

**14th GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
EUROPEAN STUDIES INSTITUTE
Moscow, 27 October 2011**

PARTICIPANTS

The Governing Board members from the Russian Federation side

Mr. Sergey PRIKHODKO	Aide to the President of the Russian Federation
Mr. Alexander GRUSHKO	Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
Mr. Anatoly TORKUNOV	Rector of the MGIMO-University, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mrs. Elena DANILOVA	Director, Department of Europe, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation
Mr. Alexey GROMYKO	Deputy Director, Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Mr. Alexander POZDNYAKOV	Counsellor, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
Mr. Mark ENTIN	Director, European Studies Institute
Mr. Mikhail MARCHAN	Deputy Director, European Studies Institute
Mrs. Tamara SHASHIKHINA	Deputy Director, 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, Estonia
Mr. Daniel TARSCHYS	Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Stockholm University, Sweden
Mr. Gerhard HAFNER	Professor of International law, School of Law, Vienna University, Austria
Mr. Erik HOEG	Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Denmark in Russia
Mr. Jaap Willem de ZWAAN	Professor, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, Netherlands

Observers

Mr. Fernando VALENZUELA	Head, European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation
Mr. Etienne CLAEYE	Head of the Operations section, European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation
Mr. Nicola SCARAMUZZO	Project Officer, Educational Programmes, Operations section, European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation
Jan De MONDT	Director, Development Office, College of Europe, Bruges
Mrs. Evangelina BLANCO GONZALEZ	Project Manager, College of Europe, Bruges

Guests

Mr. Sergey KRASELNIKOV	Head of Section, Department of Europe, Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation
Mr. Mariusz SIELSKI	Representative of the College of Europe at the European Studies Institute
Mrs. Natalia ADAMCHUK	Head, Department of the EU Economics, European Studies Institute
Mr. Gennady TOLSTOPYATENKO	Head, Department of the EU Law, European Studies Institute
Mr. Oleg BARABANOV	Head of the Department of Politics and Policies of the EU and the Council of Europe, European Studies Institute

Absent

Mr. Klaus SEGBERS	Program Director, Centre for Global Politics, Freie Universitat Berlin
Mr. Wojciech ZAJANCZKOWSKI	Ambassador of Poland to Russia
Mr. Dimitrius TRIANAFILLOU	Director General, International Centre of the Black Sea Studies, Greece

Mr. Sergey PRIKHODKO

Good morning, dear colleagues,

I would like to welcome you to our regular session of the Governing Board. I invite you all to participate as actively as possible in our discussions. Since our previous session, which, I regret to say, I could not attend, we have accumulated a

number of unsolved issues, and I hope today we have a chance to advance in our work. I would like to ask for your permission, before we move to discussing the agenda, to make a couple of statements, so as to make sure that we discuss all the issues with a good understanding of the attitudes of the Russian participants - members of the Governing Board, as well as those of our colleagues from the European Union. There is a kind of misunderstanding - or, rather, there are some differences of understanding. The first one is on the contribution of the members of the Governing Board to the work of the European Studies Institute and the second, on the role of the Governing Board itself. If you allow me, I will start with the latter.

We believe that the mission of the Governing Board is to elaborate the strategy in developing the European Studies Institute and to adopt the necessary decisions. The Governing Board should continue to be involved in the major thing, i.e. contributing to closer ties between Russia and the European Union. That was the reason the ESI was set up. That's why it is training Russian civil servants, that's why it is organizing short-term courses, that's why we promote research and concepts development. We try to respond to such questions as how to use the potential of the Institute to bring closer Russia and the European Union; how to develop our relations with the European Union, how to facilitate human contacts, contacts between citizens of the Russian Federation and citizens of the European Union. I think this is what the Governing Board should concentrate on, now and in the future. Russian taxpayers and European taxpayers are the original sponsors of our project; I think these are the questions they are interested in, these are the questions they are asking, and I think that a profound involvement or interference by the GB into the everyday work of the European Studies Institute is hardly necessary. Our job is to support, to help the administration of the ESI, but not to turn this into dictating to them what to do, not to turn this into micromanagement. This is the philosophy which I would like to propose to you. If you do not object to this kind of philosophy, then I think we can together elaborate the criteria of the

Governing Board members' activities. I think the main responsibility of the GB members is to use our professional resources to deal with the most important task, bringing closer Russia and the European Union.

At one of our previous sessions I understood that we came to agreement as to the strategic goals of the Governing Board. The first one is to develop further the successes of the Institute, providing Russian society with an educational package, which includes Master's Degree programs, short-term courses, and publications. I would like to emphasize that one of our objectives is to set up the Board of Trustees, then to work together to elaborate the principles and legislative measures aimed at involving the business community in financing the Institute. The fourth is to expand the student body from the European countries studying here, and the fifth is to expand the contacts of the Institute with other universities in Russia and abroad, the integration of the Institute into the European educational space. I have an impression these are the principles which were, on the whole, supported by our colleagues, that then we came to agreement on these principles. This is my understanding. This was my understanding. So, from this point of view, I would like to consider the agenda proposed for today. The practical personal contribution of all of us and the possibility of setting up new bodies, or units of the Governing Board. I am grateful to Mr. Valenzuela for responding to my request on this issue: I hope all Members of the Governing Board have received the draft Proposals of our European Union colleagues on the subject. If my ideas are not rejected, if you do not object to them, if you are not going to comment on them, then my suggestion is that we move to discussing the agenda. You are welcome Mr Valenzuela.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela

Я не возражаю, но собираюсь прокомментировать. Я хотел бы дальше развить, более подробно остановиться на том, что вы сказали. Я поддерживаю все, что вы сказали, не возражаю против Ваших слов, включая и то, что не входит в задачу Руководящего Совета – вмешиваться в

