

**GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
EUROPEAN STUDIES INSTITUTE
11th MEETING - MINUTES**

Moscow, May 13th, 2010

AGENDA

- 1. Introduction of new representatives from the College of Europe.**

- 2. Overview of the current ESI activities.
Director of the ESI Mark Entin.**

- 3. Report on Working Group on new fields of the ESI activities for the period 2010-2013 by Prof. Jaap De Zwaan.**

- 4. ESI budget 2010-2013.
Director of the ESI Mark Entin.**

- 5. Report on activities of the Committee on the ESI editorial policy and visibility.
Prof. Gerhard Hafner.**

- 6. Establishment of the new Governing Board committees:
• for the main criteria and selection procedure of a third ESI vice-director;
• for development of research activities at the ESI;
• for regional strategy.**

- 7. Appointment of new members to the existing committees.**

8. **The date for the next Governing Board meeting.**
9. **Miscellaneous.**

PARTICIPANTS

From the Russian Federation

Mr. Sergey PRIKHODKO	Aide to the President of the Russian Federation
Mr. Alexander GRUCHKO	Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
Mr. Anatoly TORKUNOV	Rector, MGIMO-University, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mr. Alexander FILIPPOV	Head, Division for Multilateral Cooperation and International Organizations, Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on behalf of the Director of the Department of International Cooperation in Education and Science Vladislav Nichkov
Mr. Mark ENTIN	Director, European Studies Institute (ESI)
Mrs. Tamara SHASHIKHINA	Deputy Director, ESI
Mr. Mikhail MARCHAN	Deputy Director, ESI

From the European Union

Mr. Eiki BERG	Professor of International relations, Department of Political Science, University of Tartu
Mr. Manuel de la CAMARA	Minister, Embassy of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation
Mr. Daniel TARSCCHYS	Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Stockholm University
Mr. Jaap Willem De ZWAAN	Director, Netherlands Institute of International Relations in the Hague
Mr. Dimitrios TRIANANTAPHYLLOU	Director General, International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS), Athens
Mr. Klaus SEGBERS	Director, Center for Global Politics; Dean, Institute for East European Studies, Free University Berlin
Mr. Gerhard HAFNER	Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, University of Vienna
<u>Observers</u>	
Mr. Fernando VALENZUELA	Head, Delegation of the European Union to the Russian Federation

Mr. Nicola SCARAMUZZO	Project Officer, EU-Russia Cooperation Programme, Delegation of the European Union to the Russian Federation
Mrs. Evangelina Blanco GONSALEZ	Project Manager, Development Office, College of Europe (Bruges)
Mr. Etienne CLAVIER	Head of Unit, Delegation of the European Union to the Russian Federation
<u>Guests</u>	
Mr. Oleg Barabanov	Head, Department of policies and politics of the EU and Council of Europe, ESI
Mr. Gennady Tolstopyatenko	Head, Department of the EU Law, ESI
<u>Absent</u>	
Mr. Ivan IVANOV	Leading Research Fellow of the Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mr. Tomas BERTELMAN	Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Sweden to Russia
Mrs Elena DANILOVA	Counsellor to the Minister of Economic Development of the Russian Federation

Sergey Prikhodko:

Good afternoon, dear colleagues!

I would like to apologize once again for being late. It is very good that all of you despite the short notice are able to attend today's meeting of the Governing Board. We are holding it in the new building, and I hope this will bring a new impetus to the content of our work and, what is the most important, to the educational process. As far as I understand, both the Russian Federation and the European Union, invested substantial funds in this building. So we have certain reasons to raise requirements to the administration and the faculty of the ESI .

I'm sure that everyone had opportunity to have a look at agenda of today's meeting. It is very important first and foremost, as far as I understand, for practical work in the academic year which will start in September 2010. I would like to ask first whether you have reflections or comments on the agenda?

Since I don't see any objections, let us consider this provisional agenda adopted. I was told that Mr. Valenzuela would like to make an intervention, and I would like to give you the floor as to the first speaker.

Fernando Valenzuela:

Good morning, dear colleagues.

I will try to be brief, but I want to make some comments. I would like to start by saying that it is now a long way from the beginning of the European Studies Institute, and I would like to thank first of all the Russian government, MGIMO, everyone who have cooperated in making this a reality, and, of course, the Director of the Institute – Mark Entin. We have informed you in the past that the Commission took the decision to provide an extra 3 m. euros to the budget of the Institute, which, we expect, will be matched by a similar sum from the Russian side. And this gives us a new breath, opening a new phase. We have succeeded in putting the Institute in place and making it work, and work well, and now we are

confronted with the task, on the one hand, of consolidating it, and, on the other hand, of strengthening its activities, and of modernizing some of the procedures.

So, I would like to touch upon three aspects very briefly. The first one is related to the administration and management capacity. The second – the academic quality of the Institution. And the third one, last but not least, the sustainability of the Institution.

Concerning the first one, on previous occasions, certainly at the last Board meeting, which was the first one for me to attend, we discussed the possibility of having a vice-director or executive officer from the EU who would cooperate and help the director to carry out the tasks, on the one hand, of the management, on the other – dealing with some academic aspects. And the point is, we think that the time has come to implement this idea. Perhaps we'll come back to this later. The Selection Committee will choose between three candidates to see who is the best one.

The second point as I said is academic quality. And, of course, I think that we have reached a good level, but the challenge is to go beyond that level, and to do it in three areas. On the one hand, in teaching, on the other – in research area and another one, perhaps, the editorial activity of the Institution. And, of course, let us not forget about the students. As to teaching, we've had a Committee, which was supported by the Board, looking at the quality of teaching I think this Committee should be reestablished. There is a need to review the teaching activity, make assessments, give advice, etc.

The same concerns the research. There is a Committee and we think that it is important that the work of this Committee and the relationship with the Board should be enhanced to ensure good visibility, particularly, taking into account three fellowships that are accorded every year.

Then, the students. We consider that the level of excellence of the Institution is very closely related with the level of excellence of the students, it can't be otherwise. And it is very important how the selection process is organized,

which applications are accepted, and here we think that the Committee, which used to exist, should be reestablished.

And, finally, concerning the editorial activity. We think that the most important issue today is to look at the e-journal, to look at the web-site, because we know how important it is to communicate, and to make the work of the Institution known outside and abroad, so we consider it also very important. We would ask the current Committee on editorial activity to focus more specifically on these issues.

The level of the sustainability. I think the decision that we took on the Commission side is quite exceptional. Normally, the Commission does not do the funding of this kind, the budget support, to say directly, more than once for the launching, and, of course, this is due to the fact that we consider this Institution very important, and we consider that the work that has been done is satisfactory, but at the same time we should start thinking in terms of the middle and long-term time. And the Institution has to be capable to ensure its sustainability. And that I think is something that we can discuss later, but, of course, we have to look at the budget issues, and different sources of funding.

And, finally, a word on something that we discussed several times. The regional strategy of the Institute. We have to try to reach out as much as possible to the regions of Russia, and do it as much as possible with the demand-driven, and not the supply-driven approach. This might cause costs, but if we try to be a little bit creative about it, it might provide some income through the provided services or other aspects that can be explored.

So finally, I can say that we are starting now a three year process, that should give the Institution the quality and the sustainability that all of us want for it, and I think that we should start working at it without delay.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much, Mr. Valenzuela.

I believe that all your comments and all your ideas, both related to the academic process, the research, specifically the requirements that we will bring to the audience, to students today and tomorrow, and your comments on regional strategy are certainly welcomed, as well as the ideas that you articulated on the EU commitment to nominate a candidate on the appropriate position, who will provide methodological and other help, and who will be responsible together with us for the implementation of the decisions, we will take here by the Governing Boardt. Certainly, we will record everything you said and discuss it during the meeting, which, as I understand, Mr. Entin, you will begin with the first item?

Please, I give you the floor.

Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues before I start, I would like to introduce a new participant of our Governing Board acting as an observer, it is a representative of the College of Europe our privileged partner – Mrs. Evangelina Blanco Gonzalez.

Dear colleagues, my task has been greatly simplified, because the comments that Mr. Valenzuela has made, are virtually head-notes of everything, what the European Studies Institute does. After me, the floor will be given to the Chairman of our Committee on Strategy Professor Jaap de Zwaan. He will tell you about the work that was done by the Committee and identify all new major activities being planned for the next three years and beyond.

