

13th GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
EUROPEAN STUDIES INSTITUTE
Moscow, 18 April 2011

AGENDA

1. Communication by the Chairman of the Governing Board Committee on the 3d ESI deputy director from the EU selection procedure on its activities. Exchange of views on the proposals reached by the Committee.
Speaker: rector of the MGIMO-University, academician Anatoly Torkunov
2. Exchange of views with the candidate selected for the position of the 3d ESI deputy director from the EU
3. ESI students selection and enrollment on the Masters' programme, academic year 2011/2012
Speaker: Professor Mark Entin, ESI Director
4. Exchange of views on the creation of the Executive committee.
5. Communication by Chairman of the Working group on development of ESI research activities. Exchange of views on the proposals reached by Working group.
Speaker: Professor Daniel Tarschys.
6. The date for the 14th Governing Board meeting.
7. Miscellaneous.

PARTICIPANTS

The Governing Board members from the Russian Federation side

Mr. Alexander GRUSHKO	Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
Mr. Anatoly TORKUNOV	Rector of the MGIMO (University), Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mr. Alexander POZDNYAKOV	Advisor of Department of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on behalf of Nichkov Vladislav, the Director of the Department of International Cooperation in Education and Science
Mr. Alexey GROMYKO	Deputy Director for Research of Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mr. Mark ENTIN	Director of the European Studies Institute, Professor

Mrs. Tamara SHASHIKHINA	Deputy Director of the European Studies Institute, PhD
Mr. Mikhail MARCHAN	Deputy Director of the European Studies Institute

The Governing Board members from the European Union side

Mr. Eiki BERG	Professor of International relations, Department of Political Science, University of Tartu
Mr. Daniel TARSHYS	Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Stockholm University
Mr. Jaap Willem de ZWAAN	Professor of the EU law, Erasmus University of Rotterdam
Mr. Dimitriou TRIANTAFILLOU	Director of the center of the international and European studies, University Kadir Has, Istanbul
Mr. Klaus SEGBERS	Director of the Centre of the East-European politics studies, professor of the Frei University of Berlin
Mr. Gerhard HAFNER	Professor of international law, Law faculty, Vienna University
Mr. Istvan IJGVARTO	Ambassador of Hungary to Russia
Wojciech ZAJĄCZKOWSKI	Ambassador of Poland to Russia

Observers

Mr. Fernando VALENZUELA	Head of the European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation
Mr. Nicola SCARAMUZZO	Project Officer, Educational Programmes, EU-Russia Cooperation section, European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation
Mrs. Evangelina BLANCO GONSALEZ	Project Manager, development Office, College of Europe, Bruges
Mr. Paul DEMARET	Rector of College of Europe, Bruges
Mr. Etien CLAVIER	Head of Operations section, European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation

Absent

Mr. Sergey PRIKHODKO	Assistant to the President of the Russian Federation
Mrs. Elena DANILOVA	Director of the Department, of countries of America, Ministry of Economic Development of Russia

Guests

Mr. Oleg BARABANOV	Head of the Department of politics and policies of the EU and Council of Europe (the ESI)
Mr. Gennady TOLSTOPYATENKO	Head of the department of the EU law (the ESI)
Mrs. Natalia ADAMCHUK	Head of the department of the EU economics (the ESI)
Mrs. Emilia JASIUK	First secretary, Embassy of Poland to Russia
Mrs. Flora GOUDAPPEL	Professor of the European law of the Erasmus University, Rotterdam, candidate to the post of deputy director of the ESI.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

Dear colleagues,

I just received a letter from Sergey Prikhodko, who is still aboard the plane from Hong-Kong to Moscow accompanying our President. He asked me to inform the members of the Governing Board that unfortunately because the schedule of the President had been changed a little bit he would not be able to come to Moscow for the meeting today. I mean Prikhodko, not President Medvedev. Prikhodko asked me to chair the meeting today if there are no objections among the members of the Governing Board. Do you have objections? OK, thank you. Then let me shift back into my native language and ask your opinion on the draft agenda. Do you hear interpretation? Though I understand that many of you understand Russian quite well.

So, are there any proposals as to the agenda? You are welcome.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I wanted only to raise one issue and propose an amendment to point 5 of the draft agenda: Exchange of views on the proposals reached by the working groups. I think this should be done in combination with the short report concerning the Committee on Editorial Policy and Public Relations because the issues and the matters of both the Committee and the Working groups are very closely related and it would be quite useful. And I think I would also make a very short report on this. So, with your permission, I would ask to amend point 5 in this respect.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I think this is a very reasonable proposal. Are there any objections?

Yes, you are welcome.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

I was wondering whether we have to take the subject matter of point 2 literally, because I think if all goes well, the Governing Board could simply stick to the confirmation of the results of the selection body. I am wondering whether it is necessary as a full-board to have an exchange of views with the candidate. So for me it is not necessary. I mean that was the task of the Selection Committee yesterday. And I have a slight preference to move up a little bit the new subject, number 4, because we attach a lot of importance to that one. It does not matter too much. Maybe after number 2 or something like that. But I hope that you would agree to move it up a little bit on the agenda and for the purpose of a good discussion we have distributed a piece of paper of one page at the beginning of the meeting.

Thank you.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I think that members of the Governing Board would be interested in having a look at a new vice-director. It took about 5-6 hours to select the candidate and I

think it would be a good idea to listen to the new ideas that the new vice-director would bring to the ESI. I think it would be a good idea just to have a close look at the nominee. You and ourselves will have to work with this person, in the future will have to communicate with him/her. Moreover it was our ex-officio arrangement that the vice-director will represent the EU in the Directorate of the ESI. Therefore let's leave it as a brief item, but still let's leave it in our agenda. Now we can limit the time for his/her presentation. And I think that his/her presentation will help us to have a meaningful exchange of opinions on point 4. That is setting up the Executive Committee of the ESI because as far as I understand our new contract with the European Commission defines quite clearly the functions of this new deputy director and we shall have a chance relying on the new structure of the Administration to discuss the idea of the Executive Board.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I think we should introduce the new deputy director. It's a sensible proposal. What we don't have here is the confirmation and the Governing Board must take the final decision on the candidate after his/her presentation, after his/her introduction by the Chairman of the Working Group.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

On the way here I was considering the best approach. Let's discuss it together. I will report the result of our work, of our selection. And we will have to confirm our decision. And then invite this person, not as a candidate, but as a deputy director. Do I understand the procedure correctly? Are there any objections to this proposal? Ok, you are welcome.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela:

Excuse me. I fully agree with what has just been decided, but just as a matter of suggestion. I really don't like this phrase: "third ESI deputy director" in point 2 of the agenda. If it expresses that there are three and he/she is one of them it's OK.

But to us, he/she is the first deputy director. We don't need to say "first deputy director", but, in any case, say "deputy director", not the third one.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

But he is the third to be appointed! It's not the significance. OK, we shall remove it. We shall remove figure 3 from the agenda. So if there are no more suggestions, we shall proceed with our agenda. Dear colleagues, in accordance with your decision that the powers should be conferred on the members of the Selection Committee, I want to remind you that this Committee comprised Professor Segbers, Professor Hafner, Deputy Minister Mr. Grushko and myself, who was appointed the head of the Selection Committee. And there were observers attending our session: Evangelina Blanco Gonzales, the administrator of the program of the European College of Brugges, and Nicola Scaramuzzo, the coordinator of the educational projects of the European Union Delegation in Moscow. You know him very well. At the session yesterday there was another observer - the Director of the ESI, Mr. Mark Entin. He participated ex-officio. It took us several hours in accordance with the requirements which we had decided for this vacancy: we considered the submissions, the documents of the candidates and conducted personal interviews. Personal interviews were quite lengthy. We organized the meetings in the following way. First the candidates gave brief presentations. They presented themselves and the ideas that they would like to introduce and implement into the framework of the ESI. Then they answered our questions. Each candidate received about 35-40 minutes for the personal interview. Only one candidate asked us questions. And these were meaningful, specific questions about the views of the members of the Committee as to the work of the deputy director. I must say that we highly appraised the professional qualities, the academic background, knowledge and expertise as well as professional experience of all the 4 candidates. Of course, these 4 people differ as far as their experience is concerned and their background. They worked in different organizations, in different institutions, the European Commission. Their age is also different.

Therefore this difference is quite logical. We noted the huge experience of Mr. Kellermann. As a matter of fact, he was present when the European Law Institute was set up here at MGIMO, so his experience is really huge. We noted the positive features of all candidates. As the result of the discussion and appraisal, the members of the Selection Committee were unanimous in their selection and they recommend Flora Goudappel to the Governing Board as a deputy director of the ESI. Flora Goudappel represents the Erasmus University in Rotterdam. And members of the Selection Committee relied in their decision on the expertise and experience that Mrs. Goudappel has in research, education and teaching. You all have her resume, her CV. She has huge experience as a lecturer and also as a lawyer, she also knows the budget issues. That was a separate issue we were interested in because the deputy director, as we envisage it, will take an active part in the implementation of the budget policy. That is in the Rules. And I must be quite frank with you and say that Mrs. Goudappel made a very good impression on the members of the Selection Committee. Her presentation was impressive. Also her view of what she is supposed to do. She has a proactive attitude, an interested attitude. And she is prepared at an earliest opportunity to be fully involved in this work. She will conform to the requirements for the deputy director: that is a permanent residence in Moscow, implementation of the objectives that are formulated for this deputy director. You know these objectives: promotion of the ESI. You know them all, they are set forth clearly in the selection conditions. Well, this is the main result I wanted to report to you. I want to emphasize once again that the decision was taken unanimously. And I must say that in the course of the discussion we asked more clarifying questions because after the presentations of the candidates we all came to the conclusion that Flora Goudappel was the most appropriate candidate for the job of the deputy director. I am prepared to answer your questions if there are any. Members of the Selection Committee are all here. They were all very active in our discussion yesterday. I don't see any questions. Are there any? So I propose for us formally to confirm the decision of the Selection Committee. I suggest voting on appointing Flora Goudappel as deputy

director of the ESI. This is to endorse the decision of the Selection Committee. Please, raise your hands if you are in favor of this proposal. I don't see any objections. Thank you. Then shall we give the floor to Flora and she will take Mr. Prikhodko's place and someone says "take the power in her hands right away". Being the first deputy director she will assume the powers.

I just want to congratulate you because a few seconds ago we approved you as the new deputy director of the ESI. We all want to wish you great success and want to ask you to say a few words, some kind of a presentation, but a brief one.