микроуправление Европейским учебным институтом. Поэтому мы и предложили создать Исполнительный комитет. Но я хотел остановиться на другом. Соглашаясь с основными задачами Руководящего Совета, о которых Вы сказали, я сказал, что полностью соглашаюсь. Есть один момент, который лежит в основе этих задач, и на нем необходимо остановиться еще раз. А именно наша задача заключается в том, чтобы Европейский Учебный Институт вышел на отличный уровень работы. Это, конечно, не означает критику прошлой деятельности, поскольку с самого своего создания Европейский Учебный Институт работает успешно, улучшает свою работу, улучшает свой потенциал. Но справедливо сказать, что мы все-таки не вышли на отличный уровень, необходимо продолжать прикладывать усилия и мы это делаем. Я участвовал в самых разных заседаниях, и на всех заседаниях Руководящего Совета предлагалось что-то, что было бы направлено на то, чтобы помочь Институту выйти на отличный уровень работы. И мы должны продолжать это делать, и должны об этом помнить всегда. Мы, конечно, не должны вмешиваться в ежедневную работу, но задача Руководящего Совета – вносить какие-то элементы, включая и управление институтом, которые помогли бы ему выйти на отличный уровень. И, я думаю, что это в наших общих интересах. Это не касается только каких-то отдельных членов Совета, это наша общая задача, если мы хотим выйти на общую стратегию, на общую цель, которую вы изложили очень четко. Я не буду повторять то, что вы сказали. Некоторые другие вопросы, например увеличение студентов из Европейского Союза и интеграция в европейское образовательное пространство, все эти задачи не будут легкими. Все зависит от того, какой будет уровень качества предлагаемого обучения в Институте. Я уже сказал, что согласен со всем, что Вы сказали, и просто хотел внести такой комментарий. То есть наша задача заключается в том, чтобы добиться того, чтобы Институт предоставлял высокое качество образовательных услуг.

Mr. Sergey PRIKHODKO

Thank you, Mr. Valenzuela, for your comments. Now I suggest that we move to adopting the Draft Agenda. You all have it in your files. You received it an advance. I have been informed that some proposals have been received to change it: Prof. Hafner and Prof. De Zwaan have made some proposals, as well as Prof. Gromyko - not suggesting any major changes, but suggesting that the Governing Board should discuss the documents which served as the basis of the so-called "Berlin Decisions" of a group of the Governing Board members.

Ex-officio, I will also take several minutes of your time to make a couple of comments. Any members of the Governing Board have the right to choose any format of communication, and my colleagues on many occasions suggested that we should assemble only the Russian members of the Governing Board for discussion to quickly deal with some issues which are stuck, and not dealt with by the Governing Board as such. I decided that such proposals were absolutely unacceptable. There should be no secrets among the Russian members from the European colleagues, there should be no separate discussions. So, with this in mind, some of the statements of the Berlin meeting created questions. I have questions as a result of these Berlin proposals. For example, the statement to the effect that the quality of the certificates issued by the European Studies Institute, the number of the excellence certificates, from their point of view, is excessive, and so, their quality is doubtful.

Or another paragraph, which refers to the need of setting up an external audit to evaluate professionally the work of the European Studies Institute. Then I have a question: aren't we, Members of the Governing Board, this kind of external audit? There may be some defects in our work, but we are doing this job, and if we don't do it properly, then we should probably be dissolved and this work entrusted to some external audit that our colleagues from the European Union will be looking

for and finance. Then the question is: why for several years we have been getting to our sessions and convincing each other that we need to have a collective approach to dealing with issues, as Mr. Valenzuela was quite correctly saying, in endeavoring to improve the quality of education, achieve excellence of education? This is not only our responsibility at the Institute, this is our responsibility everywhere in our life, because of the modern society challenges. But if the quality of our certificates is put into question, then I have a question: was it expedient on the part of the Russian Government and the European Union to spend so much taxpayers' money, allocated from their budgets to the European Studies Institute? These are very serious comments.

We are doing a very serious job. We set up a very important body, which has not only educational, but political importance. Through the European Studies Institute we declare the course of improving relations with the European Union. We train specialists to deal with these issues. Maybe, our work is not always excellent and we do not always explain the logic of our decisions to our European colleagues? Maybe, that is the case. And if there is a need on the side of the Russian Government, and we ask the ESI to organize this or that conference, maybe, we don't clearly explain the logic of our requests on all occasions? But it seems to me, that it is too early for us to raise these fundamental issues. We have shown that we can work together, we can work fruitfully. The European Studies Institute trains people who are very important for us, who are not prejudiced against the European Union - on the contrary, who are open to the European Union. And all of a sudden, here we are, questioning the quality of the certificates. Then let's bring to the logical end such statements: either review this whole process - or I don't know what.

If our dear colleagues have an intention to contribute more, which Mr. Valenzuela has mentioned, I am prepared to start with myself and with others. Let's increase our contribution, let's make concrete proposals, financially justified and explained, let's have other new conferences and brain-storming sessions on additional lecture

courses, invite new outstanding professors, publish new books. Let's decide together what books should be published. We are not closed to these proposals. If some adjustments are to be made, let's make them. I believed it was impossible to say these words: maybe, they are not very usual for the academic community, but as a participant of twenty-five summits between Russia and the European Union, and many negotiations between Russia and the European Union I have been directly involved in, I would like to see the continuation of the openness which we saw in the statements of Mr. Barroso, Mrs. Ashton and Mr. Rompuy to be reflected in what we are doing. I am addressing you once again with a request, please, understand me correctly: this is my reaction because I also hear questions to this effect. Yes, you are welcome, Prof. De Zwaan.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: Спасибо. Несомненно, что у нас те же самые цели, мы разделяем эти цели и идеи проекта сотрудничества между Российской Федерацией и Европейским Союзом. Мы хотим, чтобы этот проект был успешным. С другой стороны, мы подчеркиваем слова посла Валенсуэла, что мы должны помнить о качестве работы, которую мы выполняем. Я хотел, чтобы не было недопонимания, потому что вы настаиваете на возвращении к этой встрече, которая состоялась в Берлине. Может быть, вы помните, что на нашем заседании в апреле мы решили, что должна быть совместная рабочая группа в отношении Исполнительного комитета. Я пытался организовать совместное заседание в июне, в июле, в августе, в сентябре для того, чтобы это было, действительно, совместное заседание российских и иностранных коллег для того, чтобы обсудить кое-какие вопросы, потому что это второе измерение моего выступления. У нас возникла озабоченность, которая выражена как раз в наших сегодняшних выступлениях, что по некоторым важным вопросам у нас возникают проблемы. И мы эти проблемы должны решить. Инициатива провести общее заседание отражает нашу озабоченность. И мы хотели, чтобы это было совместное заседание, но мы не смогли его организовать. И тогда мы (европейская сторона) посчитали, что

очень важно провести это обсуждение, поэтому мы сами его организовали, уведомили об этой инициативе Ректора А.В. Торкунова. Когда вы говорите о качестве и о внутреннем аудите, учитывая краткие сроки до конца проекта, нет смысла говорить об этом долго, но в Западной Европе абсолютно нормально подвергать научную деятельность внутреннему аудиту со стороны экспертов, которые могут вынести решения о качестве вашей и нашей работы. Поэтому эта идея лишь отражает стремление улучшить качество работы, которой мы занимаемся. Дело не в том, что мы навязываем это решение, это просто, с точки зрения наших западных традиций, абсолютно нормальные традиционные вещи. И в нашем университете время от времени проводится такая оценка со стороны внешних экспертов, которая полезна. Она помогает нам узнать что-то новое о нашей деятельности. Я просто хотел сказать, чтобы у вас не было неправильного представления о том, что в Берлине прошло какое-то сепаратное заседание. Опять же повторяю, что мы хотели провести совместное заседание, но у нас не получилось.