That is why I would like to be very brief in my presentation. First of all, through the time of its operation, the ESI has acquired certain credibility in Russia and abroad. It is felt from regular calls that we get from all the countries of the EU and elsewhere for cooperation and interaction. It is reflected in the interest of Russian Ministries and Agencies in training their representatives in our Institute, also showed through greater involvement of our Ministries and Agencies in the academic process. It is also manifested in increasing interest of the Russian regions

in training their representatives in our Institute, as well as in their interest of the ESI working not only Moscow, but also in the regions, providing education for the human resources in the regions and having capability to train officials on regional and local levels.

What constitute are activities?

First of all it is a master's degree program. It is functioning smoothly now. Comparing with the few months ago when we all discussed it, of course, no changes could occur, there is usual, normal work. What is more important, the mechanism is arranged, it operates.

As to the short-term courses, they are occupying increasingly important place in our activities. Series of short-term courses for the law enforcement bodies, for the judicial bodies, and other bodies of the Russian Federation in the spaces of justice and home affairs, and cooperation between Russian and the European Union were held with great success. The next such short-term courses are due to take place on the October 25th- 29th this year. The key subject will be managing migration and common efforts to struggle illegal migration in Europe. In a few days, just the next Monday will start short-term courses are going to start at the request of the Justice Department, on how Russia protects human rights under the European Convention on the Fundamental Freedoms and Human Rights. Much time during these courses will be devoted to the issues related to the European Union joining the European Convention on the Fundamental Freedoms and Human Rights and to the consolidation of our common space, related to this important field of our activity. The leadership entitled by Russia to represent it at the European Court on Human Rights will lecture at these courses and, the key members of the relevant international bodies will do it as well. We pay very much attention to cooperation with the country presiding in the European Union. Now it is Spain. In future we hope to have close cooperation with the Belgian Presidency, and even closer cooperation with representatives of the European Union, since the presidency of the country is interrelated, supplemented and partly replaced by

permanent Presidency in the European Council and in other structures of the European Union. The next conference will be devoted to the new EU foreign policy under the Lisbon Treaty, crisis management and possible fields of cooperation between Russia and the European Union. Preparatory work encounters certain problems, but there are of technical nature. Their related to the volcano activity, which interrupts the schedule of trips in Europe. My words could confirm representative of Spanish Embassy. We had to postpone the Conference, when everyone was invited, everything was prepared and when hundreds of people were already going to attend on it. However as we have agreed, we certainly will hold this Conference on the highest level. Accordingly we are going to continue our work in the same intensive mode.

Speaking on our editorial and publishing activities. The most visible product of our work is our on-line journal. Mr. Hafner the chairman of the Committee on the editorial policy and visibility will probably say something on it . But website traffic is growing and authors from Great Britain, Italy and other European Union countries, are getting more involved in cooperation with our journal and there are more and more articles published in the languages of the European Union. But we also don't forget to publish books, manuals and textbooks, as our students need target-oriented volumes and it is certainly necessary to continue this work. There are a lot of sources in English, French and German, but it is very important to have such text-books in Russian so that not only our students in the ESI, but also a wider circle of students in Russian could use textbooks and study books in Russian. We are planning first and foremost using our own resources to publish a textbook in English language, which could provide opportunity while studying English, to study EU law, politics and economics.

On all specific questions regarding regional policy Professor Barabanov will be able to answer. He is primary coordinator for regional policy. We expand number of agreements with regional universities, widening faculty from regional universities. They come here to the ESI to increase their knowledge and then they

disseminate this knowledge in their own regions. I hope that the Committee on the Regional policy that we create today will help us with this important and ambitious work.

The ESI is now in the most difficult period now regarding allocation of work for the next year. Apart from all usual activity, all things we usually do, we are working on the dossiers of all our potential students and we are beginning a new cycle of recruitment for the European Studies Institute. So far we have received over three hundred applications different ministries and agencies, both the federal ones and from the regions. We have already processed about a hundred and fifty. This work is continued, and the amount of work is huge. We prepare everything so that Committee on recruitment could work thoroughly on the dossiers, evaluate them, and meet as many of the applicants as possible, we'll discuss this later today and tomorrow at the meeting of the relevant Committee. The task is very important and we understand that we must choose the best, while considering the fact that every ministry and agency and now there are about 50 of them insist that their applicants should be admitted to the ESI necessarily, so that the amount of officials qualified for working with the EU will be accumulated.

It is very gratifying for me to say some words about the new quality of the work of the GB. I left it for dessert because sweet is always left for the end. The Governing Board is starting to work in the new format. We focus on the work in Committees with limited participation, so that they be able to work very thoroughly on their issues delegated in their competence. One example of such work is the Committee chaired by Jaap de Zwaan. Particularly, I was not a member of this Committee, I was an observer, but I can say that all the issues were studied very thoroughly. Members of the Committee had opportunity to work on several options, usually there were three options on each topic and they could choose the one which satisfy the needs of stakeholders, could keep all the best the Institute already accumulated and the same time could look to the future. But I don't want to interfere into presentation of Professor de Zwaan. And I would like

to respond to Mr. Valenzuela, that, of course the quality of our work will depend on the quality of our cooperation with the EU Delegation, we are ready to be more engaged in the activities of representatives, to introduce our students to the Delegation activity and work with representatives of the Delegation even closer in every field and on every event with the wide number of officials working in Russia.

Thank you.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much, Professor Entin.

It is not part of our agenda, but I want to address Mr. Grushko on a practical issue. I think invitation of the representatives of the ESI leadership to the last Russia-EU summit in Khabarovsk enabled Professor Entin and Professor Torkunov to understand how those knowledge provided to the specific agencies by the faculty and integrated into Russian administrative structure, are used.

I think it would be useful for us to remind about the need to address from our Governing Board with a proposal to include our colleagues into the Russian delegation to the Russia-EU forthcoming summit on May 31 – June 1 in Rostov-na-Donu. This will give the opportunity to see how the practical knowledge we provide here, are used. I think it will be beneficial for the whole Governing Board. I mean both Russian part and our foreign colleagues, whom we'll inform together with Mr Valenzuela. So I would like to ask Mr Grushko to pay attention to this small detail, in order for us not to forget the main purpose of this work that is efficiency of cooperation between Russia and the EU in general, while discussing serious financial and other issues.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Thank you. As for me, I will not take too much of your time, because the documents are well founded and consistent, and I would like to thank all the

members of the Committee present here. I think that the methods of work were rather innovative anyway, because we worked on the basis of a number of proposals put forward by the ESI administration. The members of the Committee were given certain time to make comments about them by Mark Entin. On the basis of these comments we made a selection of useful subject matters, and discussed them including the financial and the budgetary consequences of these issues. Indeed I think the proposals put forward in this document reflect the fact that we are entering a stage of new ambitions, and here I also mean the regional strategy which is of high importance. We should make a qualitative leap. The sustainability was not on our agenda, but we should try to use all the suggestions made in the documents in the effort aimed at community and sustainability. However I would like to point out some relevant issues.

I will not take a lot of your time with regard to question 1. The thing that I want to say is that working in small groups allows us to improve the quality of education and at the same time to improve the skills of the participants in class, to make them communicate with lecturers, to enter into a dialog, establish a contact. However, this implies certain consequences for the budget, because there is a need to have three additional full time tutors to be employed at the University. This is also a new stage, a new activity. Full time classes on weekend - I think we agree. At least it can be useful.

Presenting the diploma thesis in a foreign language this is a topic that has been raised by the participants, and I think we should just take it in a positive manner, because it can allow the participants to improve their language skills, and also allow foreign lecturers to participate at the presentation of the thesis.

Summer language courses, introductory courses, specialized courses (items 5, 6, 7). They touch to some extent the issue of the sustainability, like the possibility for the ESI to try to develop their own resources, especially within the 3 year period. As Professor Valenzuela said the ESI can try to develop new activities which can be marketed. I have always understood that the idea in 7 –specialized

short courses for the public servants are to be given on a free of charge basis because of the obligations provided for in legislation. But we can always try to find possibilities to develop this kind of projects for the business community, for the private sector, so to say.

Research activity of course, comprises a new kind of activity. We should accept the proposal of the Committee. The costs are very modest. In fact, we are discussing the period of 9 months for three young research candidates in the domain of EU-Russian relations here in Moscow. Budgetary costs are relatively limited.