Mrs. Flora Goudappel:

Thank you very much also for the approval. Of course, I have to organize a few things at home first. Some very practical matters which always take time and careful negotiations but I am very confident that it will work out fine. Yesterday I told the Selection Committee that I thought carefully about the Institute and I gave a short presentation that I will summarize. I see that there are 2 goals for the organization. The first one, of course, is academic excellence both in research and teaching. The second one is connected to it, that is, the ESI should be the first to think of in the EU-Russia relations when you look at it from the EU side and also for European knowledge when you look at it from the Russian side. There are 3 ways of getting there. Of course, there is already a high level but there is always room for improvement. Research, teaching and internationalization. Research: I would suggest that the final goal would be one research program that will depend, of course, on participation of participants in the research program because it is necessary for contacts, for the focus and academic exchange. And also I suggest the possibility for associated research for Russia and EU without any obligation. So, there will be no payment, but having people feel involved and feel bound to your organization. For teaching, of course, my experience is mostly with the short courses, which are excellent. And, perhaps, to invite EU counterparts, civil servants as well and the same for master programs. Perhaps for EU students there should be something different from what they are offered at home. So

specialization on EU-Russian relations: on the legal, economic and political-science point of view. To be interesting, without changing anything, but taking part in the courses that are there right now. And perhaps more structural EU professors, top-rating in the modules and perhaps in that way also team-teaching - having Russian and EU professors teaching modules together. That would be of interest for both parties and also students. And, perhaps, to have better cooperation and to have the EST system introduced in some form so that comparison would be easier. And for the internationalization, perhaps it should be wider than right now. More Memorandums of Understanding, but also specific network organized from here with universities from all over Europe and Russia. They should cooperate and have a student-exchange system and also a professor-exchange system. That is in brief what I told yesterday so I hope this gives an insight into my ambitions.

Thank you.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

We are just close colleagues with Flora from Erasmus University. I'd like to congratulate you whole-heartedly on this appointment. I think this is very important and I know that you will perform this function well. The idea is to strengthen the networks with EU universities, to try to invent, to develop products which might be attractive for the EU students too. There is another issue which I would like to ask you. I wonder whether you have already thought about it. There is in the Statute a reference to another function of the ESI, i.e. to spread the knowledge of the European studies all over Russia. Now obviously the question is how to do that. Have you already developed an idea about it – should it be done from a central basis here in Moscow or should we try to involve other universities?

Mrs. Flora Goudappel:

Of course, I already have some ideas and especially it concerns the fact that there should be some sort of central point for various parts. But the Russian Federation is quite big. Much bigger than the Netherlands. Moscow is big

compared to the Netherlands. It is a different scale so there should be a regional basis and regional responsibilities, of course, in that way. But there should also be an exchange - not telling universities in the region "it's up to you" and let them swim and hope that they don't sink. But help them and make sure that they have the right tools to set it up. It also involves professors and students exchanges. That's all I can think of since I have been informed about this issue.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Thank you very much. In reality it is not a question but simply congratulation. I'm taking the floor to congratulate you. As you know, we are in the second phase of this very important project. We have a lot of expectations and we consider that the appointment of a new deputy director should help the present management to achieve the objectives of the ESI in the coming years. Yes, of course, as you have said in the very first place it implies improvement and in this way your idea was excellent. But let's us not forget the financial side of the project. The aim is to somehow make the ESI a financially self-sufficient organization. Welcome aboard! Congratulations again. We'll see you around.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear Flora,

On behalf of the Director's office of the ESI I would like to congratulate you on your election. I would like to say that the Director's office and all our staff would be very pleased to work with you and we understand that our cooperation will make it easier to resolve the big tasks that our Institute has and the ones that will be set for us to address in the future. Your unanimous election to this post means even more. It means that the EU delegation to Russia, the Presidency, the public of the EU countries will be able to assist you in the online mode in resolving the issues the ESI has to address. The same can be said about ministries, agencies and the public of Russia. Around our table you see representatives of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Economic Development, the Ministry

of Education and the scientific community represented here by the deputy director of the European Studies Institute of the Academy of Sciences. So once again we congratulate you on your election and wish you success in your work.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

Maybe one brief practical issue and maybe it's too early to tell us. But do you have any kind of idea when you could start this job?

Mrs. Flora Goudappel:

Because of the things I still need to arrange, which I have to deal with being on paid leave. I negotiated at home when I had the offer and some physical matters because I have an apartment at home and I don't want to pay a lot of money every year to the fiscal authorities. So it's very practical, and also some practical matters here, such as arranging an apartment, etc. I told professor Entin yesterday that probably September. So after the summer, September-October that would be the best way. In summer it is very difficult to arrange things both here and at home of course. So that's why right after the summer would be the best.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

The College of Europe is the partner of MGIMO and the ESI. We would, of course, like to congratulate you and we hope we will be able to cooperate with you in the same way as we do with the Director and the deputy directors of the ESI. And we are at your disposal for any issue you want to discuss with us in order to improve what we are doing together.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

On behalf of us all I would like to wish that you would solve all your practical issues as soon as possible and come to Moscow to be here with us. I am absolutely confident that you will be able to make a substantial contribution to the

development of our Institute. I want to wish you success once again. And in your capacity of the deputy director you may attend the meeting of the Governing Board.

We have already gone through two items of our agenda and I suggest that we start dealing with the third point. I would like to give the floor to prof. Entin for this.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues,

I hope that the question of selection and enrollments for the Masters' programs will be dealt with in the same short and dynamic manner as the two previous ones. We are following in full the procedure which has been worked out in the past 4 years. The President's Administration and the Chairman of the Governing Board has personally sent information letters to all the ministries and agencies, to the government bodies, authorities, governors and presidents of the constituent members of the RF about the beginning of the selection and enrollment process. So our office is working with personnel departments of ministries and agencies, regional bodies of the RF. Next Monday we are going to have a meeting with representatives of personnel departments. And their attitude is very much like last year - they want to clarify a few things, they want to send us lists of the candidates whom they will recommend to us. There are two new features this year – the President's Administration appealed to the Russian Parliament, as it is also a government body, and to higher judicial bodies informing them that they can also send their civil servants to our school. It means that we shall be comprising the whole system of government bodies. And the second thing - that thanks to the efforts of deputy director Mr. Marchan we are working more closely with the business community, with various business associations. The illustration of this activity is the meeting of the Association of European Business in the Russian Federation in the mid-May, the 16th of May, at which, according to preliminary estimates, about 40 - 60 companies will be represented, the major ones. Besides,

there will also be representatives from the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Moscow Chamber of Commerce and Industry and various business associations of the Russian Federation. We don't expect any serious results so far, but it's very important to set the process moving. It is very important to have some people sent to us by the business associations as the first step and then we can hope for an increase in their number in the future. As for foreign students I think it's a separate issue and I am not going to speak about it now. I hope that we'll be able to work very actively with the Delegation of the EU to Moscow and with the rotating presidency, the Hungarian ambassador. There is one issue which requires your decision. What I have said so far is simply information. But the question that requires your decision is as follows: at the previous meeting of the Governing Board we discussed the possibility for some regional universities, most influential ones, most important ones from the point of view of domestic politics and the Russian educational system, to send a limited number of their students. They can either be young teachers or people prepared to submit their PhD thesis. The idea is for them to come here, to take up a Masters' degree course, then they will bring the same standards to regional universities. We are speaking about a very limited group of people, about 10. We discussed it with the chairman of the GB. It should not exceed the number of 10 people. Let there be some competition between universities.

But your official endorsement is required for a decision that representatives of regional universities can have the same status here as civil servants, which would enable them to study at the ESI along with the civil servants. We discussed in detail at the previous session of GB why it was important and what should be done about it. So now I am asking you to take a formal decision.

Thank you. I am ready to answer all your questions.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys:

Well, first I would like to thank Mr. Entin for this report. I think it's a good thing that the basis is broadening in this way and I have no objections at all to the

proposal that he makes. I have one question though. Is it possible to obtain from the dispatching ministries, authorities, universities an obligation to liberate their students part-time for studies here? I think one of our remaining problems is that our students are still working full-time. They come here at night, they develop a certain fatigue. We can see it from statistics that the fatigue is evolving.

September, October and November have a better tendency than December. I mean there is a fatigue factor and I think it would be extremely important if we could have even a condition. I don't know whether it's possible to impose a conditionality. But if we could have a condition to the dispatching universities that we are prepared to receive their students, but we request they should liberate them from working obligations for a certain period, for part of their working time. Is this possible? I will be very interested in getting response on that.

Mr. Mark Entin:

This is what we usually agree on with the CEOs of the ministries and the personnel departments of the Russian government bodies. But this is an informal agreement. I think that it is impossible for those departments to do it on a formal basis. They simply cannot prescribe for their employees to work less or worse than the others. This actually contradicts the idea of their undergoing this additional training. As a result of this training they must work better. But I think we can insist that all the necessary conditions should be created by the departments and agencies for their employees' studies. We would also take measures to promote better attendance. But we shall discuss it a little bit later in accordance with our agenda.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

In connection with this topic and with the data which we find in the file about the attendance, it shows that the attendance rate is very low for law courses, economics courses and politics courses. And there is a list of factors attached which influence the attendance rates: vacation, family circumstances, unwellness, pre-holiday (I would add post-holiday), meetings, business trips and stuff like that.

So, lots of things that are not directly related to work matters. Question number 1: is there officially some kind of minimal attendance for students? Some percentage, something like that?

And the second question: when we want to attract regional students, which frankly speaking I welcome, how do we envisage that? Will regional students have to come to Moscow? Permanently or what? That may be even more difficult with their attendance, am I right? So how do we expect these students to study?

Thank you.

Mr. Mark Entin:

I shall start with your second question. The young members of the faculty from regional centers will be able to study in the Russian Federation if their regional universities partly pay for they stay in Moscow and also if MGIMO finds some possibilities to provide accommodation for at least half of them. That would mean five people. Why should there be a competition between them? I think that nothing should be taken for granted. If universities are really interested then they should promptly respond to our proposal and, of course, make their own respective contribution. And if these students do come to Moscow, they will be here all the time with the exception of vacation or some demands by their universities. As for attendance, the College of Europe conducted a special survey. Maybe the representative of the College of Europe will express their view on the matter. And also I would like to give the floor to Tamara Shashikhina. For a short presentation.

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina:

Dear colleagues,

At the request of the members of the GB which we received last week, four days before this meeting we prepared analyses of the students' attendance and the reasons for their poor attendance of our classes. This question has always been relevant for us since the inception of the ESI. Of course, like all other students, the ESI students attend classes very conscientiously in the first days and weeks and

you can look at the charts for the first semester of this academic year which we have here. Usually toward holidays the attendance drops and before the New Year it did not improve either. It is not only due to the fact that our students are grown-up people with family responsibilities, but also in any university with any regular students you will see similar trends. What have we done? What have we been doing to change the trend? We started working very actively with our partner, the College of Europe, and we imposed several sanctions including administrative measures and academic sanctions. Among many other things we are holding consultations with the College of Europe, and we also discuss issues not only with the College of Europe but also with the personnel departments of the ministries and agencies asking them to be a little more loyal to our students and give them more time for classes. So the question of course was asked quite legitimately.

One more element is work of our Scientific Council in this respect. It is now introducing some changes in the schedule of our academic work. Specifically these measures imply the following: administrative and academic sanctions actually mean that if students attend 100% of classes and not only attend them but also work very actively, they are given additional points when tests are held.

If students attend less than 30% of the classes of a certain course, of a specific lecturer these students have no right to take a written test. They have to take an oral examination in front of an examination commission. That was done for those lectures that were read by foreign lecturers. There is one specific feature here: the foreign lecturer usually does not examine students orally, that is why they usually have multiple choice tests or a multiple choice test plus an open question which is usually more difficult because the students write answers in Russian. We asked our twin lecturers, the ones who teach the same subject in Russian and we agreed that if the attendance record of our student is very poor, then this student will have to take an oral examination and the examiner will be a Russian professor. This is usually believed to be more difficult.