Chairman: Thank you, Prof De Zwaan, for your clarification. What you have said is very important and removes some of the questions that have arisen.

Prof. Daniel Tarschys: Во-первых, хотел бы согласиться с вашими замечаниями в отношении достижений института. Я думаю, что мы вместе можем гордиться тем, что достигнуто, и мы разделяем положительную оценку того, что было сделано с российской стороны по выполнению плана, разработанного 5 лет назад. Мы считаем, что сделаны большие успехи сотрудниками Института, всеми, кто участвует в чтении курсов, в образовательных программах Института. Поэтому я еще раз хочу выразить высокую оценку того, что было сделано. И как сказал г-н Яаап де Цван, необходимо также рассматривать деятельность участников со стороны Европейского Союза, как проявление заинтересованности в деятельности Европейского Учебного Института. Мы считаем, что есть ощущение, что это

участие недостаточно. И вся проблема создания поста зам.директора – это было отражением нашего стремления, чтобы Европейский Союз больше участвовал в работе Института. Я с вами согласен, что вряд ли прагматично, чтобы Руководящий совет участвовал в микроуправлении Институтом, потому что перед нами стоят стратегические задачи. Но если идея с созданием должности зам.директора пока не реализуема, надо обсудить и другие возможности того, как Европейский Союз мог бы участвовать в работе Института. И я еще раз хочу подчеркнуть, что мы говорим с точки зрения конструктивного подхода, с точки зрения дальнейшего развития Института. Я разделяю взгляды, которые выразил г-н Яаап де Цван. Руководящий Совет и оценка Руководящего Совета – это разные вещи. Но Руководящий Совет не снимает необходимости, чтобы проходил анализ какими-то другими европейскими организациями. В Европейском Союзе такая практика очень распространена, когда подобного рода усилия сопровождаются различными стратегиями по выработке оценки. В некоторых европейских университетах, я бы сказал, даже слишком много такого анализа, такой критики. Со всех сторон эти университеты оценивают и в середине семестра и в конце семестра. То есть существуют самые различные разного рода оценки и анализа, и контроля за деятельностью учебных институтов. Я бы не сказал, что только в Западной Европе, во всем мире существует такая практика оценки вашими коллегами. Приглашают внешних коллег время от времени для того, чтобы они проводили такие специальные расследования, анализ для того, чтобы лучше самому институту узнать о своих недостатках, так для того, чтобы дать какую-то информацию для спонсоров, для правительства о функционировании данного учебного заведения, чтобы создать более полное представление о достижениях, о работе учебного института. Я думаю, что необходимо рассматривать эти идеи, как конструктивные, которые заслуживают дальнейшего обсуждения. Но эти предложения никаким образом не ставят под сомнение важность функционирования Руководящего Совета.

Это очень краткое замечание о заседании в Берлине, где я также участвовал и я согласен с тем, что здесь было сказано, и хочу вас заверить, что с самого начала заседания в Берлине было ясно, что мы придерживаемся принципа транспарентности, гласности, мы не хотим ничего скрывать от других участников РС, мы хотели поделиться тем, что какая у нас озабоченность, что необходимо сделать и, как вы видите, мы предлагаем для обсуждения наше заявление, чтобы все знали, что мы считаем необходимым сделать.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Tarschys, for your clarification. I feel that by my opening remarks I provoked a major discussion, but this is right. It is our advantage that here, in the Governing Board, we are all ardent supporters of this Institute and although we may be taking some time from our substantive debate by our emotional discussions they are also important.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner: Это очень краткое замечание о заседании в Берлине, где я также участвовал и я согласен с тем, что здесь было сказано и хочу вас заверить, что с самого начала заседания в Берлине было ясно, что мы придерживаемся принципа транспарентности, гласности, мы не хотим ничего скрывать от других участников РС, мы хотели поделиться тем, что какая у нас озабоченность, что необходимо сделать и, как вы видите, мы предлагаем для обсуждения наше заявление, чтобы все знали, что мы считаем необходимым сделать.

Chairman: Thank you. I think that we'll try to bring to an end this part of our discussion and start discussing the draft agenda. I have been informed that Mr. Hafner suggested adding an item on the adoption of the minutes of the previous session. If I understand you correctly, - and you know that I missed for good reasons that session, - I suggest that we don't insist on the adoption of the minutes. After each meeting we prepare the transcript, which is to be found on our site. At any time each of you can recall what we said, and recollect every shade of meaning. On the basis of this, we prepare the minutes and forward them to you. If something is left out, you are all welcome to make amendments, these amendments

are taken into account, and the minutes are considered to have been adopted, therefore I suggest that we don't discuss the minutes once again unless you insist.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: Я два раза добавлял свои поправки, но их не отразили в документах. Сложилась такая традиция, которую мы тоже считаем, чтобы была определенность, чтобы мы все таки утверждали решения принятые на предыдущем заседании. В чем заключается важность протокола: я два раза вносил свои поправки по протоколу, но они так и не отражены. В тоже время, я понимаю, что по практическим соображениям нам нужно идти вперед, но я думаю, что для нас важно с точки зрения преемственности и уверенности в том, что не будет искажения, чтобы мы соглашались в отношении формулировки решений, которые мы принимаем. Может быть, на будущее, необходимо эту практику принять.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: Supports the idea that such practice should be adopted in the future.

Chairman: We have received the proposals of our colleagues from the European Union and a proposal from Mr. Gromyko related to setting up an Executive Committee or some other body to help the Governing Board in its work. This is an issue which we will probably discuss as a separate item. Are there any objections to it? I would suggest discussing it together with the issue of the Deputy Director's post of the European Studies Institute because they both relate to the management of the Institute. Any objections? We also had one request, to start with discussing the issue related to the personal contribution of the Governing Body members to the European Studies Institute. So, we suggest that we first consider this issue and second, setting up a body to help the Governing Board together with the issue of another Deputy Director. If you don't have objections, I suggest that we adopt the Agenda.