Now, the vice-director comes up in item 9. This is about the organization. Indeed, I think we have discussed this issue in the Governing Board. I think it reflects the EU-Russia cooperation which has been developed. I think the time has come to take this point very seriously. It would be useful to see now what the mandate, what the duties of this new person should be, what is the job descriptions. We should organize a procedure how to employ this person. I would like to ask the EU members of this Governing Board to see how we can attract qualified, professor type people to come to Russia, but at the same to look where in Moscow these people can already be found. It may be partners, civil servants, whatever, who are already personalities and will be ready to take up this job. A difficulty arises, of course, when you want to attract a senior level academic from a Western European country and offer him/her working conditions. Perhaps, this has to be discussed a bit further, but the next step of this GB is to think about the scope of responsibilities, perhaps it is possible to link it with the personality and the sustainability of the ESI. And then on the basis of the job description, we could start the recruitment procedure.

Item 11 is also very interesting. It is a very short text, but I think in the light of what was suggested by Ambassador Valenzuela and Mark Entin, we could make use of the alumni. What are they doing now? We could make use of the expert knowledge they have acquired, and even later we could their opinion on how we

can finance this Institute after the three or four years mentioned by the Ambassador. This is, of course, a well - established practice in the United States. I admit it is less developed in Europe but we can explore it not only for the purpose of the alumni coming to us, but involving them in our conferences.

Last, but not least, the regional strategy. I think it is also very important, and I think it is one of the objectives of the ESI. The ambition should be to disseminate knowledge of the ESI not only in the Moscow region but elsewhere. This issue is a little bit demanding. You have to take a look at the regions not only Nizhny Novgorod and St.-Petersburg, but also regions far from Moscow, and in this context we can make use of the experts. Of course, there are some financial consequences, but this is your starting point.

Final comment, we tried to organize these activities and we respect the ceiling of the 2 million euro per year. One way or another, and I'm not an expert in this dimension of our work, but we respected this sum. Probably there is no need to raise new money. And it is possible, as I understood, to organize new activities within the regular budget of 2 million euro per year.

Thank you.

Sergey Prihodko:

Thank you for presenting the report of the Working group on the ESI strategy. I think this is a kind of a road map for the Governing Board and the ESI administration. I would like to highlight and to add from me personally, that it is necessary to pay more attention to the regional dimension and cooperation with Universities, not only in major cities of the Russian Federation, but we should not ignore other universities. We have spoken about this here repeatedly and it is mentioned in the report. Within Russian government, we work on this in due regard to the increase in teaching level. On our own programmes we have implemented more strict and licensed procedures, and raise the eligibility criteria to our own Russian programmes, our own teachers, while paying more attention to

those regional universities, even if they are located in some small towns, which deserve it, which have qualified professionals. And this qualification is achieved largely due to their close cooperation with foreign counterparts. Such attention is paid, even despite difficult financial situation which our country face. That is why I don't want to give specific recommendations or particular conclusions, but this very regional aspect of Institute cooperative activities is of extreme importance. It is related also to the very concept of development of the EU-Russia relations. We should focus not only on political issues, not only on promoting the development of four common spaces, but we should engage Russian regions into direct cooperation. So, that we create positive interest in cooperation with the EU countries among young people. For us, for the Russian Federation it is an advantage.

This is a very important aspect, and I would like to address you, Professor Entin, as a member of the Governing Council, not as its President.

Do I understand you in a right way Professor Entin that you would like to speak on the next agenda item, on the budget for the period 2010-2013? Please, the floor is yours.

Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues,

The budget is in the dossier every of you have. So as to the budget, I would like to praise the administration of the ESI a little bit. As we agreed all the documents were sent you in advance, including the report of the working group presented by Jaap de Zwaan, as well as budget and the explanatory note to it. The only thing, of course, the postponement of the Governing Board helped us a little bit, but all documents were sent in time, so everyone knows these documents perfectly.

Sergey Prikhodko:

It is your duty, and not your merit. It's your duty to inform the members of the Governing Board in advance. You can praise your employees later, but we are not going to do it now.

Mark Entin:

What is special about this budget? It is the fact that it integrated all the proposals of the working group headed by Mr. Zwaan. While we were working on the budget according to the proposals which were made, we considered various options. The first option is adding some expenses around 360 000 Euros annually to the current budget. Then we looked for a compromise version, where we cut some expenditures and introduced some additional. And here you see the final document. In preparation on this final document we worked, as usual, in close cooperation with representatives of the EU, and we agreed with the EU ideology that we have a two million budget, and we should redistribute our expenses in a way to ensure systematic implementation in all new fields of the ESI activities, so some of the expenses were cut down, according to the established practice. We had to cut expenditures even more than it would be rational. But here we rely on the assumption, and I'm following the appeal of Ambassador Valenzuela, that the Institute will be earning money, will attract additional resources and will substitute the funds, which the Institute gets through the Tempus project, that is about 100 thousand Euro, which we receive additionally, including on development of the ESI library, and on sending very soon a group of French language trainers, who teach our students the Lisbon Treaty terminology. We will substitute these funds. Then we'll spend this money also on expanding our regular activities and on expanding those aspects which define new strategy of the ESI operation. What is the most important and the major statement is the fact that all the results reached by the Working group, were agreed upon by the Working group, which received universal support were integrated into the budget, reflected in every annual budget,

reflected in the three year budget period, and according to the first year of this budget we'll have to operate starting from September 1, or as our life shows on August 24th, 2010. Though the chairman of our Governing Board has put me straight about our responsibilities, I would like to say specifically, that during the last two months, when we processed results from the Working group, everything was done by executive secretary Ms Anna Tsibulina. She was in regular contact with Jaap de Zwaan. These are a titanic efforts so if the Governing Board approves her work, then I think we can express special gratitude to Anna Tsibulina on behalf of the ESI and on behalf of the Governing Board. It would be the first time when the GB will recognise work of an individual employee. Thank you.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much.

Dear colleagues, I think we are supposed to listen to the comments and suggestions which, I am sure, the members of the GB and our guests do have on the factual side of the document. Who would like to start this discussion? Who feels it necessary to criticize or the contrary to praise the authors of the document?

Mr.Valenzuela, you are welcome.

Fernando Valenzuela:

Thank you very much; I am more on the side of the praise than of the criticism. There is a point related to something that I've mentioned before. Let me say that it is the best opportunity now that we could see the budget. Year by year we had to actually approve a budget, and now we have an opportunity to see a budget for three years. I think it is a very important occasion. I am not particularly an expert on budget, but basically these figures look quite right. But I would like to elaborate on the idea about having this executive director, vice director of the Institute. We would have to make space here from the budgetary point of view, and, of course, the sum is not going to be negligible. It is not for us to discuss, but

we have to think about somebody coming from a new country, and that would cause a certain level of expenses. So, I don't think that it is a big challenge to the budget, but somehow it has to be worked out, in order to make space for it in the budget. Perhaps it would be the Committee that we mentioned before. They will have to look at this issue, to see where we can make some savings. Thank you.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much. Professor Entin is ready to comment on this issue, I suppose?

Mark Entin:

The working group headed by Mr. Jaap de Zwaan considered this in great detail, and they concluded that part from the salary for the vice director from the EU, there should be foreseen three paid trips home, including payment for his tickets, optimal opportunities to rent an apartment in Russia, he should not think about basic needs, but to concentrate on his job responsibilities. The amount agreed upon by the Committee is 70 000 Euro a year and it is fully incorporated in our budget. I think that if some additional expenditure will be required, then the EU will be prepared to help representative of its country, but we should not forget that the responsibilities of this director will be limited to Moscow only. Essentially, he will take part in all the spheres of the ESI activities and will receive additional compensation for it. The sums suggested by the Committee, are studied thoroughly and in fact we are ready to enforce them.

Sergey Prikhodko:

I asked you and not Professor de Zwaan, because you are the one who is the most interested in having such a very highly qualified deputy, who will save also our time and efforts and will be representing in consideration of any issues, so this is our interest. I consider it as an interest of the Russian side to create the best

conditions for the new deputy. Would you like to add something, Professor de Zwaan?

Jaap de Zwaan:

I think it would be useful, to elaborate on this question a little bit, because we need a job description. Then we can discuss how to organize the employment of this person. I think it could be useful at the GB to say one or two words about the scope of the responsibilities, and I think it would be wise. I noticed that the way the ESI is functioning at present, the education, and the administration is well organised already, but you could try to give this new person the responsibilities connected to the future activities, because of the importance the EU delegation is attaching to this question.