We are taking other administrative measures provided by our Statute. If a student has missed 60 academic hours of classes without any good reasons, he or

she is to be expelled. And we have had such cases this year. But it was not because they missed classes without a good reason. We have letters from ministries explaining that students are very busy in their offices, sometimes they have to go on business trips, students had sick leaves. Most of the expulsions were because students were simply too busy at work and they simply were unable to pass all the examinations or they were not prepared. So they did not cope with them. We are also introducing electronic tests now when in the online mode students have to answer certain question and there is a certain limit to the time when they can answer those questions. The students sit in front of a computer, they cannot consult anyone, they cannot ask anyone questions and it really helps test their knowledge. We have introduced that and I hope that all the measures I have listed will help us improve the students' attendance.

We have listed the factors which make it difficult for students to attend classes. First of all, of course, it's their work, business trips, official events they have to attend, high-ranking visitors, also the pre-holiday factor when attendance falls down and, of course, personal and family circumstances and illness. We have such a pyramid in the diagram which analyses the factors influencing the attendance of students. So actually it starts with work and then all the other factors play a lesser role, so business trips, work problems, official meetings and so on. If something is located in this diagram above work, it means that these are less important factors. Some of the students are ready not to spend so much time with their families, but they are unable not to attend business meetings. There are also other reasons and I want to stress that in the first term some students did not attend classes for some reason and were not able to pass the test. We introduced a rather difficult oral examination on the basic integration processes in the European Union, on European law, European Institutions. About 50% failed the first attempt. To be more exact, 56% were unable to pass the examination when they took the first attempt. It probably means that these people lost the habit of being students; they have forgotten that they have to learn a lot of things. And they had to take a second attempt.

Mr. Eiki Berg:

Thank you very much for this very detailed overview about the low attendance. I have to say that I am very impressed, because you were able to finalize this kind of analysis in a very short time because the request came only a week or ten days ago. But I have some comments as well. In many European countries, in my university low attendance has been regulated in the way that attendance gives part to a final grade. Let's put it in this way: those students who attend regularly all the courses get automatically about 20% of the final grade. This is one way to do. The other way to do is that if there is not sufficient level of attendance, these students simply cannot come to the exam. So you can use either this or that way, but I really doubt that an oral examination can be a kind of punishment for those who don't want to attend classes. And also I think that it's probably the time to switch over to the written examination because as we all know it's a more natural way to examine the real knowledge.

These are my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys:

Thank you very much.

First of all, congratulations on this very interesting analysis which I think is useful, also on this very modern device that you have started to use, very high-tech, educational. But I am struck at the same time by the information we get from professor Entin about a rule, obviously in the Russian public administration, that the agencies, ministries cannot release their employees. That to me sounds entirely antiquated. I mean once upon a time you could have studied one part of your life and then work 100% another part of your life. That is entirely out of date because nowadays the transformation of the economy compels employers, companies, agencies to continue with education of their manpower, of their staff. You must engage in continuing education all through your lifetime. I mean life-long learning is the buzz word in many cases. And any enterprise and agency that does not want

to go out of business must pay attention to this. So if there is a rule in the Russian public administration that you must require 100% work and have no time to continue education, then I think it's high time for change, frankly. So I would encourage you to insist on this in your talks with the dispatching agencies because it's absolutely in their own interest that the qualification of their staff improves. And that is what the Institute can offer. But it can offer that only if there is a commitment, a contribution by the agencies themselves and that contribution should be time. Money we have, but only they can offer time.

Thank you.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Tamara, I would like also to thank you for the presentation of these very detailed documents, it is very interesting for us. Just to start at the beginning – if the student is not able to come, does he or she have to take an initiative and apologize or give an explanation? Or is it simply that you after a while establish – you're 50-60%. I suppose that each student who was not able to come for an individual lecture has to apologize in writing. That's the first one. And my other question. I think also it would be wise to reflect about credit points, but also about possibilities to exclude students after having missed a number of lectures. And my third issue - is there any connection with language skills? I cannot see it from the schemes anyway, but I would like to have your assessment about it.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

I would like to say something concerning the comments that were just made about the possibilities for civil servants to be freed from part of their tasks by the respective ministries. That should certainly help, I would say, to improve the program, I am sure, and will solve the attendance problem. Once again my congratulations for providing this kind of information, and now a question. Am I correct if I see certain correlation between the rate of attendance and the fact that the course is taught in Russian or in another language? I have the impression

looking at the diagram, that the courses taught in Russian are much better attended than the others. Am I correct?

Mr. Alexander Grushko:

Thank you very much. I would also like to express my gratitude for the appraisal of the problem. I think the Institute is doing enough working with the students, but as a representative of the contracting side, we have such a term, a contracting organization, I think Mr. Tarschys is right. Maybe it's not the task of the ESI, but our common job, common objective how to explain this problem to the administration of the relevant ministries and agencies. After all, the trainees of this Institute do not come from the streets, so to say, they have been sent here by ministries and agencies, and the ministries and agencies are also responsible for the amount of knowledge received by their employees after they have undertaken the course of studies here. I think we could promote the solution by sending relevant letters to ministries and agencies containing the analysis of the result of education of the employees. And these letters could also draw the attention of the administration of the ministries to this problem as well as the request in the future to the ministries and the agencies to take this problem into account. Of course, we understand that the staff in the ministries are overworked but still we should request for our trainees to receive favorable conditions for studies. Because after all this is in the strategic interests of the ministries and agencies that are dispatching the employees for their studies here. I think if we approach this job in a consistent and regular manner, we can also achieve not only our internal supervision of the attendance, but also supervision on the part of the ministries and of the agencies and this will also contribute to improving the attendance because the ministries will be also interested in improving the attendance of the employees.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much. This is a very important point, the communication between the ESI and the ministries and agencies (1:29:20). Do they get any

information about the educational record of their employees from the employees themselves and from the ESI Administration?

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina:

Thank you, professor de Zwaan. Dear colleagues, Mr. Hafner, Mr. Berg. I want to go back to the explanation notes from the students. Naturally when they miss classes, apart from their explanation they also write an explanatory note. This is a disciplinary measure which we elaborated. Besides students who regularly miss classes see a very unpleasant for them Order of the Director of the Institute with a reproach to them displayed for everyone to read. This is a moral measure. For people who are grown-up, these are grown-up trainees, they are usually negatively influenced by this. Because these are usually people of some influence at their ministries and all of a sudden they see themselves in the list of bad students, who are reproached for missing classes.

Besides we have individual talks with them, we also offer them questionnaires to explain their attendance and all this is connected with attendance and the impression of the lectures given by Russian and foreign professors. I must tell you that there is no connection between the language of the lecture, whether it's in Russian or other languages. As to other students of MGIMO usually the attendance is very high when we have foreign lecturers. For our students the situation is different. When you look at the first term, look at your hand-out material page 1, you see here that during the first term we have very good attendance. So the first three lectures of the first term, the attendance is the highest, because it is the beginning of the term, when the course has only started. When the students start attending, they are very active and they are fresh, they are full of strength – it's early autumn, nice weather, people are still fresh after their vacation. And they are also testing our approach, whether discipline is really important for us and we are testing them. It's also connected with the fact that students know from the very beginning, that, for example, European integration basics, European Institutions courses end up with an oral examination. It's a very difficult subject

and when we decide to analyze the attendance, we'd better analyze various courses in the second term. If you turn the page and look at pages 2, 3, 4 – we analyze the attendance in the second term when our students break down into 3 categories: law, economics and politics. Law students are most disciplined and this is the most numerous group. Therefore the attendance is not surprising. With politics and economics the attendance is pretty similar. As to the attendance by law students we can see here a very clear-cut trend, and we see a very high attendance by the group of students from various ministries. They attend the lectures they are interested in. It's quite normal that people don't attend the course on European Union Council because very few of them are interested professionally in this field. Last year the picture was different and this course was very actively attended. But this year we have many students who are interested in customs, in taxes, in trade law, so they are more interested in these courses. While last year we had a different intake when students preferred the securities market, the budget, the banking law, so it's all connected with the interests of trainees.

And the same is true with the economics groups. We must also remember that our lecturers who come from the EU are people who teach narrow subjects and in Russia we don't have many specialists in this field. And as to the matters of more general interest, we have lecturers of our own in this field. Therefore for us it is interesting to take a comparative approach to these lectures. We are interested in specialists in negotiations, in lobbying, also in people who can organize mock games. Of course, for European lecturers it's much easier to prepare them, they can do it much better. As to the attendance by economics students, now we have the following situation. It's April and most of international lecturers will come at the end of April, May and June. So we have put Russian lecturers at the beginning of the term. Therefore the attendance and the breakdown of lectures are different. As to the students of politics I would say the results are the same for foreign lecturers and Russian lecturers. We shall analyze the reasons for poor attendance. Of course, we have the effect of Tuesday. On Monday and Wednesday we have best attendance because the first class is that of a foreign language that's why people

come for the foreign language and stay for the lecture. The lecture starts at 7 o'clock and they have enough time to be in time for their classes. On Tuesday we have the so-called Tuesday effect, because they have to come at 5.30 and quite often they are late. They don't have a foreign language class and sometimes they miss classes because they don't have a foreign language class. The Academic Council will consider our timetable and see whether we can move or change the sequence of our lectures to make the attendance more logical. I hope I answered Mr. Demare's question. - as I said, there is no connection with the fact whether the lectures are given in Russian or in foreign languages. As to foreign language classes here the attendance is quite high. We have not analyzed it because, practically speaking, they all attend the foreign language classes and if for some reason we cancel the foreign language class, then the teachers have to make up for it. Here the students are very zealous to have their classes and not to miss a single class for whatever reasons. Here we have small groups and we didn't carry out the analysis because the attendance is very good and we supervise it very closely because there is a requirement that a foreign language is an obligatory, compulsory component according to the Federal Standard for the Politics group. The so-called Federal Component for us comprises the following courses: compulsory, selective and optional ones. So these are the three elements. We are going to supply you with this analysis, but at the end of the term. It's difficult to do it in the middle of the term, difficult to offer an objective picture related to attendance.

Mr. Oleg Barabanov:

As a follow up to what Tamara has said, I want to add about the Tuesday effect. The Tuesday effect comprises one more problem. We must understand that people stay in their offices from 9 till 5, and then they come here for 3 classes. Of course, we supervise their discipline, we collect the explanatory notes, we reproach them, but the attendance very much depends on the lecturers. If the lectures are dry and not interesting, then on Monday they fall asleep and don't attend this lecture on Tuesday, they are grown up people, it's their choice. We,

heads of departments, work with most of the Russian lecturers and we have selected such professors whose lectures are not only informative but interesting as well. So the lectures should have this performance, show effect as well. I understand that Marius, the College of Europe representative, is trying to carry out this work with foreign professors. I understand that Mrs. Goudappel will have this as her responsibility as well. But foreign professors frequently change. While most Russian professors have experience of 4 years, they know how difficult it is to deliver these lectures in the evening and try to turn them into a kind of drama, many foreign professors give a dry Power Point presentation lecture on Monday and have no attendance on Tuesday. So this is the job of the lecturers as well to make the lectures interesting. Though the problem of attendance is still the problem of the ESI Administration as well.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much for the explanations. There are 2 small questions. 1) I assume that in the Russian universities, as far as I know, the students are then provided with transcripts of the exams and the lectures that they attended. Is that also applied in the ESI? 2) I wanted to know about the communication between the employer and the ESI and students. Does the employer get information from the ESI about the results of the studies of the students here?