Now the first item: personal contribution of the Governing Board to implementing the ESI major strategies. I would like to start with myself. The President's

Administration of the Russian Federation launches the recruitment and enrolment of the trainees of the European Studies Institute. Prof. Entin reported to you that I personally send information letters for the recruitment and the short-term courses to the heads of absolutely all ministries, departments and agencies of the Russian Federation, as well as all governors. I also regularly meet with them for this purpose. I also defend the strategy which we elaborate with you. I think that this procedure functions well. It's for you to judge whether it is successful or not, but the number of applicants is steadily growing with each year, which makes it possible for us to select more and more qualified potential trainees for our Institute. The competition is growing, the number of applicants is growing, and we think this is a positive development. Besides, on the basis of our decisions and making use of my position, I popularize the work of the European Studies Institute in order to make it more visible, report to the President of the Russian Federation, the Government of the Russian Federation. I pass our information materials to Mr. Barrozo and to Mr. Rompuy through our Russian channels. Together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs we try to help the European Studies Institute by supplying them with practical materials which are connected with specific areas of cooperation between Russia and the European Union, so that the academic process and the process of education could be brought as close as possible to what is stated in the regulatory documents of the Russian Government and also of the Russian Ministries. I am not calling on you to provide a similar report on your own contribution, maybe, this would be excessive. I just believed it necessary for myself to account for my activities. I am not calling for a broad discussion. What I want to propose is that Mr. Grushko should say a few words about his personal contribution, so that our colleagues from the academic community, from the embassies should understand better the endeavors made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to promote the academic process at the European Studies Institute.

Mr. Alexander Grushko: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I also support adding this item to our Agenda. I share your view that we should have a clear idea that our

Governing Board deals with issues of the strategy of the ESI and the task of this body, as I see it, is to create the right context, both political, educational and otherwise, for the effective work of the Institute and better results of its work, better feedback. Since I represent the Ministry which will, to some extent, define the task, I don't believe I should interfere in the academic process as such, and I see my task as making the academic courses compatible with what we are doing in relations with the EU: the creation of the common economic space, a common space in culture and education, a common space in internal affairs and justice and so on, because these are the most important fields of cooperation between the EU and Russia. Our Ministry does its best to contribute to the academic process by organizing representatives of the Ministry to give talks here, so that those who study at the ESI should have a better picture of the tasks dealt with by the officials who work on this track at the Ministry. I think this is a very important prerequisite to organizing the academic process well. We also seek to build the academic activities of the Institute into what we are doing. First and foremost, by assistance in organizing seminars and conferences, by suggesting topics to be discussed at these academic conferences, and also by sending representatives of our Ministry and other ministries and agencies of Russia to participate in these conferences.

As a member of the Governing Board, I also do my best to enhance the visibility of the Institute. I am popularizing the Institute, I very often convince my colleagues to come here and give lectures on certain topics. And we are now doing our utmost to invite Ms. Ashton to give a talk at the Institute on the 17th of November, Catherine Ashton, who is the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. If it does take place, it will be the implementation of one of the decisions we took at our previous meetings. On the whole, we seek to integrate what the Institute is doing academically, in translating the basic documents, in providing the legal analysis, into the work of our Ministry, because what the ESI does helps us in our practical work. So we work to encourage such links with the Institute. It should be in-built into the structures dealing with the development of relations between the

European Union and Russia. And we also seek to use the foreign policy contacts of the Ministry for speaking of the Institute, providing information of the Institute and every time we speak of cooperation with the EU, the Institute features high. This is an example that such cooperation between Russia and the European Union is already yielding good results, and the existence of the ESI itself is the embodiment of the political will to create functioning and workable instruments of cooperation between the European Union and Russia. And this is something that is resilient to the ups and downs of the political developments, and shows that our cooperation is sustainable.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Grushko. I think our colleagues from the European Union will appreciate the information you have provided. I don't insist that other members of the Governing Board should provide such an account of their activities, but if somebody wants to take the floor, you are welcome. To the report on my contribution I would like to add that my contribution was quite modest but I'll be doing my best to contribute more and to do everything I can to facilitate the work of the Institute and, what is also important, to create a situation when what the Institute does, will be more and more important for those engaged in practical work, in developing relations between Russia and European Union. I think we all can support what Mr. Grushko has said.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner: Спасибо за предоставленное мне слово. Я благодарен выступившим руководителям Руководящего Совета с российской стороны, но я хотел бы сказать, что мы тоже очень много делаем, чтобы популяризировать Институт в Европейском Союзе. У меня, в частности установлены контакты с Дипломатической Академией в Вене, и студенты этого Института приезжают в Венскую дипломатическую академию, и эти связи оказались очень полезными для обоих учебных заведений.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: I believe that today we are not supposed to provide accounts of what we have done, each of us. I believe, Members of the Governing Board from the EU are contributing immensely to the work of the Institute and they are making a great personal contribution, because all the Members of the Governing Board who are present here take part in the academic process as such, they give lectures here, at the ESI, take part in the conferences that the ESI holds. Our activities and our enhanced role should probably be connected with the new tasks that we have outlined for ourselves. I think that's why we should raise the question of auditing the curriculum and the syllabus that we are offering here, in order to have them certified. For example, our University, MGIMO, is now engaged in having our syllabus and our curricula certified in order to enhance the visibility of our Institute, to increase the rating at the main rating agencies.

I think, similar work should be done for the ESI and, of course, here we should rely and we will rely on the support and assistance of the European professors, who have gone through these procedures with their Universities many times. This is something we should be doing in the future. And I agree with Mr. Prikhodko, that the Institute hasn't existed for long enough, so that this work should be dramatically stepped up. I think that first we should engage in the internal auditing of the work of the Institute, the work of the Members of the Governing Board, and then we can take it to the next level and have it assessed by the rating agencies, and so on and so forth. The issue of the personal contribution does not require a personal report. It is simply meant to give an impetus to each of us to think about what we personally can do to improve the positions of the Institute.