Also the financial management and the sustainability issue. It should be a person who has academic education. It should be as we call it “a sheep with five feet”. I am always looking for a person who does not exist. So it should be an academic with expertise in EU-Russia relations, who can give advice and start activities with regard to future work in the field of marketing, sustainability and so on. That is something the GB agrees on along general lines. We can try tomorrow to write a text for the job description and to present it.

Anatoly Torkunov:

I absolutely agree with Professor de Zwaan that it should be a “sheep with five feet”. As we are speaking of a person who will represent the EU or the EU Member states on a permanent basis, of course, he should have some academic and research experience, because if we speak only about purely administrative duties, the current team is functioning fairly well, taking into account also good skills of teamwork and there are not so many students after all, and we agreed on the previous GB meetings not to expand the number much. The new person should nourish the European spirit, maintain knowledge about the EU and he must be

accessible to students, he must give lectures, and that is why in discussing job description it is necessary to highlight this specifically. Of course, it would be very good if he had knowledge about budget issues. However I think that there are representatives of the EU Delegation who do not monitor the expenditures very closely. These issues are discussed, regularly reviewed, but so understanding in budget issues is very important, but it is not the principle thing for this vice director. I think the most important thing is that he should be a good researcher and good, knowledgeable and experienced lecturer.

Klaus Segbers:

If we come back to the issue of the deputy director, I would like to say that it would be very helpful for us to understand a three year forecast for the budget, and to know where the changes are. Because to properly assess the budget proposal, we need to know what is going up, what is going down? And I think it would be great to do not for each position, but for the big changes in the budget, to give us a rough understanding where the biggest changes are foreseen.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you. Any other comments?

Manuel de la Camara:

Thank you very much. I think that the most innovative issue for us to do is to decide what will be the responsibilities of the new vice director. Because if you look at the normal vice director in various Institutions, they have a lot of academic relations with other academic Institutions. It is one of their major activities, and if it is going to be his role, it is very important. I see the budget covers the vice director's travel only of 2100 Euros. That is really not much. So it is going to be difficult at this stage, until the job description is completed, and the profile of the person is well defined.

The budget comes first.

And then, of course, we must see what will be his real activity, because I think the relationship with other Institutes is very important.

A lot of institutions want to know about Russia, and this gives a lot of opportunities to widen the relations of the ESI. One more question is why are there no more Russian students in Europe, why don't we have more students from Russia? This is something that needs to be answered.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much, Mr. de la Camara, for your comment. I would like to say a few words concerning job description for the new vice director. We have a very good record. Mr. Grushko and Mr. Torkunov know perfectly, that we have even adopted some technical regulations applied in the EU for implementation inside of Russia. Perhaps, my comparison is rather remote, but it says that we here are ready to apply in Russia some of the legal rules or technical norms, which are used in the EU. So, we won't have any problems in formulating job description and our colleagues will help us.

Alexander Grushko:

Thank you. I will be very brief. Manuel somehow took the words out of my mouth. I fully support everything he said. Maybe this activity of the new vice director should be seen broader than simply the task of servicing the ESI. I think he could become the center of research activities. I am saying this on the basis of how mechanisms academic and students exchange work in Europe, taking into account the variety of programs in EU on national level. That could be positive not only for the ESI, but also for the EU Russia relations as a whole. This is one of the most promising fields of his future work, I think.

Daniel Tarschys:

Mr. Chairman, I'm quite sure the European Commission keeps an eye on how money is spent. But it would be very useful for our discussions to have a clear picture of the money spent so far.

All the other Boards have the past expenditures. So you can compare all the budgets and then discuss a new one. It is very difficult, from my point of view, just to look at the future without having a clear picture of the past.

Sergey Prikhodko:

I think, we have discussed this topic of how our future plans correlate with our past spending, very often.

Are there any other comments?

Please.

Mark Entin:

First, I would like to say to Manuel in order to avoid any misunderstanding that the money which was appropriated for three trips home is what the labor legislature provides for, it's even more. These are personal expenses for his private trips, which are not related to his work for the Institute.

Anyway these are private expenses, and as for the duties that this person will have to fulfill, the money is foreseen also in other items of the budget. All the items of the budget are in full compliance with the European Commission requirements, that is why many activities are financed through different articles of the budget and the sum of these articles ensures every activity, so in the dossier along with the budget explanation note was included, where it is shown how activity is financed from different sources. In the dossier we have a document which is budget for accountancy needed for the administration and also the budget as the members of the GB would like to see demonstrating how every activity is funded. How we redistribute the resources again is also clearly explained in these

documents. If the chairman does not object, I would like to give the floor to our vice director Tamara Shashikhina. She will give some comments on that.

Tamara Shashikhina:

Thank you, dear colleagues.

Coming back to the questions of how money is spent by the ESI throughout the period it has been functioning I want to say that as for today comparing the budget plan for the next three years and financial report for the past three years and a half, would not be quite financially correct. The thing is that in 2006 we approved a plan for three years - 2006-2009. As the ESI was only starting to work then and we were launching all our activities, the funding came after the Institute started to work in practice. The money came to the account a little bit later. And of course, as we all remember, in the first years our spending were very modest. Now it is the fourth year that the Institute has been functioning on the money that were allocated. In fact very careful and rigorous spending of every eurocent enabled the Institute to exist during the fourth year as transition period and prepare to the implementation of the Regional strategy. Due to this for the GB members to have understanding on which articles we changed standing and how they changed, I've prepared a chart, which was not planned in advance, however foreseeing the questions could appear, I prepared this chart and I suggest that you compare financial plan for the first 3 years of funding and the financial plan for the next period. Perhaps, in terms of budget and finance it would be more correct. Up for today we have already reported to the European Commission twice. The European Commission approved our accounts, and we have already submitted our 3rd account to the Commission, but we can't say yet whether the European Commission approved it or not, because we are working right now on those questions and comments that the Delegation of the European Union has sent us, so this issue is still in progress. So I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we cannot give you a detailed account because the periods of accounting do not

correspond to the financial plans periods. Even though financial plan is approved for 12 months, we submitted first accounting report for 7 to 8 months. For the second year we actually submitted an account for a year and a half, and for the in third report we actually present an account for 12 months, but of the calendar year, from the 1st January to 31st December, while financial plan is approved for the period from the 1st September to 31st August. That is why I would like to propose you not to compare because these numbers are incomparable. I'm ready to pass reports.

Sergey Prikhodko:

You can simply hand it out. Thank you, Mrs. Shashikhina for your explanation. In our questions from all our colleagues, I see sincere interest in having you and the part of the Institute you lead to continue to work as good, so that we could focus more on the questions of ideology, policy and teaching. And I am quite grateful for those detailed questions that are raised, they help us. Certainly, anyone neither had, nor have any doubts in carefulness and accurate oversight by our colleagues from the European Commission. I hope as well as everyone who is present, probably, that when we'll discuss the 10 or maybe the 20 three year budget we'll have such an experience, that there will be no questions. Personally, I would like to add that we have some very prospective human resources in MGIMO for the Ministry of Finance. Our colleagues from the European Commission have trained us so well, that we can assist Mr Kudrin in preparation of budget and more complicated our Russian events. Now do you have any additional comments? Maybe, Mrs Shashikhina, you would like to draw our attention to something additionally?

Tamara Shashikhina:

Yes, thank you very much. I would like to say that even the budget for 2006-2009, which we approved in 2006 was adjusted every year, moreover some new

items and lines were added to that budget, as, for example, the item which provided funding for the permanent representative of the College of Europe. So the budget we are now proposing is a kind of a model budget which we will test in the first year of our activities 2010-2011, and we will see where we can save and on the contrary where we will need some extra money. If we look carefully at the final chart, in the row coloured green these is the budget, which was adopted for 3 years, and for the items, which are related to the salaries of our staff, here some increase has been made on 400 000 Euros. If you remember, it was related to the fact that at the 9th meeting of the GB we decided to increase salaries on 23% to all staff and visiting professors regardless of their nationality. And on the item that deals with paying foreign academics we provided a considerable increase and you can see it in the item 1.2 on the second page. We have planned 168 000 Euros in 2006-2009, and now we are planning for the next 3 years 463 246 Euros. Here the ESI is working on the basis of its experience of cooperation with our foreign colleagues and, of course, taking into account the fact that the Tempus project, despite the support of the College of Europe, was only extended for 12 months and this July it comes to its end. So expenditures funded from the Tempus Project earlier, now will have to fund them from the ESI budget.