Thank you.

Mr. Mark Entin:

I would like our answer to be very concrete. We have a very good example of the work of the Economics Department. So I would like to ask professor Adamchuk to tell you about the publication of the program and its elements.

Mrs. Natalia Adamchuk:

A year ago professors of our Department prepared a book on the competence approaches in teaching our economic subjects. We studied Russian and foreign

experience and the requirements of the Ministries of Education and published a really good book which was distributed among our students for them not to use any notes but to have a program in their hands as well as training tests in each discipline before they even start listening to the lectures.

We have recently distributed a questionnaire and the trainees are quite satisfied with this book, but we haven't completed our work as standards of the third generation for the Master's Program have been elaborated. Tamara Shashikhina has explained here that after we have revised the programs in accordance with the new standards, we shall prepare a new version of the book. Though we believe this is our basic manual and it takes into account the perspective of our classes. We will continue working at this program and I want to emphasize once again that our students are grateful for receiving such a book. We are grateful to our colleagues who financed the publication of this book.

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina:

We have contacts with the ministries and agencies, first of all we have our graduates, our alumni who go back to the ministries and we have contacts with them or personnel departments. It depends on the personnel department whether they take a consistent approach to sending people here. The Federal Monopoly Service is very active in maintaining contacts with us. We concluded an agreement with them and their personnel departments is very active. When the personnel department is not very interested, we have no means of pressing them, so we work through our graduates, because in the past years we have formed a community of out graduates who help us to find our students.

We take into account the requests of ministries and agencies and our former graduates return here, take part in our further conferences, conferences of MGIMO, not only the ESI. They are prepared to share their experience, they take part in conferences and they explain what ministries need and what they missed in our educational programs. Taking this into account we constantly upgrade our educational programs, we offer selective courses where students can choose the

course they are interested in. For us this is the request of the ministries and this is what students will use in their work later on.

Mr. Dimitriou Triantafyllou:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. This has been a very interesting discussion, but I'd like a little bit to dampen it, because this is all about procedure. There are 2 things I would like to talk about now. One of them is what we were talking about now. You have told that you responded to the request of the Board that was made four days ago. This Board has been functioning for 5 years now, so it is not as if we have discovered something new. This is the problem the management should have told us about. There is a tendency and somehow we need to address it. So it should not come as something unexpected. Yes, we haven't discussed it and we have five full years of the ESI and the statistics should have been out there. This is an issue we should have dealt with at some stage. So I think the management should put it into the agenda, this issue should be followed up so that we can have a discussion and find solutions to it.

The second thing has to deal with the selection, the director's opening remarks. Because for two years I have been in the Selection Committee together with my colleagues from the MGIMO, the ESI and the College of Europe. For the last two years I took the initiative each time to write a brief report about the process. This time I didn't take the initiative on purpose, because I think this is not my responsibility, but the management's responsibility to take the initiative and inform the other members so that we have a report to see whether the procedure is going on and how the process is going on because the Director raised the issue at the beginning about the foreign students. Why are we having this now when the selection process is coming to an end? Well, we could have done this when we evaluated the results of the previous a year, when we finished the selection process. We sat down and selected the students and we had the numbers. Again I am just raising issues that have to do and, maybe, are also linked to the next agenda item, but I think we need to find processes that these things should be done more

systematically, because ultimately it comes down to a request at the last minute. We have a discussion on a limited amount of time, some good things have been said, but I do not think it is enough to resolve the problems which are systemic in a way whether it's selection, whether it's attendance or anything else. This is all I wanted to say. I am just changing the subject.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues, I just want to stress one thing. Regardless of the fact whether the GB pays attention to some problem, whether it sends requests or not the ESI regularly attends to all these problems and we deal with all these problems and solve them on an every- day basis.

Thank you.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I think that is something what we expect and what we accept. The core of the matter is that we have a Governing Board, not a pocket board. So when there is a problem which is serious, I think all the members of the Governing Board, the Russians and Europeans expect to be alerted on time so that we can address it in a proper way. That is the thing and the core of the message that we'll have to raise when we come to the next item on the agenda. Thank you.

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina:

Dear colleagues,

Thank you for your proposals. When I started answering your questions related to the attendance, I said that the request came four days before the session. I meant that we analyzed the attendance of the second term because this is something we usually do at the end of the term. As to appraising the work of the ESI and the attendance, this work is done regularly by all lecturers. All lecturers have an attendance sheet where students sign their names and the professor signs his name as well. And after each course we analyze the results and the reasons for

absence. And the same is true of the questionnaires, which are done every term. But because the GB session is held in April, in the middle of the second term, we had to do it in a rather urgent manner, i.e. to do it for the second term which we usually do later on.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

Allow me to say a few words. I think that the problem of attendance is an eternal problem for every university because in this or that way it is raised at every session of the Academic Council, Deans' offices and so on. And the attendance depends on many things, on the methods used by teachers and professors. I agree that for grown-up trainees we should use Socrates' method of teaching, that is an interactive dialogue with the students. And students must be prepared for such a dialogue, because if they are not ready, there will be no dialogue. Of course, it all depends on the qualities of the lecturer, on his abilities to attract the attention of the students. We know that even with regular lectures sometimes the hall is full of students and students come from other courses and other department. And there is another lecture with very few students although they know that the lecturer is a very good one. It depends on the intake of students as well, because students also differ and those who work in the universities know very well that some intakes, some courses are absolutely excellent and have very good students, many of them. While another intake will be very medium and the graduates don't achieve much success in their later life. I think the exchange that we have had here on the problem of attendance is very useful and the Administration of the ESI should draw lessons and should introduce new methods into their work and Deputy-Minister Mr. Grushko is quite right. There should be stronger contacts with agencies and ministries. Our President and our Prime-Minister constantly raise the issue of lifelong learning. This is the requirement of the state. Therefore ministries and agencies should keep this in mind and our contacts with them should be closer - both with personnel departments and the ministries at large.

And of course our previous experience should also be used here. We have had similar experience with our part-time students who had classes in the evening. Therefore we had to move their classes from evening to Saturday morning and people who had jobs attended classes on Saturday better and their abilities to absorb different subjects and foreign languages were better. Of course, it is not very convenient for lecturers but our lecturers don't have 6-days working weeks therefore they can arrange they work on Saturdays.

We must also understand our students. As a rule they are people who have families. They are young people, usually well-educated people, very capable people that's why their ministries and agencies want to use their potential to the full. So we must take into account all the circumstances. But, in principle, the way I see the situation, and I am monitoring the situation both at the ESI and the University as a whole, I see that the Director's Office of the ESI is giving it a lot of attention to it. They know all the students individually and particularly those who play truant. Many have been expelled for non-attendance and this is an important administrative measure. Today's exchange of views has shown to me once again that, as we used to say in the past there is 'much room for improvement' and we should use these opportunities to improve the situation.

As I understand it, on this issue we had an exchange of views, but there is an issue where we have to take a decision. That's is proposal of Prof Entin, that we either accept or reject, to include into the intake quota teachers or post graduates from regional universities whose education will be partially funded by the European Commission and the Russian Government. Their number should not exceed 10 people. I personally believe it is a useful endeavour. It will have a spillover effect of transferring knowledge to regional universities. Though I must say that we discussed our program of cooperation with regional universities at our previous meeting. This program goes on, our professors go to regional universities and give lectures there and hold seminars.

But I think that basic to our work should be the work with the young faculty members of regional universities and we should use to the full the potential that we

have. And this instrument, the ESI is a very good instrument. It is well-funded and we can provide some of those regional students with accommodation at our dormitories which will make it much easier for regional universities to send them because, of course, regional universities do not have the financial possibilities of renting flats for their faculty members here.

But, I think, that probably we should think of a special program for them because if they attend classes together with the master's degree students sent to the ESI by ministries and agencies it won't help them to become better teachers. They, of course, must receive more profound and specialized knowledge. Because it is one thing for a person working in a ministry, he should know things that will be important for his practical work, but professors', teachers' knowledge should always be much more profound, so they will have to get a special curriculum, special instructors, special seminars, special requirements. Moreover, I think these people should become very visible and they should be monitored by the GB, probably we could invite them to make some presentations at the meeting of the GB, so that the GB would see with our own eyes that the results of the work of the ESI will be a good contribution to the work of regional institutions.

So now I can put this proposal to the vote or shall we discuss for some more time, if necessary, this question of whether we should add faculty members from regional universities or people who have recently graduated and are working at their thesis at regional universities. I personally think it could be useful for young lecturers, recent graduates of universities who intend to stay and teach at these universities. Are there any ideas on this subject? Shall we put this question to the vote?

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I think it sounded clear and I am ready to support it. But I would only like to know about regional universities. What kind of universities do you have in mind and how do you select them?

Mr. Oleg Barabanov:

Well, there are two ways of doing that and we are using both these methods, so to speak. The first one is as follows: in each regional center the rector of the state university is, as a rule, a person who has a lot of clout in the region, a person who knows the administration, the governor, the vice-governor and in this case the letters that we send to the governor in the name of Mr. Prikhodko are usually forwarded to the rectors of these universities. So, maybe, we shall follow this practice and monitor this process more attentively and send special letters to the rectors.

The second thing: MGIMO has a network of regional partners in Russia and we regularly report on them at the GB meetings. We have informed you about the partners with whom we have signed agreements of cooperation. And there is also another organizational factor. A number of regions, first and foremost the financially affluent regions, have their own delegations in Moscow. They have something which is close to a hotel for the people who come here. Students from these regions, they are usually oil-rich regions or the Northern Caucasus republics: Chechnya, Ingushetia, North Ossetia, sometimes will not need places in our dormitories, which makes things easier. But, of course, the selection process will not be automatic. The Selection Committee will have to deal with all these candidates along with others and professor Triantafillou is a member of the Selection Committee as well as representatives of the College of Europe. We shall not automatically admit them simply because they come from regions.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

I think the proposal that rector Torkunov has just made is excellent but if we vote in favor of this proposal it should involve the fact that we need to design a special program for them as you have just mentioned. Otherwise they will be idle part of the day and as you justly mentioned they need to receive training at a higher level than the civil servants so that should be covered with the design of a new special program. And probably the new deputy director could play a role in that

together with the College to the extent that you would like. Because I think that it's an excellent idea and perhaps if the funding were available, they could stay in some European countries, European universities where they can perhaps also learn a bit more, but I think it's an excellent initiative.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

When I spoke about some program for them what I meant was they should have some additional program. Of course, they should be taking the basic course so as not to pile up expenses. But they should have an additional program, additional subjects, something that can be done, probably, not through lectures, but through some consultations, individual tutoring, discussion and testing on the literature they have read individually. So it should be an addition to the program, rather than instead of it.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela:

