Other challenges relate to guidance and data (e.g. in higher education, IT-systems do not speak to each other.
- DE: the purpose is to finalise the Valicom project until 2018 under which equivalence will be reached between qualifications obtained after formal learning and after validation.
- BG: recent legislation has been put in place. Legislation is however too heavy for citizens as too complicated for them to do all exams. There is a pilot system for validation in VET (co-funded by ESF) and a self-assessment tool is under preparation.
• BE: in BE-FL validation arrangements are in place in the areas of education, sports and culture. There is however fragmentation. To make an end to it a concept note on integrated policy was drafted and the government works on a decree. Standards for validation are currently in elaboration and work on Quality Assurance is ongoing. The main challenges relate to budget availability and to come to an integrated framework for adult learning, VET and higher education. In BE-FR validation is also in place and fragmented as different ministries are in charge of different parts of the validation system. Validation is quite well developed in adult learning. A consortium for validation is in place for all occupations but is not yet fully operational; work is in progress on the issues of assessment and certification. A report can be presented but not before late 2018.

COM concluded that one of the main obstacles for progressing seems to be lack of political support from the national governments.

E+ Policy Experimentation Call 2015

There was one proposal for this call, which included partners from the EQF AG. This proposal has now been introduced to the second phase as a full proposal. The evaluation will take place in a few weeks. At the next EQF AG meeting in December, the outcome of the evaluation process will be presented. The Experimentation Call concerns validation arrangements and it is an opportunity to bring policy makers closer to real life.

Upcoming call for proposals on Skills Audits for VNIL

COM will launch a new call for proposals on studies for skills audits for validation of non-formal and informal learning by the end of 2016, funded through the ESF. The core of the studies will be a mapping exercise of skills audit practices in various sectors. The mapping should include some of the following aspects:

• Which types of audits exist?
• How do the processes and mechanisms work?
• How are the audits managed?
• A mapping of the demand and supply side and the mode of delivery.
• How are the standards used?
• Efficiency and costs

The proposals should target specific groups with specific needs such as migrants, low-skilled individuals, unemployed people and young people. The expected outcome of the studies is detailed guidelines for people working with validation. COM envisages that the studies will have a maximum length of 8-10 months. The maximum budget foreseen is EUR 500,000. More details will be provided at the EQF AG meeting of 8-9 December.

State of Play of the European Inventory on the validation of non-formal and informal learning 2016 and on the online Inventory VNIL database

Cedefop provided an update on the state of play of the European Inventory and the European Database on Validation of Non-formal and Informal learning (cf. ppt). The amount of data collected from January to April this year is enormous. Currently, the data are being analysed. It is expected that reports will be published by the end of 2016 together with a synthesis report. All reports will be available on the Cedefop website.

Cedefop briefly presented the main points on the agenda for the conference in Thessaloniki on 28-29 November 2016. The conference will focus on how to make learning visible though strategies for implementing validation of non-formal and informal learning. Specific user groups will be placed at the centre, i.e., migrants, low-qualified individuals, unemployed people and employees. Several members of the EQF AG will be at the conference and will present country experiences.

5. PEER LEARNING ACTIVITIES

First discussion on the PLA Programme 2017-2018 (EQF and VNFIL)

The PLA on validation and costs planned for 6-7 December 2016 will be postponed until 2017. Note AG 38-3

6. CONCLUSIONS AND AOB

Upcoming dates

- 13-14 October
- 23-24 November 2016: ETF Conference on 'Making better qualifications', Brussels (BE)
- 28-29 November 2016: Conference on 'Making learning visible' (validation), Thessaloniki (EL)
- 8-9 December: 38th meeting of the EQF AG, Brussels (BE)