The item 1.2. deals only with external lecturers, because expenditures on those lecturers, who are Russian citizens are funded through the item 1.2. and it is entitled "Visiting professors". Here you see spending on salaries. In the item 1.2.3 expenditures on the salary of vice director from the EU, whose salary will be the same as other vice directors. Now the item 1.3. I would like to draw your attention to it. This is registration fees and per diem. In 2006 we did not take into account the students' visits and we did not know, unfortunately, in which item to include visits by students and staff, when there is registration fee. So following our 1st account submitted we ask to put in this adjustment, that registration fees which we pay to both the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna and the College of Europe when our students go there for summer schools are also included in the item 1.3. The

thing is that life in Europe does not become cheaper too, so our expenditures grow and we take it into account and don't discuss. Certainly, we ask our partners in to provide some discounts, book tickets in advance, but we understand that the most important is result and we work on this result during these trips. Another item which as you see is colored red, that is dividing among trips by staff in different countries. This division was made intentionally, as this is a way for the Institute to indicate, that some negotiations are already planned, trips to certain countries are already planned. For this reason these countries Belgium, France, Austria, etc are highlighted separately. There is a new subdivision; this is Russia and other EU countries which haven't been identified earlier. And again it is related to the implementation of the Regional strategy. I would also like to draw your attention to the aspect related to the item 1.3.5 which deals with expenditures for accommodation of the EU vice director. As these costs are included in the per diem item, it is defined for 180 days, but legally it is only because it is the item related to per diem, and it's impossible to account there any other way. This refers to accommodation including food and apartment, so vice director will get additionally to his/her salary 3 000 Euro, which is sufficient sum in Russia and in Moscow to perceive himself/herself as not just middle class, but to feel rather comfortable. The next item is travelling. I would like to emphasise that in the budget for the next 3 years - 2010-2013 we have cut down on the basis of our practice a little bit not only number of trips, but also costs of tickets which we are planning to purchase. Originally as you remember the costs for air tickets for all was 700 Euro, but in reality we seek and plan to find the best budget options and no flight for any single student has ever cost 700 Euro. That is why we reduced expenditures on flights for students up to 500 Euro, for the Governing Board members the 700 Euro are preserved and for the staff they are reduced to 600 Euro. And here we decided specifically according to the practical record we had during four year budget term. As our Director has already said, an item 2.5 deals with personal trips home to the vacation, to the place of permanent residence and origin for the vice director.

Why three trips specifically? According to Russian legislation, vacation is available only once every six months. But since we also take into account that he will have to come here first and leave at the end of his employment term, we included three trips and we hope that he will respect the Russian legislation since he will be hired under the Russian legislation. Regarding equipment and supplies, I would like to emphasize, that here in the item 3 for 2010-2013 expenditures has been reduced significantly. While for the first period we adopted 306 000 Euros, for the next three years we suggest 105 000. This does not mean this is quite sufficient for replacing all the equipment which gets old or unfortunately breaks. Here we expect that we would find additional funds and earnings, so we are actually providing for the lowest possible amount.

Quite the same the Institute took into account in the item 4 that utility payments in Russia increased, that is why spending on the electricity, water, security etc. have gone up by 20%, but these expenses have not become much higher than in the previous years because expenses in item 4.1 which is costs for running an office according to our practice we decreased and we'll try to continue to spend these funds carefully, as well as Internet use enables us to save on communications in item 4.2.8, because it is not related to the utility payments, however new technologies help us to save on these articles. So in general we haven't exceeded the limit, we have even saved, as for the first three years we adopted 270 thousands Euro and here we have 260 thousands Euro. So the general trend is that we have some additional spending, but we haven't gone over 2 million Euro, though according to our calculations to implement everything that we have planned, we need 2 400 000 Euros. Therefore administration of the Institute has a task to earn 400 000 Euros or save this money every possible or impossible way, but not on quality of education.

Thank you, I hope I have answered all your questions.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you, Mrs. Shashikhina, for detailed comments. I would like to remind you all, and our distinguished members of the Governing Board, that we approach very thoroughly expenses as well. Nevertheless Russian government found opportunities to provide special funds to build this building, to buy furniture, equipment, to provide Internet, and other communication facilities.

Please, Professor Berg, the floor is yours.

Berg Eiki:

Thank you. I have a question concerning the table. Do I understand it correctly that the green color here corresponds to the figures that are the actual costs and not something that is financial perspective for the years 2006-2009. So what do these figures correspond to really - the planned costs or the real costs?

Tamara Shashikhina:

The green column, as I have already said at the beginning of my presentation, is the budget plan for the period from 2006 to 2009. And as to the spending at the present moment, by August 31st the money will have been fully spent. It was calculated clearly that by December 31st, 2009 we reached parity of expenses from the Russian budget and the grant provided by the European Commission, where 51% comes from the Russian part, 49% comes from the European Union. So by August 31st I will ask the GB to appeal to the administration of the MGIMO to take into account the fact that some of the expenses, specifically 300 000 Euro, is on collateral kept by the European Commission. The money will be transferred to us if our final financial report for spending of 3 million Euro will be accepted by the European Commission, right now we have not yet received from the European Commission 3 million euro, but we've received 3 million minus this collateral, which will be transferred to the ESI account only after our financial report will be finally accepted. This will happen

only after September 24th 2010. That is why starting from September 1st we will work without these 300 000 Euro. So we'll have to apply to the MGIMO-University to finance our expenses, which perhaps later on Commission will agree to cover. Here MGIMO takes huge risk in crediting and providing money for development of the Institute, all the funds will be spent as planned, today it could be seen from the three reports we have had.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much, Mrs. Shashikhina. Are there any other questions on the content of the documents provided? If not, Professor Entin, are we supposed to adopt the budget formally or to recommend to the European Commission to approve it?

We as members of the GB must approve it according to our statute. Is there anyone against adopting the proposed budget?

Let's vote. Who is in favor to approve this budget? Please vote. Thank you.

Do you want to speak?

So, is there anyone against? I see none, and no abstentions. We congratulate you.

Tamara Shashikhina:

We have approved the three year budget, and we are asking the members of the GB to approve the budget for the academic year 2010-2011 which will be testing for the three year budget.

Please vote for two decisions.

Daniel Tarschys:

Since I've asked the question, I would like to thank Mrs. Shashikhina for the detailed explanation. I think I find the items inside the budget perfectly acceptable. And as far the problem of trying to get money out of the Commission on time,

welcome to join all the rest of us. In the Institute for the European Studies you are acquiring the experience about what it means to have to deal with the European Commission

Sergey Prikhodko:

I would like to thank you once again for the work which you simplified for us by your very complete explanations, Mrs. Shashikhina. As to specific issues, it has become our tradition that we'll take into account all the comments when we prepare for the next session of the GB. We need all the comments concerning the funding and expenditures. Thank you very much once again. If I understand correctly we agreed on the 5th item of the agenda to listen to a report on the activities of the Committee on the editorial policy and visibility.

Professor Hafner, you have the floor.

Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much. The last meeting of the GB confirmed the creation of the Committee on Publications Policy and Public Relations. Also the composition was decided last time. According to this we had a meeting in March here in Moscow with Professor Zagorski, Professor Kaveshnikov as members and me, and Professor Mark Entin as an observer. The first issue was certainly to define the mandate of this Committee. You have the report of that meeting. You can see it on paper. But in any case I want to emphasize some points, that were discussed and what was recommended.

As to the mandate of the Committee, it was recommended to formulate it in such a way that, first of all, takes into account one objective - the public policy, to consider the elaboration of the editing policy and to organize the review of the publications of the ESI.

On the other hand, our second objective – is to advise how to promote the ESI public relations and to contribute to the increase of the public awareness of the European Studies Institute.

In particular, it was said that it would be recommendable to make the ESI a major academic documentation center on EU-Russia relations in Russia. This mandate is only a recommendation; it has to be approved by this GB. We made the mandate as broad as possible, since it is easier to cut it down, than to enlarge. So I submit it to the GB now.