Very briefly, I just wanted to say a couple of words. I want to say that this aspect of regional dimension has always been a very important aspect for us, so we can only support this. On the other hand, I think that in order to take a decision on the actual implementation, I think it would be interesting to have a report with some elements concerning the program. I feel that, as you said, this cannot be the master's program, it has to have a plus, but also on the modalities implemented, perhaps ways. You know I am thinking about some kind of an Open University system or some Executive Masters that do not imply physical presence all along the program, only during certain periods, critical moments of the program. I mentioned this, but I am not a specialist on this issue, I am not talking about it from that perspective. I am not touching upon it from the perspective whether it is necessary, but whether we can afford it. I think we can afford it for a certain time, a certain dimension of a program. But I think it is very important that when we engage in it, we must know what it means in terms of financial costs and must be sure that we can carry it out at the level that we should aim at. At the end of the

day I think after this whole discussion that we have had about attendance, about all this I think there are two aspects that are very important from my perspective. One is to ensure that the real level of knowledge, when students leave the masters' program or whichever program, is really very high-level knowledge. And the second one, of course, is that through that we would maintain a certain guaranteed level of this grade. So when people know that somebody has been following and got the grade of these courses, this master, they know that this person is well-educated, and this is an important thing for the University. This is also true for the regional universities proposal which is a very good idea but we need to take precautions. Thank you.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Anyway it would be my proposal to take this issue up again in the next meeting because we have discussed the regional strategy several times, but we haven't found concrete modalities how to be most successful. Because I can also imagine that we can also help universities in regions by sending lecturers from Western Europe to give concentrated courses for one week or two weeks or on the full-time basis. So it should not be completely necessary to bring all these people to Moscow. I am very open to that because I think the ideas that you have proposed are very positive. There are perhaps other modalities in order to get the same effect. And that is by profiting from broadening the networks of expertise on European law and economics. We can send people from Western Europe for two-week courses and so on. And that might have the same effect. Not only lecturing by lecturers themselves, but also by students which I have done once in the new member states at the candidate stage. It is very useful to have in class not only students, but also junior lecturers who can take over the responsibility and we could practice this kind of working method in Russia.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I would agree with that with pleasure but there is one question: are we talking about a systemic education or education by listening to a course of lectures? These are different things. Because even a brilliant course of lectures read by a brilliant professor for two weeks will not provide profound knowledge as systemic education, like a Master's program, even when attendance leaves much to be desired. So I think the two approaches should be used side by side. As to taking a decision, let us give this proposal more consideration.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I think the suggestion from the ambassadors is, probably, a sound one that we have some trend here for generally supporting the regional dimension, that for the next session we would expect a concrete brief report on how to execute it, right? And that could involve financial issues that can involve different strategies of reaching out. And that can also involve something that I find quite important, that will broaden a little bit the way of marketing the program, like, for example, when we do not only address the administrations of the regions, but also the potential students in the regions to start with. The students could potentially apply with the motivation letter and their CV and the supportive letter from the respective *vedomstvo*. If the students apply, that may raise the degree of motivation. So if you try to put this financial elements into the strategy, kind of part of strategy, give some fresh breath and prepare information for the next session and then we can take a decision.

Mr. Alexander Grushko:

Thank you very much. I believe that we are approaching this issue with too much caution and bureaucracy. There is not much doubt about the need for the ESI to require a regional dimension and we have discussed on several occasions the need to involve young-faculty members from regional universities and provide them with a systemic course at the ESI. This is one of the important dimensions in the work of the ESI. And unless this involves some important budgetary

implications, and, as far as I know, all expenses have been included in the budget, why don't we start working in this direction and then on the basis of the experience that we have obtained by this time, we could slightly adjust the program or take some other decisions. But I don't think that at this stage we should be too cautious and first work out some theoretical paradigms and only then take decisions. I think life itself should prompt us in what way we should organize this work in the most effective way. Without practically launching these programs it would be very difficult to do this. So I think we could take a decision in principle today by allowing the ESI to enroll up to 10 people. We are not speaking about a great number of people who will be enrolled. We are speaking about a very limited number. And on the basis of this experience that we shall accumulate, then we can take a decision to further develop this program or otherwise.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

If we follow the recommendation of a famous European who once said: "Let's start a battle and see what happens next", we can do likewise. So what are the opinions? Let's hear them to try to get some consensus. The doubts are understandable. I totally agree with Mr. Grushko that every move should have some practical beginning. Probably we should not have the target of 10 people. Maybe we should only recruit five, if we find them. Because we have all these theoretical discussions but, maybe, we won't be able to find such people. It's very important for these people to be knowledgeable motivated and so on and, of course, there should be a pre-condition that they should go back to their regions. Because very often people who receive good education here in Moscow don't want to go back to the region, they want to stay in Moscow. And if we take such a decision it would probably mean that those people delegated from Kazan, Yaroslavl or some other city should sign an agreement with their university that they would come back.

I don't think it would involve very important budgetary implications for us or any budgetary difficulties if we delegate to the ESI the right to select five

candidates, introduce them to us at the next meeting of the Governing Board and present a plan on how we shall work with this category of people.

Yes, you are welcome.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela:

Yes, I have no objections to start working on it at this scale so that we can also assess the impact of costs and so on to a certain level. But I think it's also a very important a concept on which this program will be based. To be absolutely frank, I think, of course, this is the matter which has the character of a preventive decision which the Governing Board has to be involved indirectly. Our program, I think, is that our meetings, as it was mentioned before, for natural reasons we could not do otherwise but meet a couple of times a year. Six months broadly is a too long distance to keep an eye on the progress and implementation of a strategic decision. So I am sorry to now refer to another point of our agenda but I would be much more comfortable with this experimental approach to an Executive Committee of the Governing Board. That would together with the management of the ESI somehow bring the elements together and take the steps that are necessary for the implementation, which corresponds more or less to the concerns of the Governing Board. Then, of course, it will report to the Board itself. I think that would help to satisfy some concerns. Otherwise I think this idea of launching, as a kind of experiment, the program is not a bad one, of course, but I would like to have some elements that will ensure that this distance between what is going to be done and the Board is not so big.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

The question concerning the presence of these people from other universities in the ESI. Is there already any idea what should be the program, concept and how long should the presence be of people from other universities here? A year, half a year or what is the idea?

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

The idea is that these people should take the master's degree program but they should have also additional courses because they will not have any jobs like the others. They will only have classes.

Mr. Oleg Barabanov:

We already have had some experience with our foreign students, with an Italian and a Swedish student who studied at the ESI. They take the basic master's degree program; receive a diploma of a Master of International Relations. But since they are free in the daytime, we organized special programs for them according to their requests. For example, the Italian student was interested in international relations on the post-Soviet space and we made arrangements with different lecturers at MGIMO who read courses at the International Relations Department, the Department of Political Science and special programs were offered to this student. He attended a course of lectures, he also had individual tutoring and he took examinations. The same goes for our Swedish student. She is interested more in political science and a tailor-made course has been made for her.

The same approach could apply to regional students. In the evening they attend all the lectures, receive knowledge on the EU and language classes and in the daytime, if for example they come to me, the Department of the EU Politics, I actually enroll them for day-time courses on the Theory of International Relations, on the new technologies and techniques of international relations. Somebody may be interested in some regional issues, for example, Romania and its external activities. They will get these additional programs on the basis of what is already being taught at MGIMO. It just takes an hour-long discussion.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

I think we have here two or three proposals and some of them can be implemented: the minister's proposal on that pilot project, we have Klaus's

proposal for a report by September to see and even Ambassador Valenzuela's proposal, which is something that cannot be implemented. I think if we vote on this, we can start doing everything: work on it practically and try to come up with the report on its structure and the process for it.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I like this approach. Colleagues, I'd like to remind you and the esteemed Ambassador, too, that forty two Master's degree courses are provided at the Institute in the daytime and in the afternoon where many professors, including foreign professors, among them professors from the EU, deliver lectures. We have eleven joint master's degree courses with foreign universities: Fry University, Science PO, Shuman University, universities in Germany, France and Britain. So without any additional spending I, as the rector of this university, will simply allow these young faculty members from regional universities to attend these master's degree courses in the daytime on the basis of the program which will be specially tailored for them. We will do that to make sure that they will represent our school with honor when they return as lecturers to their universities.

But I also agree with professor Langesman that this, of course, should be monitored very closely, discussed and analyzed. So, probably, on the basis of the discussion which we have had we could take a compromise decision. On the one hand, support this idea, agree to it but make it contingent on what his Excellency has said. That is that we should enhance the monitoring of that work of the ESI and this program. First of all, I would like to stress that according to the decision that has been taken and the Contract signed with the European Commission, this monitoring is enhanced by the appointment of a new deputy director who directly represents the European Union and the European Commission. But if you have other ideas, you are welcome. On the issue of regional faculty members and young scholars do we agree that it does not involve additional spending and everything that is done on their additional training will be done within the framework of the university; do we agree to this?

Yes, you are welcome.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

If I understand correctly, the purpose of attracting young academics from regional universities to MGIMO where they would spend something like a year is to train them in the European affairs so that when they go back to their university they can play a more important role in the teaching of European affairs. So we should, of course, keep that a reference part because that means if other subjects are taught in addition to the masters' program as it exists, everything should be focused on European affairs and there cannot be things that have no relation to European affairs. So that, I think, is the key factor. And we should, of course, aim at providing the program with interest so that the purpose should be fulfilled.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

It should be a specially tailored program on the basis of the European affairs courses that are provided by the International Relations Master's Program, World Economics and others. There are a variety of such courses including taxation, EU taxation and things like this. So for the full time department it is planned for two years. For them it will be shorter.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

Your proposal seems to me acceptable, I mean without any doubts. However, I would like us not to forget the other proposal, that is that the Governing Board should receive a report at the next meeting. I would say this report, to a certain extent, should take the form of a proposal on the basis of the experience that will be developed in carrying out this one. Then the next Governing Board could have a report which would be a proposal on how to go on with the program.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

I want to point that it would be an excellent example why the proposal made is an appropriate one. So we are opening new challenges, new directions and in order to have the management in appropriate manner I think this discussion, that took us an hour, is an excellent example of the need to establish a sort of intermediate body that might help the ESI administration and in a certain way adjust the responsibility of the Governing Board and might be very helpful. So, from my point of view, the items proposed are a bit linked.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

These issues are connected and after we discussed the first issue we reached the consensus. I mean working with the regions, special targeted activity, without any special expenses for the European Studies Institute with the main objective of training, in the modest way, new specialists in European studies. These specialists in European studies will later on work in the regional universities dealing with the EU problems. Now as to the next item I understand professor de Zwaan is going to make a presentation.

Mr. Dimitriou Triantafillou:

So before we close this subject, I just want to make one clarification. I said something before and there was no reaction from the management, but I want to address the issue of students' selection. I am frustrated that there was no report because personally I think that the last year selection process was the best up-to-date and I want to have it on record also. The process, the way it has developed over time was the best up-to-date: the interview process and everything. My point was that because we don't have a report, it cannot even be discussed, and that's all I mean. I mean the process for me, and maybe other members of the Selection Committee will agree too, has been improving. And it was the best so far. That is what I wanted to clear.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues, do we approve the decision to allow the Administration of the European Studies Institute to select a small group of lecturers from regional universities for studies here?

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

So, are you in favor of this proposal? I understand it's a unanimous decision.