Chairman: Thank you, Academician Torkunov. I think you have already given us sufficient stimuli.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan : Я тоже может быть мог бы сказать несколько слов. Все мы согласны с той мыслью, что поддержка на высоком правительственном уровне в Российской Федерации очень ценная и придает этому проекту тот статус, который наш проект безусловно заслуживает, и мы обсуждаем

сейчас, в какой-то степени, будущее нашего проекта и говорим о нашем личном вкладе. Я думаю, что у нас сейчас уже четырнадцатая встреча и четырнадцатое заседание нашего Руководящего Совета, кроме того, мы работаем в рамках рабочих групп, мы работаем, безусловно, в сфере образования и, конечно, мы готовы участвовать больше в формировании самого образовательного процесса, учитывая наш опыт и мы обсуждали вопросы в конце сентября, и в частности я мог бы предложить новые проекты сотрудничества с различными факультетами моего института, и мы хотели бы предложить в Университете Эразмус в моей правовой школе, мы хотели бы пригласить Ректора, вы знаете это учебное заведение будет проводить заседание в Бухаресте, и мы хотели бы рассмотреть возможность приглашения Ректора, чтобы он рассказал об этом Институте, в таком многонациональном контексте, может быть это было бы очень интересно, и оно могло бы помочь Европейскому Учебному Институту установить связи с различными правовыми школами.

Chairman: These are very important steps and I very grateful to you for what you have said, and for your appraisals. Well, if there is nothing more to say on this issue, I suggest that we go on to the new structure of the ESI, in conjunction, as Academician Torkunov suggested, with the issue of the third Deputy Director. To introduce this subject, I would like to say a few words. We often speak of rotation, the need for the rotation of the Members of the Governing Board, and the Russian part of the Governing Board is thinking about it. One of the possibilities is adding, without expanding the Board, of course, representatives of the broad public of Russia. Professor Torkunov also informed me of the outcome of his talk with Mr. Valenzuela. There is an intention to suggest that some ambassadors from the EU could be invited to participate, on a permanent basis, in the Governing Board. If our partners come to agreement on this point, that will ensure greater continuity and make the work of the Governing Board more efficient.

I also have one more proposal I have not yet discussed with my colleagues. This is the first time I mention it. I don't want you to take a decision on this immediately. We proceed from the need of parity on the board and in the funding. I suggest as an idea for discussion, if it proves to be logistically and financially acceptable, that we should hold one of the meetings of the Governing Board on rotation basis, for example, in Brussels. Then our partners, if they are ready to do that, could ensure the necessary public relations work, ask some representative of the European Commission to be present at this Governing Board Meeting. I would like you to at least weigh up the possibility of such a thing. We should set ourselves practical tasks, but if at some point we feel that we have matured enough to do that, if our colleagues from the European Union and we have a sufficient number of issues which have to be discussed at such a level and in such a format, will you please simply weigh the possibility of doing this at some stage. We, on the Russian side, would be interested in this, and we believe it could be important for the students.

On the second item of the agenda we have as one of the presenters here, Mr. Jaap de Zwaan. He prepared some considerations reflecting what Mr. Valenzuela has submitted to us. This is one set of considerations, and another set of issues is raised in what Mr. Gromyko formulated in his letter. So, I believe that we shall have at least two presenters, two reporters on this item. But since we wanted to consider it along with the issue of creating, possibly, a new committee and the post of the Deputy Director, Mr. Torkunov will speak on this. Mr. De Zwaan is the first to get the floor. You are welcome, Mr. De Zwaan. Or would you like Mr. Torkunov to start? What was your arrangement? OK.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: Maybe, what I'll say will determine the track that we'll be working along. I, as a Member of the Governing Board, appraise this idea positively. I believe that having an Executive Committee as a body which meets more regularly and discusses both the issues of the academic curriculum and the activities of the Institute through the prism of what we discussed earlier, when we engaged in selective auditing, so to speak, of some of the syllabi, and also deals

with administrative and financial issues, without supplanting the Director's Office, but in a way, which would make it possible to report to the Governing Board on its ideas, of course, when the Executive Committee finds it necessary.

I think it is also necessary because when the appointments committee discussed the issue of the third Deputy Director yesterday, unfortunately, it was unable to come to a consensus. Originally, we agreed that on personnel issues we shall take all the decisions by consensus. You know that we took a unanimous decision on Ms. Goudappel, and I think we did everything we could to take that decision: we spent a lot of time studying the CVs and interviewing people. But it so happened that Ms. Goudappel proved unable to accept this proposal and her latest letter leaves no doubt about it. On second thoughts, on having weighed up everything, she came to the conclusion that she does not want to be engaged in administrative work, she wants to be participating only in academic work and she decided that even her application was her mistake.

Yesterday we discussed three candidates. They are all very good candidates: Mr. Vinogradov, Mr. Sielski, and Mrs. Malgin. I would like to report to the Governing Board that we have already discussed the nomination of Mr. Vinogradov and the Members of the Governing Board representing the European Union said they would not interview him, because Mr. Vinogradov participated in the contest on the terms that were announced, but at the time when he took part in the contest he was not a citizen of the European Union. He received EU citizenship later. It is generally recognized that Mr. Vinogradov is a very good professional, who knows the issues we are dealing with, very well. And we also appraised the other two candidates very highly, but after a thorough and very detailed discussion, we came to the conclusion that we could support none of those three candidacies unanimously. They are all very good candidates, but there was no unanimous support for any of them, and I formulated my proposals on the outcome of the meeting in the following way:

We have very little time left before the present Agreement expires, so probably we shouldn't now announce a new tender, a new bidding, because the procedure proves to be very long. It took us a whole year to discuss it after we announced the first tender, so if we started a second tender, the second round of bidding now, it would take us almost to the end of the Agreement. Hopefully, both the European Union and the Russian Federation will support our project further. But maybe, with the establishment of the Executive Committee we could transfer some of the functions that we were planning to entrust to the third Deputy Director, to the Executive Committee - partly, academic functions, partly, - administrative functions. All the more so that today we have the intention of inviting to the Executive Committee people both from Russia and from the EU, who know very well not only the academic issues but also have dealt with administrative issues at some stage in their career.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Torkunov for your proposal. I will express my opinion a little bit later. And now I give the floor to professor De Zwaan.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: спасибо, уважаемый Председатель. Я, прежде всего, хотел бы подчеркнуть, что наше видение Исполнительного комитета, так сказать является консолидированным мнением и я его изложил и, наверное, он должен только помочь в эффективности. Никаких полномочий по принятию решений здесь не может быть, только помогать и администрации Института и Директорату и РС в подготовке вопросов, в осуществлении решений, но только РС является высшим органом и, наверное, он должен встречаться дважды в год именно поэтому, мы такую группу несколько низшего уровня можем сделать для повышения эффективности работы, именно в этом будет состоять ее цель. Я ценю тот отчет, который вы представили о наших вчерашних обсуждениях, к сожалению, мы не сумели прийти к консенсусу в результате этих обсуждений и учитывая, что у нас остается ограниченное время до окончания 2013 начала 2014 года, конечно, можно рассматривать различные соображения, но я готов был поддержать

создание исполнительного комитета, который действительно мог бы помочь нам в организации эффективной работы без повышения какой-то стоимости, если мы можем согласиться все, я готов поддержать.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. De Zwaan. I would like to give the floor to Mr. Gromyko.