Secondly, we discussed in details what was already addressed by Ambassador Valenzuela concerning the electronic portal or the web-site of the ESI, - how to improve it, to increase it. And to provide it with teaching materials, to make it a useful means for the researchers and students. What is also necessary is to improve the English version of the web-site in order to make it internationally accessible, because the language is a major obstacle to the international awareness.

For this reason also linkages should be established to the Universities and research centers in order to make the ESI known. The College of Europe is also asked for certain help in this regard.

A series of publication on the external policies, economics, and law should be launched. In this regard I want to draw your attention to the possibility of the publication of the Russian yearbook of European studies; it should include articles of high scientific standards.

Sergey Prikhodko:

That is a very good idea.

Gerhard Hafner:

And in particular not only in Russian, but also in English. I myself took as an example the Russian “Egegodnik megdunarodnogo prava” where they have all

the articles with the English summary at the end, if they are in Russian. The English articles are highly welcome.

We recommend and emphasize the need for the GB to take part in this activity.

The next issue, and this was in particularly emphasized by Ambassador Valenzuela, is the online journal All Europe.ru. The problem is that it is obviously frequently used by the Russian researchers but it needs to be increased. And this issue should be addressed. Of course, we also have the problem of the English version of the journal. Articles in English could be included and it could be discussed how to combine the journal with the Russian yearbook of the European Studies. Perhaps we could save some expanses.

Further on the problem of the scientific publications was also discussed. It was recommended that the ESI certainly become a center of such publications on the European studies. And other Russian institutions should also be provided with such materials.

And what is necessary and what is certainly an issue which I want to emphasize is the acquisition of foreign publications and foreign literature. Because what I know from the Russian universities is they are really suffering from the lack of the scientific literature. For the benefit of the students the situation should be improved.

As to the question of the public awareness, it was proposed that Mr. Chairman could also help to inform Russian ministries and agencies about the ESI activities and academic programs. The road shows on the ESI should be sent to institutions in Russian regions in order to increase the information about the ESI. In particular, what could be very useful is to provide the information packages on the ESI education services, as it is done in the European Universities. Lack of information is one of the major issues now.

In this regard, it could be useful that the GB contact the Embassy of the EU Presidency in Russia with the proposal of the meeting of the ESI authorities with

all the embassies of all EU member states. What should be the objective is to propose short courses for foreign people living here in Moscow, foreign companies, EU organizations and embassies. So, that they could also get more information about the EU-Russia relations.

And, of course, the conferences and the seminars could also be held in cooperation with research centers and Institutions of the European Union, again with the purpose of dissemination of information about the ESI. Then as it was already said by Jaap de Zwaan the question about the ESI alumni. It is the coordination of the alumni, establishment of the network of the alumni that is necessary in order to increase the awareness of the ESI among other institutions.

The problem is that all these activities are not budget neutral. And we thought that perhaps two more jobs could be created and high level professionals could be involved on the contract basis for this purpose.

I want to stress that these recommendations are not recommendations that should be realized at the moment but in the long run, these are the final goals which should be achieved in the future.

I hope tomorrow at our meeting we could continue the discussion of these issues.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you so much, Mr Hafner, for your report. And I want to thank you for the ideas which you put forward. I think that all these ideas are of practical importance, and we shall use them as guidelines. As a chairperson at the request of the ESI before the beginning of every academic year I try to attract attention of all governors of the Russian regions and all heads of Russian ministries and departments with personal letters. By these letters we inform all governors and all heads of ministries, agencies and committees without any exception and all executive bodies we have in Russia. Particularly by my letters I inform them about recruitment of students, about opportunities we provide.

Regarding more detailed acquaintance with the ESI activity, I want to say that we will of course try to take into consideration all your proposals. Am I right? And by the way virtually all governors respond to our letter, the responses now come faster and more regularly. So I want once again to thank you and to express my appreciation of your presentation, which is very practical. It is necessary to keep on with this very useful and required work for us. Are there any other questions? You are welcome.

Tamara Shashikhina:

Mr. Chairman, I have some figures to approve the activities that our Chairman mentioned. Now we received 337 applications from 15 ministries, from the State Duma, Council of Federation, the government of Moscow region, 27 federal services and agencies, governments from the Russian regions, representatives of the Karelia republic, Astrahan region, Kursk region, Ivanov region. These are the applications that we have received, these people sent us all the documents and this process is still under way.

Mark Entin:

On my part I would like to thank, Mr Hafner, for the work of the Committee. I think that the document, which has been submitted for our consideration, sets the Strategy of the work for the ESI for the next 3 years, so that at the end of this period we arrive at the result that Mr. Hafner has proposed and members of the Committee have proposed. That is huge work, but this work and it is the main line in the report is in the interests of the Russian Federation, in the interests of cooperation between Russia and the European Union, and not some local policy of the European Studies Institute. But as this is really a huge work and the work which is related to the English language activity, this is also a detailed programme for the future vice director from the European Union, I think it will fit well his future mandate.

Dimitrios Triantaphyllou:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One thing that occurred to me when Professor Hafner was speaking. He said two things. One the visibility and promotion here in Russia and also abroad that is why I am thinking about the emphasize on English, and the second, I think, we all agree on the priority of the need of research.

I think that one thing that we could also do, that could also strengthen the ESI in the long term in terms of sustainability, is creating a journal? What I mean by the journal, an academic journal. Institutes in Europe now have journals. These are the reference journals. We have enough academics to start an editorial board, to start a reference journal on the EU – Russia affairs, which I think will be good for the Institute because it would be a journal of the Institute. It means starting the selection by very highly qualified individuals whether they are Russians, Europeans or Americans, to deal with this issue. In the long term, this would strengthen the reputation of the ESI here and abroad. When I talk about an academic journal, it means that the ESI becomes part of the research community. Because the articles will go through a selection process. They will give academic impact; they will impact decision, impact policy, impact scholars and practitioners in terms of what is happening in the framework of EU-Russia affairs. And what is going out of that is very interesting. We have some journals but we don't have EU-Russia affairs. It might take some time to set it up, to create some links with the UK, French, etc. publishing houses.

This might be another idea which I am putting on the table. Thank you.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you so much, Mr. Triantaphyllou for your ideas. I think we register and will try to implement creatively all rational proposals made by the members of the GB.

Yes, please.

Berg Eiki:

Thank you. My observation is more of institutional nature. I think we are also invited to confirm the mandate of the group and I was wondering if we can take a close look at the text. I think we should aim at the reference publications, and I was wondering whether it is a correct draft.

Perhaps the more important concern is the composition. I think if the GB establishes the working groups, their composition should comprise that members of the GB, who will also be members of those Committees. And, to that extent, I think that is not very well followed. I wonder whether we could change the participation of the members of the GB in these working groups.

Gerhard Hafner:

Answering the first question. Of course, the idea is to arrive finally at a review. At first the idea was to do it through the Russian yearbook of the European affairs. I must confess I have certain experience to start with. The publication of a journal demands far more efforts than a yearbook, so it should be done by a peer review. We will discuss how to achieve it. There are many implications to the procedure on how to come to the result of the establishment of the peer review.

As to the composition, the problem is on the EU side. I was alone in this Committee. Certainly in the Committee there must be somebody who understands the Russian language, and I do.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Professor Hafner, if you don't mind I could join your working group? Would you like that?

I have to apologize to you, but the foreign policy agenda of my head is very tight and I have to go back to Kremlin, and I would like to ask you Mr. de Zwaan to continue as the Chairperson if you don't have objections. I promise I will ask

thoroughly our colleagues, on what you will agree on further agenda. If you need to vote, I delegate my vote to you.

Anatoliy Torkunov:

I should have to do the same because the ASEAN center is being launched in our University in accordance with the agreement between Russia and the ASEAN, and I am going to receive the Ambassadors of ASEAN nations now. Unfortunately, I have to leave too.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Following the line of transparency, I am supposed to hold a conference now on the state visit to Ukraine by our President Medvedev. The ministers have gathered and I have to consult my colleagues whether we are doing everything right with regard to Ukraine. And whether we are taking into account Ukraine's interest in developing their links with the EU. I hope you don't object.

Thank you, good bye.

Professor Hafner wanted to say something before we leave?

Gerhard Hafner:

I wanted to say that I will be very happy to have you as a member of the Committee.

Sergey Prikhodko:

Thank you very much.