The concrete dates for the EQF AG meetings in 2017 have not yet settled. However, meetings are scheduled for February, April, June, October and December.
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<td>Erzsebet</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICELAND</td>
<td>GYLFDÖTTIR</td>
<td>María Kristín</td>
<td>Rannis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICELAND</td>
<td>PALSDOTTIR</td>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>O'CONNOR</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Quality and Qualifications Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>KELLY</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Quality and Qualifications Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>WAFER</td>
<td>Andrina</td>
<td>Quality and Qualifications Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>DI FRANCESCO</td>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>Instituto per la Formazione Professionale dei Lavoratori (ISFOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOSOVO</td>
<td>DANUZA</td>
<td>teuta</td>
<td>National Qualifications Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATVIA</td>
<td>RAMINA</td>
<td>Baiba</td>
<td>Academic Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIECHTENSTEIN</td>
<td>KINDLE-KÜHNIS</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Agency for International Education Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIECHTENSTEIN</td>
<td>SCHÄDLER</td>
<td>Eva-Maria</td>
<td>Agency for International Education Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIECHTENSTEIN</td>
<td>ANDENMATTEN</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Agency for International Education Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUXEMBOURG</td>
<td>NOESEN</td>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACEDONIA</td>
<td>ALEKSOV</td>
<td>Borcho</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>GRECH</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>KLEINGELD</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Culture and Science, Directorate Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>HUSA</td>
<td>Else</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>VIGE</td>
<td>Gro Beate</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>CHMIELECKA</td>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>Institute of Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>CHŁOŃ-DOMIŃCZAK</td>
<td>Agnieszka</td>
<td>Institute of Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>DUARTE</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>ANQEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>RADULESCU</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Minister of Labour, Family, Social Protection and Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>SILVESTRU</td>
<td>CATALIN IONUT</td>
<td>National Authority for Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBIA</td>
<td>BOJANIC</td>
<td>Mirjana</td>
<td>Ministry of education, science and technologival development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</td>
<td>JUNASKOVA</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>National Lifelong Learning Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</td>
<td>PATHOOVA</td>
<td>Ildiko</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>LINDÉN</td>
<td>carina</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Edholm</td>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>SCHRIEVERHOFF</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation SERI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>COLES</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>EGERTON</td>
<td>CAROLINE</td>
<td>Council for the Curriculum Examinations &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESSEUROPE</td>
<td>WANG</td>
<td>Anja Trier</td>
<td>BUSINESSEUROPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEAPME</td>
<td>MAYR</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Institute for research on qualifications and training of the Austrian economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Trade Union Confed.</td>
<td>ROMAN</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>ETUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Forum (EYF)</td>
<td>GIL</td>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>European Youth Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCIS-LLL (The Lifelong Learning Platform)</td>
<td>XHOMAQI</td>
<td>Brikena</td>
<td>EUCIS LLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN STUDENTS UNION (ESU)</td>
<td>ŠUŠNJAR</td>
<td>Aleksandar</td>
<td>European Students Union (ESU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION (EUA)</td>
<td>ZHANG</td>
<td>Therese Kai Ying</td>
<td>EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN VOLUNTEER CENTRE</td>
<td>CIVICO</td>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>European Volunteer Centre (CEV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
<td>BJORNAVOLD</td>
<td>Jens</td>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>Slava</td>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
<td>VILLALBA GARCIA</td>
<td>Ernesto</td>
<td>CEDEFOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>DAS NEVES D’ASSA CASTEL BRANCO</td>
<td>Eduarda</td>
<td>ETF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACEA</td>
<td>GROMBEER</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>EACEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACEA</td>
<td>PAOLETTI</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>EACEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</td>
<td>Pereira</td>
<td>Ana Carla</td>
<td>DG EMPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</td>
<td>Nomden</td>
<td>Koen</td>
<td>DG EMPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</td>
<td>Peressini</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>DG EMPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERT (Danish Technological Institute)</td>
<td>Hougaard</td>
<td>Karsten Frøhlich</td>
<td>Danish Technological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</td>
<td>Busuioc</td>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>DG EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL OF EUROPE</td>
<td>Restouieux</td>
<td>Jean Philippe</td>
<td>COUNCIL OF EUROPE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>