Mr. Alexey Gromyko: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say first and foremost that I, personally, proceed from the assumption that for the Governing Board to function, it is very important that the level of interaction should be better and there should be relations of trust between all its members. All the parties, as we have heard today, agree that the existing mechanisms of implementing the aims of the ESI require further development and improvement. And my personal view is that we have to answer the question whether we should simply continue along the road and improve what we already have, or come to the conclusion that we haven't achieved our aims and, probably, change tack a little and create new statutory structures in order to improve the situation in some spheres of our activities. I, for one, believe that the issue of the Executive Committee belongs in the sphere of management, in order to improve the efficiency of the management process. I believe that all of us have agreed that on matters of fundamental importance, the Members of the Governing Board are unanimous in the attitudes to our activities and the question is whether the efficiency of the existing management bodies should be improved by more oversight or whether we should establish new bodies, which would require, some amendments to the statutory documents of the ESI.

I proceed from the assumption that it would be expedient to stress the need for collective decisions on the basis of compromise and taking into account the opinions of all of us, and the opinions of the two sides, of the two parties. If we pose the question of how the Governing Board could be helped in its activities, I see two ways to do it. The first one is to give to the Governing Board additional levers of implementing the existing agenda. And the second option is to establish new statutory supervisory or other structures at a time when we believe that the

potential of the already existing bodies, which are already provided for in the statutory documents, is not used to the full.

As for the two plans to establish the Executive Committee that we have, I would like to report to you that at the time when we received the Proposal from our partners, we discussed it, and prepared our proposal in response to theirs. I believe, it reflects the collective opinion of the Russian members of the Governing Board, that we are open to discussion of both options, and I think everyone knows that Prof. De Zwaan and I have already started discussing the two options, the two possibilities. If there is the will to continue these consultations, I am ready to continue this joint work and probably arrive at some final decisions in the near future in order to achieve the aim all of us are seeking to achieve, when we want to enhance the good things we are doing, where we are happy with what we are doing, and in removing the obstacles we are unhappy about, something we are doing, where we believe that some drawbacks have accumulated over the past years.

Chairman: Are there other people wishing to speak? You are welcome, Mr. Entin.

Mr. Mark Entin: Dear colleagues, I don't know how fully Mr. De Zwaan informed you of the consultations he had with Mr. Gromyko and the proposal which was made to the Governing Board, but you'll find all these documents in your folder. I hope you have all come to the session well prepared with the texts and the specific proposals that have just been mentioned.

Chairman: Thank you. If there are no other comments on this issue, I would like to sum up our discussion on it.

First. The possibility of setting up an Executive Committee. I see no rejection of the idea, and I would say that, in principle, it has been agreed to by all Members of the Governing Board. **Second.** As to the powers and the competences of this body, as well as its composition, these issues require more elaboration, but I think that

we are close to consensus on two issues. The first is for it to have more sessions than the Governing Board and to be accountable to the Governing Board. The second is that the Executive Committee should comprise at least four people, two from each side: from the European Union and from the Russian side. And I think it will be correct to elect or select them from the membership of the Governing Board.

Another idea is to support the proposal of Academician Torkunov and to say once again that because we all did not plan the attempt to find Deputy Director Number 3 well enough, that's why we remove this issue from our agenda now, and the responsibilities of the third Deputy Director are to be delegated to the Executive Committee. I don't know whether we shall raise this issue in the future or not. Mr. Tarschys, you are welcome.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys: Я согласен с вашим суммированием и господином Громько. Добавления: исполнительный комитет не будет дополнительным контролирующим механизмом, это больше участие в сотрудничестве. Поэтому тут надо рассматривать в положительном свете исполнительный комитет как стремление укрепить работу Института и как стремление укрепить и усилить инвестицию и участия со стороны Европейского Союза в работе Европейского Учебного Института и если мы в настоящий момент, может быть, или навсегда, не знаю еще, оставляем идею третьего заместителя директора, то мы сэкономим небольшое количество средств. Эти средства можно использовать для работы исполнительного комитета.

Chairman: A brief comment. I think Prof. Entin will be highly satisfied to have Mr Tarschys's statement reflected in the minutes of our session: **that the Executive Committee will not be a supervisory or controlling body.** Mr. Gromyko, did you want to add something?

Mr. Gromyko: Mr. Chairman, you just took the words out of my mouth, you expressed the very idea I wanted to express. I think Mr. Tarschys's clarification removes the questions which we had.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: что касается второй темы, может быть четче сформулируем, предложение достаточно простое на полторы страницы в отношении функций и компетенций Исполнительного комитета, это просто выполнение того, что решается на Руководящем Совете и подготовка решений, которые будут приниматься на Руководящем Совете, в сотрудничестве с администрацией Европейского Учебного Института, поэтому здесь все просто. Помимо этого не надо пытаться создать ситуацию, когда мы соглашаемся в принципе, но не принимаем конкретного решения, поскольку мы пока не внесли изменение в Устав, надо согласиться в отношении того, что рабочая группа начнет эту работу. Это будет связано с необходимостью внесения поправки в Устав, когда мы может сделать это официально, но как рабочая группа может начать работы. Что касается полномочий: не надо преувеличивать полномочия этого органа, просто для того, чтобы помогать пока в работе Руководящего Совета, выполнение его решений.

Chairman: I agree with your criticism of my statement. It was not quite clear.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys: Хочу подробнее остановиться на этой идее. Мы уже начали говорить об этой теме в прошлый раз, но сейчас мы опять выходим на эту тему, сейчас вы сказали, что есть соглашение в целом, но пока мы не можем окончательно решить, поэтому важно, чтобы на временной основе, в виде рабочей группы начал функционировать Исполнительный комитет. И хотел бы сказать, что эта рабочая группа могла бы заняться разработкой окончательного предложения для нашего Руководящего Совета, для нашего состава Исполнительного комитета, его статуса, его компетенций, может быть не делать это положение слишком сложным, оно должно быть достаточно простым и рабочая группа могла бы работать в виде

Исполнительного комитета и разрабатывать текст положения. Я думаю, что мы быстро приходим к решению проблемы и поскольку мы быстро идем к решению, то я хотел бы предложить господина Де Цваана и Хафнера в качестве членов этой рабочей группы.