Mr. Mark Entin:

As to the voting, I want to give a brief comment. Dear colleagues, discussing the earlier items on the agenda we touched upon a very important issue and this is the issue, and you have emphasized that in your presentations, that is important for all European universities. This is a serious problem we are going to work with and what I mean is students' attendance. Mr. Triantafillou made a proposal here and we know we are going to talk to our applicants and we are going to make this a very tough requirement. So, this is their attendance and their contacts in this field with their bosses at the ministries and universities. In a week we are going to have a meeting with personnel departments from the ministries and agencies, services of the Russian Federation. We are also going to have a meeting with representatives of the constituent members of the Russian Federation who have their offices in Moscow. We are going to take into account what you have suggested today and we are going to shift our emphasis in our discussion. We used to explain to them what we expect from them. That was creating conditions for our trainees. This time we are going to organize our work in a different way. We are going to prompt them to formulate their own activity in this field. What they can do to encourage students' attendance. We have shown to you what we do in our work to supervise their attendance. There have been some very interesting proposals expressed which we will try to implement. There may be different proposals like the system used by American universities, other universities. Some of the experience can be borrowed here, some cannot, but we have not come to an end of our activity. Our discussion is not the end of our activity.

I invite you all whether you are in Moscow or not to continue our discussion. You can always phone me. Let us have online communication, regular communication. We can start with individual exchanges and we have many opportunities to use modern technology for these contacts and to have an ongoing exchange on this subject. As to the decision which you have adopted, it is the natural part of the work of our university because our students have individual plans of their work and if we enroll representatives of regional universities they will also have an individual plan of studies which will be more profound and better elaborated. These regional lecturers will have their scientific tutor or adviser who will keep track of their work. I think huge assistance can be given to them thanks to the new deputy director who will represent the European Union and the deputy director will make her contribution to this work. During the next session we should listen to her proposals as to how we should better develop the work of the European Studies Institute in the future, what else should be done to make our work more efficient. You have also noted that Flora Goudappel declared improving the excellence of our work as her first priority.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

Item number 4: Exchange of views on the proposal to set up an Executive Board. Who would like to speak on the subject?

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Well, I hope I can make this introduction relatively short - I mean in the light of all experience and the new issues that we have had now on the table already for quite some time within the group of the EU members. We had this discussion about how to revitalize the mechanism which is called the Bureau in the Statute in order to make it even more operational and effective. I think we have a Bureau established in the Statute, however its composition is very high level and practice showed that it was very difficult to collect these people. I think that we have to acknowledge it hasn't really succeeded in playing the role which we

awarded to it. Now when we have to acknowledge that the Governing Board is responsible for the whole management of the projects, we have also to realize that when we meet twice a year it is very difficult to survey all these responsibilities. So it's either of the two. Either we increase substantially the number of the meetings of the Governing Board or we try to find more practical means. After discussion within the group of the EU members it has appeared that there is a strong support to revitalize this issue of the Bureau. However, to give it another format and to commit more clearly members of the Governing Board themselves, which is first addressed to the EU members. So we will make a commitment that at least two of our people will meet when this Executive Committee meets. We think that it requires also from the Russian side that there should be an active participation which probably cannot be assured by the Chairman of our meeting in view of his numerous responsibilities, etc. So we have to find more suitable forms. We would also like to underline that the intention of this revitalization of the Bureau idea is not to interfere with the responsibilities of the Governing Board, nor to interfere in the prerogatives of the Director but simply to make this process a bit more smooth. So the emphasis will be on implementation.

As to our discussion how to attract also participants in our projects from the regional universities: it's something on what certain further reflection is needed, its implementation and preparation for the next meeting. The idea is to have at least, perhaps, an extra meeting in between the Governing Board sessions or perhaps more. But let's start on the safe side. It is April now. Perhaps we have to convene another formal Governing Board meeting in September so you can envisage that in June. It might be feasible to discuss with Mark Entin, with the new vice-director "how are you now progressing with the idea of inviting these five candidates from regional universities?" So in order to make this process a bit more smooth. It might help, I think, in the end the whole Governing Board.

This issue has a final dimension which I would like to highlight. I was going through the text of the Statute which we drafted in 2006 during, perhaps, one meeting. Now it needs a bit of a new appraisal. There are certain issues which are,

perhaps, not very well drafted and there is one issue which came to our minds when we were discussing the composition of this executive body and how not to interfere with the competence of the Director. But it sounds to us a bit odd, it's just an example of where, I think, the Statute needs to be revitalized. So it is a bit odd to note that we decided in 2006-2007 to include the ESI management as a full-fledged member of the Governing Board, while it is also responsible for the implementation. That sounds a bit odd and we have to think it over again. So it is, on the one hand, a proposal to address management issues more smoothly and to have the Executive Committee meet in June.

We also propose to put in the Director and the EU vice-director, however, without voting rights because they have other responsibilities: administration and the ESI management.

And the second issue is that we have to draw the consequences with regard to the Statute itself and then the follow-up proposal is not only to agree in principle to this idea and the basic ideas as we have put them in this piece of paper. But also to allow this group to reflect in the June meeting not only about how, for example, this idea of regional universities could be brought on board but also to reflect on eventual amendments to the Statute which, at any rate, are necessary even to revitalize this idea of the Bureau. That's my introduction and I think it's a kind of summary of the discussion that we had from the EU side. Probably, there are also some colleagues who would like to add some comments.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I was listening to Jaap present this proposal. It's also because he mentioned 2006 a couple of times. Now the ESI has been in place for 5 years and I think it's not bad to do some sort of review of this process: where it is, where it's going and what needs to be changed. So the 5-year-period gives us enough of ground, the experience and so on that we can look and review as we move ahead. So because you mentioned 2006 I wanted to add that it's a nice period for a review.

Mr. Alexander Grushko:

Thank you very much. I don't know where to start. Maybe I'm a victim of political correctness because, to tell you the truth, I don't quite understand the essence of your proposal. On the one hand, as far as I can judge on the basis of our today's work our prerogative is clearly defined. The Governing Board is to determine the main directions of the work of the ESI, to plan the budget, to supervise the Administration in most fundamental spheres. If we look at today's discussion through the proposal of professor de Zwaan I don't see any issue which the Governing Board could not have dealt with. If we set up some intermediate body it will either encroach on the competences of the Governing Board or it will encroach on the competences of the European Studies Institute Administration, specially taking into account the fact that we appointed another deputy – the first deputy director.

We may form a kind of grey zone, an undetermined zone with the functions which are not clear. I'm expressing my doubts because today is the first time I see this proposal. At the moment I don't see any added value in this proposal. My second apprehension is related to the fact that our group of people here is a balanced body where various agencies are represented and organizations on which the European Studies Institute is based. On the Russian part sending two participants will be not easy. I'm quite frank with you in my apprehensions. I suggest we don't make haste with this proposal. It is true that situations may arise when we may need more frequent meetings of the Governing Board. If some people cannot come more often, nothing doing. Such meetings are useful anyway whether all of us are present or not. Between today and the next session I don't see any major issue arising which will require either an important decision to be taken or some fine tuning which the Administration of the European Studies Institute cannot cope with. We have regular working contacts every day. I know that the Administration is in constant contact with the European Union Delegation here. There are also research contacts with sister universities and research centers. Therefore this proposal needs more consideration, we should balance all the pros

and cons. We must understand what is the added value for us in setting up an additional body. I think this is a serious issue and we should be apprehensive of creating more red tape which will not ensure the real process.

Mr. Eiki Berg:

Thank you very much. We discussed it and I was involved in the discussion. I don't think it is a new organ; it is a replacement of an organ that already exists according to the Statute. So for this reason it is not an additional one. The prime reason was the Bureau, as far as I know, was never convened. But at the beginning there was a certain need to have such an organ and I think this need did not disappear. As to the possible infringement on the competences of the Governing Board whether directly or not, I don't think it is really an issue because we can, in any case, take a certain measure to preclude such an effect. It was the main idea for the Bureau formally that this institution, a new body should have no power to take a final decision, it shall have power to take, if a decision is necessary, a provisional decision that needs confirmation by the Governing Board. So in any case the Governing Board would have control and it would remain the competence of the Governing Board. And when I come to the report of my Committee, I would give reason why it is really urgent. Thank you very much.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues, I'm glad that you raised this issue. It's true that we have been working at this proposal for some time. When I reported to Mr. Prikhodko about the current work of the Institute and the tasks of the Institute, he naturally asked questions related to the steps undertaken to implement the decisions of the previous meeting of the Governing Board. These decisions didn't have a formal expression but we all supported the idea that the priorities of our Institute comprise the excellence of the work of the ESI, as Flora Goudappel said today, besides: setting up the Board of Trustees, improving the financial stability of the Institute, better contacts with the business community, issues related to the networking, the

regional strategy in the new conditions when there are six major regional centers supported by the European Union and also issues related to international students.

As the Administration of the European Studies Institute we have our framework of competence. Some decisions are to be taken either by the Government of the Russian Federation or by the European Commission. It was natural that we started thinking how we can advance on this path and Mr. Prikhodko suggested that we convene a session of the Bureau to deal with these priorities. Why a sessions of the Bureau? The thing is that over the previous years when we decided to set up the Bureau we relied on the assumption that members of the Bureau must be present in Moscow. That is the first consideration for decisions to be taken fast and for these decisions to be implemented, i.e. to start their practical implementation before they are confirmed by the Governing Board. So that was the first consideration and the second consideration was for the Bureau members to have real power to promote these decisions. I mean contacts with big business, cooperation with the European Union, the European Commission. We have our Statute and it was reconfirmed when we signed a new contract which in detail provides for the structure, for the functions of the European Studies Institute. It was several months ago when we reconfirmed this system. It seems to me that we made a tactical mistake. When we pointed out that the Bureau only has a deliberative function. It's the Governing Board which makes decisions. Probably we should follow a different path and maybe we should convene a session of the Bureau soon and see how we can carry out practical decisions, implementing the objectives set for the Institute by the European Commission and the Russian Government. Maybe the Governing Board can delegate some functions to the Bureau like adopting some decisions and the Bureau can also consider some other possibilities. The bureau comprises Mr. Prikhodko, Mr. Anatoly Torkunov, Mr. Valenzuela and ex-officio - the presidency country. They can decide that there can be another body, not the Bureau, carrying out this work. If such a decision is taken, then we can think of some specific follow up.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

I think there is a very strong and real tendency in the Governing Board to take our own responsibility and our work most seriously. And we can think about different ways to implement that. One way could be to meet more often, and maybe there are organizational or financial limits to that. I don't know but very much more often than twice or three times a year, I think, will be difficult. Another option could be to install a body which, and that is very important, has no real power, but provides us with information that sometimes, I have a feeling, we don't have, or it arrives late or we are not aware. Therefore we feel sometimes that the decisions of the Governing Board have been forgotten about or maybe ignored, some activity on the side of Administration was not founded on any kind of decision of the Governing Board like the establishment of this organ which we will discuss later on research matters. And some urgent matters have not been brought to our attention like the "yavka" (attendance) problem and some other things. And so if we want to take our role more seriously, we have to think about the ways of enabling ourselves to do that. So I think we should not do something like the minister said correctly "giving our power away" , but we should think about how to use it more properly, in a more effective way, in a more professional way. Right? So I don't think there's readiness of this body to shift away powers from the Governing Board to some Bureau, but there should be some kind of organ, some kind of agency in the first place providing us in time with proper information, alerting us to potential areas of activity and then we can see if there is urgent need for convening the Governing Board maybe more often. I think that is the core idea. Thank you.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela:

Thank you. I don't want to repeat, but I am afraid that I will have to repeat some points. Let me say one thing to begin with. I think this is surprising that this Board hasn't an executive committee. That happens almost universally: in the private companies, in public institutions, precisely because it is a way of accepting

the fact that a Board can not normally meet too often and that in between meetings the Board has to keep somehow an eye on what has been decided or look forward to the preparation of the next Board. That is partly the responsibility of the management, but not only - it's mainly the responsibility of the Board. It is the Board that has to see that it is in the position to take the right decisions, to follow-up all the decisions and so on and so forth. I think that today there was an occasion, and I have mentioned it and I repeat it now, I think it's very inappropriate to launch even an experimental program before we have accepted it, without practically a single paper about the concept, the organization, the implications, financial analysis. If we have an Executive committee, it somehow will continue with the management to follow up issues and will somehow conduct the evolution of the issue until we meet again. I feel more comfortable, all of us feel more comfortable this way, I think. That is one example and but we may find others.