Good bye.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Well, I thank the colleagues. If this is all right for you, it is a pleasure for me to be the chairman. It is now half past one we should make an effort to have lunch in time. We turn to issues 6 and 7, which are closely related.

Perhaps it is the best to make some introductory remarks, and we can ask Mark Entin to make some clarification, and then try to see where we can get agreement about the establishment of the Committees. We shall focus on the EU vice director, and leave the reference for desert. We have now to set up a mechanism for the selection of the ESI vice director procedure.

Second point is the development of the research activities. I am also wondering about another useful idea. I understood one of the comments made earlier was also to give the EU vice director some responsibilities in regard to research. It is not a bad idea.

For the regional strategy it is fair enough to have a closer look at it. In order to cooperate more specifically this is better for Oleg Barabanov, because you know the sort of demands, contacts with other universities or regional authorities.

Mark, would you like to make further clarifications?

Mark Entin:

Thank you.

At the very beginning of our session today we emphasized that the ESI is entering a new stage in its work. We are beginning to work on resolving new tasks; we are setting ourselves more ambitious goals. And the GB also enters a new stage. Over the past years the GB has tried new forms of work. In addition to the two Committees which had existed before, specifically the Committee on the selection of students and the Committee on the recruitment and selection of faculty it established two more committees, including the Committee chaired by Mr. Jaap de Zwaan and the Committee chaired by Professor Hafner. Operation of these committees indicated that we made a right choice. Working in this format enables

to discuss the issue professionally and in details, to assess it from all sides and to submit to the GB already mature and elaborated opinion. And we've worked in such way today. The conclusions from two Committees have been presented and they were approved. Moreover on the basis the budget of the ESI for the next year as well as for the next three year period have been approved. That is why formulating the agenda for our meeting today and thinking about how the activities of the GB should be organized (of course, in close contact with the Delegation of the European Commission) we suggested that 3 Committees should be established. However, assuming that the Committee on strategy has already completed its work. Its conclusions are already integrated in our activity. It is necessary to create three Committees, so each Committee would work in its own sphere, and now we can exchange agreed opinions to see what people think about it and then ask these Committees to submit to the panel discussion their proposals already studied, elaborated and financially secured, maybe those subjected to some additional assessment.

So this is the content of item 6 on our agenda. My proposal is to adhere to this ideology in the new stage of the GB activity, in the new stage of the ESI activities.

Tamara Shashikhina:

Thank you, acting chairman who now possesses unique combination of three votes, including one casting vote. But as a person representing the gender minority I would like to suggest the GB to consider the new stage in our work after the lunch break. We will be more efficient in doing it after the lunch.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Can we be sure that we will be all here after the break?

Fernando Valenzuela:

I think it is a perfectly good proposal. Unfortunately, I will have to leave. In my case this is less serious because I don't have a vote to give to anybody.

My colleagues will clarify any point or issue which the GB will need. Otherwise, I think it is fantastic and I would be happy to have lunch and stay with you, but I have to go to the Duma.

Before leaving I would like to make three points very briefly. From my side, I think we basically support proposed Committees. One of them is going to be very specific, which is the selection of the vice director. This is one time job; it is not putting more burden on the structure of the ESI. It is extremely important and in that sense we would ask this Committee to try to speed up the work so we could have this vice director appointed as early as possible, before the end of the year.

This is connected with one of the points I wanted to make. This is the connection between the working group and the Board. This connection is always preserved between our members of the Board and Committees. That facilitates the communication.

Then, as to the research activities of the Committee. It is very important to participate in the process of the granting the three fellowships.

Finally, the Committee for the Regional Strategy. We now have all the forces on our side for the development for the future years. So, at this point Committee will look after this strategy. One thing that I profit to point is that when we were listening to the report on the research there was complementarity. But we should see that there is no duplication. We should look for the synergies, but at the same time avoid the overlapping.

Let me jump to item 7. It is connected with the question of the appointment of the members of the Committees and particularly the Committee on the recruitment of the students. We give it a great importance.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Klaus Segbers:

I think we have to consider the role and functioning of the new Committees, working groups because there is a certain tendency of fragmentation. We shouldn't put ourselves in the situation when, on the one hand, we are serving in the working groups and, from the other side, we have to assess the work of the Committees and we have to supervise ourselves. That sounds weird, I think. When there is a certain reason to establish ad hoc organizations, there a need to do that, otherwise it is very doubtful. Not only to establish, but also to serve in such groups with the exception of the Selection Committee of the Deputy Director. Otherwise I would strongly suggest that we be careful. Our task is not everyday operation; our task is to look at it, to assess it, to monitor it.

Daniel Tarschys:

I basically share the view that we should avoid having too many Committees. I wonder whether the Committee on research activity is too close to what Gerhard Hafner has already been doing. So, it can easily be integrated into Hafner's Committee.

Gerhard Hafner:

Certainly, I hope we shall have tomorrow the meeting of the committee. We can discuss it how to create a mandate of the Committee, if there is such a wish.

Jaap de Zwaan:

It is my impression that we should not embark on a long discussion. It's correct what Klaus has said. If it was not this committee which took on board the discussion, we would have lost control as the GB. My idea is that it is a bit too modest to be only involved in GB meetings which take place twice a year, in order to be ready to give some flavor to the membership of the GB slightly more than it

is required. But I realize that we have in mind separation of members. This Board is the only entity which is allowed to take decisions.

But again the strategic document. It was not feasible to discuss all the issues in details. I think we could take a rather pragmatic approach to these issues. With regard to the vice-director job, we could agree on having a committee which should interview the candidates who are considered to be suitable to have this position. But some preliminary work has to be done in view of the job description.

To a certain extent, I come back to the remark I made earlier. We could try to set up a task force, if we like, who could gather tomorrow and write down some useful things and present them in written form for comments. It would be a job description, ideally complete with working conditions, the cost of accommodation, and also how to publish an advertisement and how to do this. We could try to find within the EU a candidate who could be placed here, somebody who is already working at a senior level position at a West European University and could be posted here for two years, for example, at MGIMO. This is a minimum duration because you need time to get a grip on the activities and also because we have to take into account future prospects of this person.

My proposal would be to see who is around tomorrow and to give this group, let's call it a task force, a mandate to draft this preliminary text and to have it circulated among the GB, but something has to be done on this issue.

On the second issue, my idea was also to try to find a practical solution and, eventually, to add this issue, so to determine priorities in the area of research and to merge them into the mandate of the editorial Committee, which we have already established. We should mind the composition. It should be visible that it is a working group of the GB. Because there were some members were not members of the GB, at least from the Russian side.

With regard to the regional strategy, let's not be too formal about it. It is new and we have to learn. We can exchange ideas. In fact, it is topic which came up in

the agenda because we put it in the agenda, and, apparently, because there is a demand from the Russian side.

With regard to research – my proposal would be to join it to the work of Professor Hafner’s group, to ask them to come up to the next meeting with the sort of first ideas about priority for the research program of the ESI Institute.

With regional strategy, I am rather flexible. I think it is rather useful to have an exchange of views and then to ask this group to present at our next meeting in September or October the first result of their findings.

Gerhard Hafner:

As far as I remember we have tomorrow the meetings of the Committees and the Committee on Strategy will be held tomorrow morning.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Not necessarily, because, in principle, we are finished with the mandate.

Gerhard Hafner:

This Committee could take up the question of the job description.

Also I am wondering about the necessity of having such Committee in order to avoid the proliferation of the Committees. Because if we have this new deputy director, it will be his task to control all these issues.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Well, on the last point let’s not be too formal. I know from my experience in the discussion in the Strategic Group that there is a lot which is developing. I think it is a pity to wait too long before trying to establish sort of infrastructure organization. So I would not mind to have to allow the meeting of such a working group who could report back at the next meeting of the GB and then obviously, in the end, that should be a part of the responsibilities of the new vice director,

because communication will be an essential element in the mandate of this new personality.

As to your first point on the selection, tomorrow it would be only preliminary work, it will not mean that the people who will be present tomorrow will be the members of the selection Committee. That's something that we have to decide now.

So I am willing to do some work tomorrow. But there should be some others who will take up the responsibility to select a candidate?

Evangelina Blanco Gonzalez:

Unfortunately I am not here tomorrow but as the representative of the College of Europe we would like to take part in that Committee, so I am happy to make comments on your conclusions tomorrow.

Gerhard Hafner:

We have the agenda for the Committees tomorrow, and I am wondering which Committees are planned tomorrow.