Chairman: I second this Proposal; I'd like to propose two people on our side: Mr. Torkunov, if he agrees, and Mr. Gromyko. OK, - Mr. Gromyko and another member of the Governing Board, because we are thinking of rotation, - somebody who will be very active. Now we are talking about the working group, not as a final member of the Executive Committee. We can support the candidacies of Prof. Hafner, Prof. De Zwaan and Mr. Gromyko now. As to the fourth member, let us take some time and think about the fourth candidate.

Rector Torkunov: If you don't mind, I would like to make a small comment. I think the Executive Committee will have more meetings, at different times. It's important to have the people who are physically able to travel and devote more time to the work of the Executive Committee. Therefore I am prepared to work in the Working Group but not as a Member of the Executive Committee later on.

Chairman: As to the official composition of the Executive Committee, we shall decide on it when we have a proposal on the status. There are two different bodies: the Working Group and the Executive Committee. So, you see how transparent our decision-making system is, we are discussing it out loud, openly. So, let's decide on the following: we set up a working group and Mr. Torkunov, please, take note that we need maybe two weeks to elaborate a Proposal on the Executive Committee. ... So, how much time does the Working Group need? Two or three weeks to elaborate a Proposal on the Executive Committee and send the text, the draft proposal, to all members? **The first decision.** We decide to set up a Working Group. **Second.** At this stage we remove the issue of the third Deputy Director and we set up a Working Group of four people, and we give them three weeks to elaborate the Draft Proposal. And please, dear colleagues, be flexible in your approach to the text: it should be good and short, but we ask you to be prepared for

amendments to your text. So we'll take three weeks to prepare this text, and through the electronic voting system we'll send this proposal to all members of the Governing Board. As to the composition of this Executive Committee, we shall decide on that after we adopt the text proposed by the WG on the Executive Committee, after we adopt the provision on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: Я полностью согласен, я думаю было бы очень полезно, если бы мы могли свое заседание провести сразу же после заседания Руководящего Совета. Мы здесь все присутствуем, это могло бы помочь. И тогда в письменном виде мы могли бы достичь хороших результатов.

Chairman: So I'm winding up the discussion on this point. Are there any questions? Any misunderstandings? Is there any need to clarify something? Thank you for a very active and constructive contribution on the part of all members.

According to our rules, if this is a decision, we must either say that there is a consensus, or we must put it to a vote. As to this decision, the way I formulated it, and the wording I used. Are there any people who abstain from supporting this decision or do we have a consensus? We have a consensus. Any objections to the consensus? - No.

Now, let us move to the substantive issues of our agenda. And, as far as I have been informed, the first point is the report on the current activities presented by the Director of the European Studies Institute, Mr. Entin.

Mr. Mark Entin: Dear colleges, I fully agree with the main statement made here during the first part of our discussion, that we must advance, move forward, develop, make use of new forms of cooperation. At our previous sessions, I tried to give a full account of the work of the Institute, and I monopolized the microphone. For our discussion today we suggest another format: just some opening remarks on my part - and then I would like to show to you that we have a team of people working here, at the European Studies Institute, and all of our people have

something to report to you. I will ask all of the members of the Administration to take not more than five minutes and to report on the relevant items of the agenda.

Compared to the previous year, what are the novelties? What are the new results? What are the new achievements? I think that there are a few items that we can report here. **First of all**, we defend the academic freedom, we insist that no political authorities or administration interfere in the content of our lectures, in what our professors write and what they say, what they believe in and what the content of their lectures is. This enables our students to get acquainted with different views, to understand the approach of the European Union to Russia, the relations between the European Union and Russia, to understand the views of the representatives of ministries and the practical specialists and professors. These enable them to have a panorama of views on relations between Russia and the European Union: how the relations are developing and in what direction we're moving. And I think, this academic liberty should be guaranteed and maintained in all possible ways.

Second. Our selection process is undergoing constant improvement, and our work is getting increasingly visible and more and more known through the so-called "vinegrape," i.e. by word of mouth, through informal communication. On the one hand, ministries are more and more interested in sending their staff here as students; on the other hand, our alumni themselves make our work well known. They themselves attract more and more applicants to our Institute, so the number of applications is growing, the competition is getting more tough. We are very cautious, we are aware of the need to preserve the quality of our education and we increase the intake only by several individuals each time. It is my personal impression that the quality of our students is constantly improving. What makes me say this? - Because we see having motivated students as our main objective. They can have a different starting level, but in the process of education, as a result of it, we must be sure that all our trainees improve their level and have sufficient

qualification and expertise to contribute to better relations between Russia and the European Union.

My personal impressions show that the study trips are very important and useful: to the Vienna Diplomatic Academy, to the College of Europe in Bruges, thanks to our colleagues in Vienna and Bruges. We added one more study trip at the invitation of the British Ambassador representing one of the EU countries: a study trip to Birmingham and London. Our students received an opportunity to meet members of the House of Lords, the House of Commons, the Foreign Office, the Treasury and other structures... They met professors, and it was pleasant for me to see how well our students could participate in the discussions with these people, how well prepared they were for the discussions. They asked for the dialogue to be more intensive, for their study trips to acquire new dimensions.

We also made steps to set up the alumni club of the European Studies Institute, and we hope that after this body is set up, it can serve as a bridge between the MGIMO alumni and the European College, because this is also an important instrument of bringing people together – people of Russia and people of the European Union. And now, Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, members of our team, of our administration, can briefly report on their activities. Please, keep to the time limits. I have announced the time limits: preferably, 3 minutes, but not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Mariusz Sielski: Господин Председатель, Ваше превосходительство, профессора, коллеги, я буду краток, все охвачу и скажу позитивно, что процесс отбора студентов, как обычно, был организован не только Европейским Учебным Институтом, но и представителем партнерских организаций Европейским Колледжем. Сейчас я хочу сказать, что у нас есть постоянный контакт с нашими коллегами в Брюгге и мое личное участие, огромная работа моих коллег профессора Тамары Шашихиной и Екатерины Егоровой, которая отвечает за подбор кандидатов. Цифры, которые необходимо упомянуть с самого начала: у нас было 454 кандидата, мы