That's why I think the Executive Committee is not a new body; it is simply a group of the Governing Board which is particularly entrusted to accomplish the task of monitoring, preparation of the next Board, etc. Something that is practically universal, done in many organizations, certainly in the private sector, etc. But there is another aspect. I see the Bureau more as a mechanism of the management, here we are talking about the mechanism of the Board and that is the most important difference. That's why whether there is a necessity for management to have a kind of corporate bureau or not is up to the management, to a certain extent. But, certainly, for the Governing Board I understand it is important to have somehow this committee that would ensure that the lapse between the two sessions of the Board is not kind of void, empty space, but something in which there is a follow-up.

Then not for the record but nevertheless. Thank you for your offer about the Governing Board. But, for one reason or another, our rules prevent us from being members, that's why we are only observers. I am only an observer at this table because our rules prevent us from being part to governing boards or any office, or

institutions that receive finance. This is a potential conflict of interest. So unfortunately I will not be able to be part of the Bureau. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander Grushko:

I would like to apologize for taking the floor again, but I believe that probably today we should not take any decisions. I feel inclined to say that there is a problem with the preparation for the session. We should prepare ourselves and we should be ready to take decisions at every meeting of the Governing Board. I agree with the criticism which we have heard today that it would be helpful if in the files we have been provided with we found a paper explaining the main ideas of the ESI regional policy.

Nevertheless, from today's discussion I don't quite understand what the advantages would be of having an Executive Committee which would replace the Bureau if it does not meet more often. But the Executive Committee may also fail to hold its meetings for some reasons and I have failed to grasp the advantages of the Executive Committee over the Bureau and its functions. Anyway, we should reduce it all to paper if we mean something different from the Bureau.

I also have another question. The Administration, the directors report to the Governing Board and we are the body to which they are accountable. What will be the place in this mechanism for the Executive Committee?

But I see the point of improving the preparation of the meetings of the Governing Board. Don't take it as criticism of you, it is criticism of myself. Because we must have more material and we must have a chance to think it over. Even yesterday's meeting at which we discussed other things showed that we were discussing informally the real problems the Institute is faced with. Today we already have a better understanding of what we should pay special attention to. A certain preparatory committee should exist, to use the international parlance. Anyway, I think it's a very serious proposal which should be very carefully considered from the point of view of competences, goals and added-value

compared to the instruments which we have in our statutory documents and the Contract.

Mr. Dimitrious Triantafillou:

Thank you. It all goes back to process and implementation. I will give you one example, one of practices of the last 5 years of this Board meetings. Maybe it's our fault for not bringing it up or myself as a Board member. For example, the minutes of the December meeting were given to us 3 months later. That's when we got them. These are things that have to be improved, that's what I am saying about process. We can make a decision and say "we want them in a month or within 20 days", we can do that also. But I think there are things that Jaap and the others spoke about and that's what we were trying to say. That is that somehow now, 5 years down the road we are still talking about issues which ultimately come down to how the ESI works. Maybe it is an issue of trust. But why should we be having these issues right now? We still have them and that's why sometimes we get to discussing things and process and people get defensive. The idea is that if we institute something like this, it might not last very long, may be just a year. That is not something permanent. As I would see it, it is to ensure the processes.

There's always a reference to the new deputy director. The new deputy director would assume her functions in September-October and it will take her a while to get adjusted anyway. So this is not a panacea either. The new deputy director has to learn about the processes and implementation of decisions as well. So this is it. It is a body without decision-making responsibility. And I think Ambassador Valenzuela said very correctly - an Executive committee will help the process along between our Board meetings. There are very practical ways to do it. I am just thinking that some time we will be talking about this and some time, maybe in June, we have the Students Selection Committee. I will be here, there may be another Board member coming here. That's a good time to actually meet and see where we stand on this meeting. So this is a question of practicalities, more than anything else.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Also I have still my voice on this. I think we should go a bit further on this. I mean we are in the second stage of this project. We are really trying now to develop some ideas, some issues of the attendance of students, the regional strategy. It requires a lot of attention. It is my conviction that with two meetings a year the Governing Board is not able to take the responsibility, to be accountable even for what is happening. And I do not want to blame the ESI Administration, not at all, but it was us who had to bring up this idea of attendance of the students. It was you who brought up this idea of involvement of regional universities without a concrete proposal, but I do not want to blame you for that. A simple fact is that with two meetings a year this high-level Board cannot really function properly. Again it's not in order to interfere, to take away responsibility. On the contrary, it is in order to make this process much more smooth. In fact, the proof of the pudding is the fact that we already provided for such a body, which is the Bureau. However, it doesn't function. Why doesn't it function? Probably because the composition is too high-level. Make it easier and make it just a sort of intermediate mechanism that we could also link to a probation period. But we are in the stage of this project where we have to look to the future as well and to find suitable permanent structures. It's my conviction again that if we do not increase the number of the Governing Board meetings - because that is clearly the alternative, then we have to find more practical modalities. And I think such a body (and the emphasis again is on implementation, not on decision-making, not on policy-making) might be very helpful. So I think we should take courage and go a bit further than simply remaining with general exchange of views. I think that is more or less how we stand in the project. Perhaps today again we had a very constructive meeting but why is that? Because we all feel committed. Did we have all these issues well-prepared? I have my doubts. According to the proceedings in my institute, which are not perfect either, I mean they were not sufficient as yet.

Mr. Alexander Grushko:

Well, now we should probably be winding up this discussion. I agree with many things that you have mentioned but I believe that nothing prevents a member of the GB to put forward a proposal if he so wishes. I think we should really change the procedure and if some ideas do come up, of course, the point should be raised and then all the members of the GB should have about two weeks to examine the issue, but that does not require the establishment of some additional structure. Whether we have a Bureau or not, whether we have the Executive committee or not, nobody will release us from the responsibility of assisting the ESI in its work and I think it is only natural if all the members will be making proposals on how we could improve the work. I don't want to sound like an opportunist, but I would like to believe that this topic should be prepared in greater detail before we take some decision so that we could understand what would be the benefit if we go along this way.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I suggest that we try to sum the discussion. First of all, I am very deeply touched by the interest of the members of the GB in the future development of the ESI and I think this motivation that made them put forward a proposal about how this work could be enhanced and improved. We can only thank them for their desire to contribute as much as possible to the work of the ESI. I support this idea in general and I believe that it could be implemented. But there are several questions, several issues that are connected with the bureaucratic contradictions, so to say. Gerhard says there is the Bureau but it doesn't seem to be working much, which is true. They say that the Executive Council or the Executive Committee will replace it. But then we shall have to make respective changes in the Contract and in our Statute. It is quite possible that some changes should be made. I agree that 5 years have passed and showed that a high ranking leader simply is not able to be always aware of what is going on. But I must tell you he is trying hard to keep track of things and prof. Entin regularly visits him in the Kremlin. I am

speaking about Mr. Sergey Prikhodko. He is usually briefed on everything that is taking place. You know that he usually attends our meetings. It is only today because of a late arrival from Hong-Kong that he was unable to attend.

If we decide to introduce changes, we'll have to change the current status of the Bureau. We cannot take such decisions without our Chairman.

So I would like to make a proposal which will make us feel that we have not wasted our time today on this discussion and are really making progress. I would like to ask you formulate, relying on our statutory documents, i.e. the contract and the Statute, a very brief proposal in writing that will somehow provide a legal ground for such a body. It can be a brief paper that we can discuss after we have received it. That is the first issue.

Second – the relevant issues that you have raised. I agree with what Dimitriou has said. The Selection Committee would be working and other members of the Governing Board – professors de Zwaan, for example, - could come and take part in it as there will be the new component - the young academics. We could exchange views on current issues including the Executive Committee idea.

I would suggest, and I would also suggest it to Mr. Prikhodko, that we convene the meeting of the Bureau in the format provided for in the Contract, i.e. four members plus a representative of the ESI Administration, and discuss things. I think that without Mr. Prikhodko it would be tactless to take some decisions. Moreover, some of us only learnt about this proposal when we received this paper and the agenda in the morning.

I want to stress once again that I like very much the interest which is taken by the Governing Board and professor de Zwaan personally who has been making a great contribution to the work of our Institute from the very beginning. And I support it all. But I want us to do everything correctly and consistently. So let us suggest to Mr. Prikhodko that the Bureau meeting should be convened and this proposal should be discussed. Logistically, I think we can suggest that probably it could be not exactly an executive committee or council but maybe some

representatives of the Governing Board could be appointed and we could discuss it in June when the Selection Committee meets.

What are your opinions? We shall discuss it all with Mr. Prikhodko in advance and take a decision. I think that there is some point in this proposal because the Bureau in the current form will, most probably, be unable to discuss all these issues in detail. So it would be correct to have a body which would meet more often and discuss things in a businesslike manner. Incidentally, when they come to its sessions, members of the GB from the EU could read lectures at the ESI and MGIMO and we would very grateful to them for it. We, the MGIMO, would be even prepared to pay them.

So let us take this transitional decision, not a final one. Can you agree to it? Yes, professor, you are welcome.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

The College of Europe is only an observer so I would not take sides concerning whether a Bureau or another body should be set up. But I would like to suggest in parallel with what has been just mentioned that the College, being a partner of MGIMO, should perhaps be more regularly informed and consulted because if you look at the Terms of Reference you see that a partner is supposed to be consulted before new activities are proposed. And, for instance, concerning the working group on the development of the ESI, research activities and other initiatives we have learnt that sometimes after the fact. Whereas according to the Contract we should be regularly consulted. And I think that is something in parallel with what has been discussed but it is separate from the issue whether or not to set something up.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I think these issues are interconnected and this is one more argument in favor of the need to combine everything. If we create some executive council, then we must decide how the College of Europe in Bruges is going to be involved.

Should it be involved? I think yes, because the College of Europe is our partner. There many nuances here. So, on the whole I am in favor of the idea to discuss everything but we have to consider the details and then return to it and take a well-grounded decision. Do you agree?