Jaap de Zwaan:

None for the moment.

Gerhard Hafner:

At least the Editorial Committee should meet tomorrow.

Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues, as for the administration of the ESI. Our role is to put forward proposals. The GB takes a decision. And if the GB takes a decision and establishes something, then the next question arises. If some structure is established, then we can immediately take a decision as to when the next meeting

will take place. As of today, we have had 4 Committees. So far, implicitly, we have agreed that the Committee on the selection of students is necessary - it will continue working. Second, the Selection committee for the faculty is also necessary – it will work. The Committee on Editorial Policy and Visibility was established earlier. It is strategic Committee. It makes a substantial specific contribution to the activities of the ESI and the members of the Committee have reported their intermediate results of their discussions, but I assume, the Committee will work for the next 3 years on a permanent basis, meet additional times apart from our GB meetings and periodically report its proposals. We also had a forth Committee – a Committee on Strategy chaired by Jaap de Zwaan. This Committee has completed its mandate; we have received the result of their work which we desired. So it ceased to exist.

On the agenda there is a proposal to establish structures. If you establish them, than the next issue is composition of the relevant Committee and when the next meetings will take place. In principle we could discuss these issues over lunch. So why not to continue work in the Committee setting right after the lunch or we could continue our discussion, listen to all the views on the remaining points on the agenda and then move to the committee setting, having established them in advance. As for us, representing administration, which is member or observer of the GB, we will follow the way you think the GB should work. This is no slightest pressure or preferences on our side. We understood that there is some positive record. Let's use this knowledge, but nothing prevents us from deciding operationally, what should be created, how should be created in the framework of all previous meetings.

Tamara Shashikhina:

Dear Chairman, Dear Director, as a representative of the administration I would like to remind you that at the invitation of Mr. Valenzuela we all are invited to take part in celebrations of the Europe day. The bus has been ordered for 5.30 –

5.45 p.m. Until that time you can fully use facilities of the University. If committees need separate rooms, you can use this room, you can use other facilities, we simply have to know how many rooms you need for working.

I would like to address you not as a member of the Administration, but as a member of the Students' Selection Committee. I would like to ask members of the Selection Committee to meet at 4 p.m. to interview the first applicants. We have not been able to process their documents yet, but these people would be unable to come in June. So I suggest we meet these first 10-15 applicants today and discuss the date of our next meeting when you will be able to come.

There are 4 members of the Committee on selecting the applicants.

The chair of the relevant department, Mr. Triantaphyllou and the representative of the College of Europe, who is present today. There is no need to delegate powers for you. Moreover, it will be your first time.

Jaap de Zwaan:

I don't want to overload the work of this GB, but my impression is that this Committee could perhaps meet, but what can it reasonably do? The applications were not distributed in time, so it is difficult for us to take the decision about the suitability of these candidates. We can decide when to meet next time. At least you could meet and see what you can do, and the rest has to be postponed. For the rest I would like to be a bit practical. We can already, from the EU side, designate 2 members for the selection Committee of the ESI vice director – Klaus Segbers and Gerhard Hafner, they are volunteers. Those who have an interest can stay after lunch and I will be one of them. Let's not call it a working group but a task force.

On the research questions, if you have ideas we can bring them out now. But it should be discussed in September together, let's hope so, with the new vice director.

With regard to the regional strategy, it is nevertheless useful to listen to what the ideas are from the Russian side and we should add our ideas. We can allow one

meeting of a working group on a regional strategy and also report back in September.

Oleg Barabanov:

If you don't mind I would like to speak in Russian according to our procedure.

Thank you very much for supporting the idea that formal or informal, some further work should be done on regional policy. I have already preliminarily discussed it with Eiki Berg, and he agreed to be a part of this working group or committee, whatever you call it. I would also be very glad if you personally or any other member of the GB would agree to work in this format, as apart from analysis of the current work on relations that the ESI already has with regional universities and centers, there is a new programme and qualitatively new situation, that deserves to be discussed and here we need a Committee. And as far as I know the EU Delegation in Russia has invited application for creation of three regional centres of European studies. The application process has already started, so three regional Russian Universities will be selected. Each of them will get 500 000 Euro grant to establish the European Studies Centre. The aim of this program is to establish something like our Institute in 3 regions of Russia.

The question arises on methodological coordination of activities among the ESI and those 3 centres, which the Commission wants to establish in Russia, as I think it would be wrong to pretend that we don't notice them and they don't notice us. So I think it's important that probably even without personal meetings, we could exchange opinions, maybe by e-mail because applications from regional universities are accepted until May 30th. As a representative of the European Commission Nicola may say precisely which unit of the European Commission is responsible for this, and in June there will be selection process of these three Russian Universities, relying on the record the ESI already has, while as I reported to you in February we are working with regions for more than two years.

It would be logical if our voice is heard. I mean, not just as the ESI but the voice of the GB in general. And Professor Eiki Berg said that he would be interested to study applications, because he as the Estonian representative is interested in looking into North-Western Universities' proposals this way or another. So I would like to make a proposal, that during selection, though not trying to compromise autonomy of the Commission anyhow, this is their competition and their money, they have every right to choose any 3 Universities, but we think that our opinion, opinion of the ESI and both Russian and foreign representatives could be sound. This is the first proposal I would like to make. That is why I believe that some work on coordinating our regional strategy should be done already in June. The second issue we discussed with Eiki Berg, was that he would be here in Russia in September because there will be a big Convention of the Russian Association of International Studies in Moscow in MGIMO and he proposed to employ this opportunity to combine the meeting of the Association in Moscow with potential Regional Committee meeting. And there is a proposal from the Saratov University, it invited the Committee on Regional Strategy to hold a meeting not in Moscow, but in their city and to discuss all those issues on the ground and we will have an opportunity to see their University. We discussed with Eiki that maybe, we could plan the meeting for the end of September. That is what I wanted to say.

Jaap de Zwaan:

I think we have to decide what we will do today. Tamara made a practical proposal. A bus is leaving at 17:30 and we can have lunch and do whatever we want after it.

The date of the next meeting is still the question.

I am a bit anxious that we are bringing the next meeting of the GB too early but I am OK with that. Later on those who are volunteering will stay here and draft the job description for the new vice director. When it comes to interviews with

candidates, the EU members of this selection Committee, which we will establish, are: Klaus Segbers and Gerhard Hafner. My idea is to leave this to the next meeting and to discuss it in conjunction with the mandate of the vice director. We should contact you. As to the regional strategy, I think we would like to know what initiatives exist now, what are the relations.

Let's see, because Daniel Tarschys is a volunteer, Eiki Berg is a volunteer, I am a volunteer – there is a lot of interest and then we shall see whether we meet either today or tomorrow and let's leave it there.

Let's have the agreement about the next date and then continue.

Evangelina Blanco Gonzalez:

I just want to express the wish of the College of Europe to be represented in the working Committee for the selection of the EU vice director as an observer.

Mark Entin:

Members of the Committee from the Russian side for editorial activities have been, of course, notified, and they confirmed that they would be available. But if we have time now before 5.30 p.m. Professor Kaveshnikov is waiting to speak on the agenda, which he prepared as the Secretary of this Committee, for about an hour already, as we were going to make a lunch break an hour ago. He is a member and a secretary of the Committee. Please.

Jaap de Zwaan:

Then I think we can meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

With regard to the next meeting, Mark, September? October?

Mark Entin:

As for September. In September our students usually visit Bruges and get acquainted with the institutions of the EU, and this year we are going to have a pilot project – a preliminary intensive language course.

So, from technical point of view September is practically the least convenient time for us. As for October, in any case we have to know the calendar of the GB chairman, Mr. Prikhodko. He suggested the first dates in November, but he has not confirming it anyhow. Maybe if we could come up with two different suggestions, we could propose him to decide. As to meet without him will not be quite correct.

Jaap de Zwaan:

My proposal is to meet on Thursday, because we could continue working on Friday. With regard to the working group meeting, if we should meet on Thursday, then let's meet in November.

The 11th of November is a suitable date. Is it Thursday or Friday the 12th?

If we only focus on the GB – it would be only Friday the 12th.

So, we fix the 12th of November subject to the approval of Mr. Prikhodko, and we reserve the 11th of November for the preparatory work. Or 18th of November and 19th of November. Let Mr. Prikhodko decide himself.