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much. I was wondering - in order to establish such an Executive Committee do we really need to change the Statute? Because we established also other committees without changing the Statute. So is it not possible to take a decision here and then to discuss it together again when we are coming together in the GB?

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I'm not quite comfortable with this. I think we all have to look once again at the Statute and the status of the Bureau and take the final decision taking into account the opinion of the Chairman of the Governing Board. I think it would not be correct if we take a decision now in Mr. Prikhodko's absence. Knowing him, I don't think that he will object to this idea but without him I don't think it should be correct if we take a decision. There is no urgency. Because there is no objection to expanding the participation of the members of the Governing Board in all activities. I am making a concrete proposal related to the June meeting here at the ESI. In June there will be a meeting when Dimitrious will come here and representatives of the College of Europe will come here to take part in the selection process. We could discuss the issue of the regional young lecturers and that could probably be seen as the fore-runner of the work of the Executive Committee. But I am not inclined to take a decision on it now.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

I think that sounds fine but just to make it very concrete. I mean you have learnt that there are certain desires, there are questions, perhaps, certain reluctance.

So we have to find means and ways how to solve them. But can we not agree on you to take note of this wish from the side of the EU members? I think it's a good idea to make this project, this proposal more explicit, more concrete and bring it to the meeting of the Selection Committee in June. Perhaps we add two or three things. It is not in order to disturb the activities of the GB, but we have to face the future. Is the way all the elements have been elaborated a satisfactory one? I have the impression, not to say a conviction, that there are certain issues that really need to be reviewed, perhaps not to be decided but at least re-discussed. Let's try also to have a very interesting and broad meeting in June, and also take these issues on board and then present the final proposals also after having our Chairman Mr. Prikhodko at the next board meeting.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I think we can all agree on this. Alexander (Grushko), do you have any objections? Professor Zwaan has formulated his proposal. I believe that it has been a very useful exchange of opinions and we should realize that it's in our interests, the interests of the ESI administration to have as deep involvement of the members of the Governing Board from the European Union as possible because this is a joint project. So it is in our interests to have them involved. The more European members, very prominent scholars are involved in the activities of the ESI, the better for the Institute. I support this idea but the idea so far needs some more time and elaboration. It must be very important for the future. Now I suggest that we go on to the next issue.

Mr. Paul Demaret:

Sorry to intervene again on this. I think I can understand what the rector said that today perhaps is not the day to take a decision. Perhaps it is not wise as our Chairman is not here. I want nevertheless first to support this proposal about the working group and this very formal approach. But I would like also to say something that is very important. I am talking about it not as member of the Board,

but I am talking about it as a partner of this project. And we think that it is extremely important that we have a permanent attitude of adaptation. We are going to start new activities not only with the regional dimension, but others involving also the questions of funding, contacts with the private sector, particularly European private sector and so on and so forth. All this needs, requires adaptations in all the structures. I am concerned to see this kind of reluctance to, on the one hand, adapt, when there is some eagerness to launch this without proper preparation. I think that I want this to be reasoned carefully. Thank you.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

I believe that we can subscribe to this and I agree that a permanent adaptation and adjustment to new situations is necessary. We should proceed from the fact that we are partners. It's not simply two parties taking part in the project. We are partners and colleagues. I don't have the least inclination simply to reject this idea out of hand. The only thing that I believe is necessary is to think it over better and prepare the issue. And the meeting in June would be a wonderful opportunity and it would be very good if Yapp came to take part in it. It would be possible by this time to have discussed it with the Chairman of our Governing Board. We should not create artificial irritants in the work of our Governing Board. Nobody is interested in that, everything should work smoothly. Moreover, we have known each other for a long time and we have been cooperating very productively. And in view of all the comments and the debate let us agree that on the whole we feel that this idea is attractive but we should work out all the details. If there are no questions shall we go on to the next point on the agenda? The next item, who will report on it, Daniel? There is a point of order. Shall we have a lunch break and then resume work? There are two opinions. Either to have a lunch-break and resume work afterwards or continue work now and wind it up quickly.

Shall we vote?

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

Sorry, because I have to leave very soon. Could we discuss the date of the next meeting in June?

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

So shall we continue with the meeting? Now the date of the meeting. We were speaking of October originally. Is that correct? Yes. Some people who will have to leave us very soon have asked us to deal with this issue. Mr. Prikhodko made a mistake mentioning December. We were speaking of the 24-27 October, the middle of the last 10 days. From 24 to 27th of October. What day of the week is it? One of these 4 days. Taking into account the fact that you have to arrive on the 24. The 27th is a Thursday, isn't it? A month is too long. When are you leaving for the US? The 25 of October. Dear colleagues, we have a choice: the 17-18th of October. Of course, we need the Chairman. This all is OK, if Mr. Prikhodko is with us, if President Medvedev doesn't have any visits. If not the 17-18th, look at 25. We understand that professor Segbers will be in America. What about the other members of the Governing Board? Is it OK with you? The 25th of October?

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

Because on Mondays and Tuesdays I teach, my preference is not to come here. But I will figure it out.

Mr. Anatoly Torkunov:

Is October 26th all right? It is Wednesday, ok? We will let you know about the final decision as soon as we can. We have two options: 17-18 or 26, ok? We will propose two dates to Mr. Prikhodko.

Mr. Mark Entin:

Dear colleagues, may I ask Mr. Gromyko while Mr. Anatoly Torkunov is absent to be in charge, to act as the chairperson of our session?

Mr. Alexander Gromyko:

Despite the fact that our program has been very full and we have discussed in detail many of the issues, I suggest that we continue with the program. Well, there is another very important item in our agenda and it's the report of the chairman of the Working Group on Research on the activities. I suggest we move to this item now that we have settled the date of the next session.

Mr. Eiki Berg:

Sorry to interrupt. I want only to remind that this point was amended, it includes also the report concerning the editorial policy and PR committee.

Mr. Alexander Gromyko:

Yes, it includes proposals that you have mentioned, it will consist of two parts and I think that the first part can be left in the way that is formulated in the agenda. So I suggest giving the floor to Mr. Tarschys.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys:

I suppose that at this stage of the proceedings we should be brief about every point. There has been a meeting which is described in the document in front of you to consider the connection between teaching and research. Of course, this is a crucial relationship that is very important for European universities and has been so for the last 200 years, I think Humboldt was the first ideologue behind the connection and there have been slightly different traditions in different countries to this effect. I mean in some countries research was always mainly conducted in universities, in other countries it was concentrated in academies of sciences and the educational institutions were more clearly oriented towards education. But I think it has been basically agreed that it is very useful for universities and higher institutions, institutions of higher education to combine the two fields of work and for several reasons. First of all, because we need teachers who are well-qualified and who have done research themselves, we need teachers who are presently

conducting academic research. And we need possibilities for students to have an immediate contact with research. So this is the background of the issue.

The group was convened by the director and it was clearly an exploratory discussion that was held here in Moscow in February with a number of people invited. The group discussed several aspects of the relationship, the need of serious research activity. It was clearly noted and understood that everything will be determined by the resources available. So what you have in front of you is, in a sense, partly a wish-list, a list of things that are desirable but also, I would say, very important if we want to give a serious research dimension to the Institute. I think it's very important to consider a number of aspects that are listed in this document. It is important, and this was noted at the meeting, to take into account and to profit from the relationship of the ESI to MGIMO. MGIMO is, of course, a very powerful academic institution itself. Even if the research work carried out in the ESI is not very notable or significant in volume, we have, of course, very significant research work carried out at MGIMO. And I think it is a very important necessity to try to link better ESI to the research work carried out at MGIMO. So it was seen as one objective of this further activity. Clearly the issue of having a specific committee raises a question that professor Hafner raises and what is also noted in the paper.

Clearly this question is related to the Special Committee on Visibility and Publicity and, I think, one cannot consider having such a committee without a very close link to that committee. And the proposal in this paper is if this committee is created through the decision of the Governing Board, then there should be a constant interaction and, perhaps, joint meetings with the other committee so that's the production of things worthy of visibility and the actual publication and visibility activities are linked organically together. I think I am given short time, I think I'll stop there, you have on paper a number of items, a number of proposals from this working party. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander Gromyko:

Thank you, professor Tarschys. It's true that Russia has developed for many years along the path when research activity was mainly focused in the academic research centers. But in the past years we have been very intensively discussing and carrying out reforming activities aimed at bringing together the potential of educational institutions and research centers. This is yielding its results. In Russia we don't have a simple approach to these results but we follow very attentively the examples of many countries where this integrated approach works quite well. The European Studies Institute will sooner or later have to face this prospect of combining research and education. Dear colleagues, you are welcome with your comments and proposals on this subject.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner:

Thank you very much. I am very grateful to this working group for taking into account the close relations between the editorial policy and the public relations committees and certainly, from my side, we'll do everything for them to cooperate very closely. I have one question concerning one point, point number three. As far as I know the legislation in Russia concerning PhD's is very rigid and only a few scientific institutions are provided with the right to conduct such PhD activities. And I was wondering whether the ESI is entitled by the Russian legislation to do it? Thanks. That's it.

Mr. Oleg Barabanov:

I want to say that it's true that there are some interesting proposals on how to work with postgraduate students. The European Studies Research Institute has the right to have postgraduate students. We have been doing this for the past four years. The ESI three departments have their own postgraduate courses. Every year we have full-time postgraduate students plus part-time postgraduate students working at their PhDs. The proposals which you have made are already being implemented. You are quite right that our laws on postgraduate courses are outdated. They are very rigid and there is very little flexibility. As we work in

Russia, we have to abide by our laws. When you make a proposal to introduce an additional examination for postgraduate students, I'm not sure we can do this fast taking into account our rules. In accordance with our rules, our postgraduate students, all of them, have to take exams the year after they are admitted to the postgraduate course. This depends on their specialty: law, economics and whatever. This is a very complicated examination, a professional examination which comprises many professors and lecturers as examiners. So this proposal falls within the practice which we already have. Our practice already provides for such very profound examinations. As to other proposals, I agree with them all. In March we conducted a seminar with the participation of all postgraduate students of our European Studies Institute where they made presentations. We are implementing these proposals and will be glad to receive regional post-graduate students. When we talked about regional lecturers, they can do their PhD research here.

Mr. Klaus Segbers:

We have a migration here which is higher than at a train station. So I have a formal move and I want to minute it that this body is not able to take decisions. If not, then not. There's no Chairman, there's no Deputy Chairman, there's no Director. And we are talking about the committee which is not established and we never established this committee. And there is a serious move from our side, to the Direction of which is not here: not the Chairman, not the deputy, that it is not acceptable to create any kind of organization without the consent of the Governing Board. So if we are unable to take any kind of decision, then we have to take a break.

Mr. Alexander Gromyko:

We could discuss some of the proposals contained in the report. When we come to the need to take a decision it's clear that if we can't do that without a quorum. But we haven't reached the level when we need to take a decision. For the time being we are raising practical issues contained in the report.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan:

I like the subject very much but this is not very serious. I think we should take ourselves a bit more seriously. Germany is not here, the ESI administration is not sufficiently represented, so this is not serious. So maybe we should have a break and continue after the lunch.