приняли 149 человек, это подтверждает то, о чем говорил профессор Энтин. Есть представители министерств, представители регионов. Я вчера подготовил свежую статистику в отношении характеристики студентов, там есть и схемы, надеюсь быстро пройти по этой информации, что бы вы увидели особый характер этой программы. Перед вами есть документ, который показывает все цифры, хочу привлечь ваше внимание к тому, что эта программа является исключительной: у нас больше мужчин чем женщин, это связано с тем, что мы готовим гос. служащих. У нас есть три специализации: Европейское право 64 студента, 64 на Политике, я сейчас показываю информацию за три предыдущих года, как меняется возрастная характеристика. Справа вы видите нынешний набор, люди с 25-35 лет, это люди у которых уже есть профессиональный опыт, они проработали в министерствах 5-6 лет. Здесь вы видите откуда поступают студенты: 4 из частного сектора, есть представители органов правосудия, пять человек из университетов, самая важная группа из федеральных агентств – 58 человек, представители Парламента, Совета Федерации, Федерального собрания, Гос. Думы. Следующая категория показывает как меняется статистика, на этой диаграмме вы видите выпуск студентов: самая большая группа в этом году – 80 человек, эта группа из государственных университетов, которые находятся в Москве и это количество растет. Следующая группа – студенты из частных ВУЗов, это количество сокращается, различие в цифрах связано с тем, что у нас больше студентов, чем в прошлом году. Что касается предыдущей квалификации, вы видите, как меняется эта ситуация, количество государственных университетов растет, т.е. студенты, которые приходят сюда уже учились в государственных университетах, они получали образование там, они больше дисциплинированы, привыкли работать в государственных образовательных учреждениях и привыкли к университетскому уровню обучения. Что касается дипломов, самая большая группа, это получившие диплом специалиста, затем есть 14 человек, которые получили магистерскую степень и несколько человек есть кандидатов, есть

кандидаты медицинских наук. Кандидаты наук в основном из Университета внутренних дел, они хотят получить конкретную информацию здесь. Самое высокое количество студентов, которые учились пять лет – это те, которые хотят получить степень магистра. Здесь вы видите распределение студентов, вы видите как меняется тенденция за последние три года. Желтая кривая показывает, что сейчас больше студентов с магистерским дипломом, но есть студенты и с дипломом специалистов, насколько соответствует их специальность по диплому, вы видите по европейскому праву, экономике и политике, всегда мы имеем большинство студентов, которые получили соответствующее образование. В прошлом году мы обсуждали ситуацию с г-жой Адамчук в сфере экономики, у нас вызывала озабоченность та ситуация, когда было немного людей с экономическим образованием, но сейчас это количество выросло, и они очень хорошо учатся. Что касается уровня языка, то уровень улучшается, все больше студентов поступает с отличным уровнем языка, я задаю следующий вопрос, на который легко ответить: наши студенты, даже с хорошим уровнем языка, им все равно необходим перевод, потому что они не знают терминологии. И последняя информация: только 90% человек раньше писали академические работы, т.е. имеют опыт написания академических работ. Это отвечает на вопрос о необходимости преподавания курса о написании документов в письменном виде, юридических документов.

Chairman: I want to thank Mr. Sielski for a very brief but very informative presentation, and very useful information, which gives us a general idea, sums up our impressions of what has been done in the past 3 years and is being done at the Institute.

Mr. Eiki Berg: У меня была отличная возможность читать курс лекций в конце сентября, могу сказать, что мое впечатление было очень положительным, я понял, что большинство студентов слушали лекции на английском, это очень большое улучшение, по сравнению с тем, что было

раньше, но вопрос у меня остается: сколько иностранных студентов было набрано в этом году?

Mr. M. Sielski: В этом году у нас нет иностранных студентов, кроме одного студента, который пишет диссертацию. Она из Италии, но она ходит на наши лекции, ее присутствие очень важно. Есть два студента, которые закончили образование в Европе: один учился в Будапеште в Центральном Университете, другой студент получил такое же образование в другом европейском университете.

Chairman: Other questions? No. Thank you, Mr. Sielski. Let's move to the next point, which is forming the curriculum for the next year.

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina: Let me start by saying that our Institute is developing alongside the evolving standards of the Russian Federation, and the specific feature of the ESI is that it is working in the territory of the Russian Federation, and we are subject to the standards of the Russian Federation. From this viewpoint, the last academic year was quite interesting for us, because a new Education Standard was elaborated for Master's programmes in all the three spheres of specialisation where we train students: international relations, jurisprudence and economics. Besides, amendments were made to the new law on university education adopted in Russia. Which of these developments affected us? First of all, the length of the period of studies was extended to two years, because originally it was supposed to be eighteen months, but the standards now provide for a twenty-four months' duration of studies, which applies to this year's entrants. They were enrolled for two years, or twenty-four months, and those who successfully complete the course of studies and write an application, will be able to take their state exams and to present their Master's thesis in eighteen months. This is not a shortened programme, like it used to be in the past, but an accelerated programme.

So, the Standard changes the wording and has a different approach to this new practice. For us, it is a more convenient and more correct approach, because all of our students are only part-time students, they all have jobs. By the time they have to present their graduation papers, which are the final result of their work (which is true of all Master's students) sometimes they do not have enough time to prepare a good quality paper and we do not allow them to present their paper. Therefore, the new approach, from our point of view, is a good one, and we are happy to adopt the new standards. Students will really have another six months to prepare their Master's paper and dedicate all their time to this work.

At present our syllabus is overloaded, and we'll have to change some of the courses and call them electives, because they used to be compulsory for us as part of our standard. But the new standards introduce new compulsory subjects, for example, for jurisprudence - the History of Legal Theories. In the past we did not offer the course, because most of our students took it when they were Bachelor's Degree students, but now this is part of the federal standards for the Master's programme. For international politics we have a new subject: Megatrends and Global Issues. We did not teach this subject before. So, we have introduced it at the expense of other subjects. The maximum workload of students within one academic year should be fourteen academic hours a week. That is why having an extended academic period is for us a very good way out, because that means we will be able to keep up the level of excellence, and test the knowledge of our students better, and so on and so forth. In this way we can comply with the standards of the Russian Federation.

For the previous intake of students at ESI we made our final examination more tough, our requirements more tough, and, besides their graduation paper, also introduced an oral examination (viva voce) in their main subjects. So, we provided for two state examinations, altogether we shall have six examinations. Students will have fifty or sixty questions they must prepare for the state exams; and these questions cover all the subjects they have studied at the ESI. Students draw an

examination question and provide an oral answer to the State Examination Board. We introduced this practice last year, this year it will continue, and we hope this experience will be positive for us. In this way we will be able to respond to the criticism of our European colleagues, because the quality of education will be proven not only by the graduation paper, which students prepare, but also in viva voce examinations.

Last year, we introduced intensive language courses, which was a recommendation of the Governing Board. This year, we continue this practice and in our law department, which is the largest, we have eight language groups, six groups in the economics department and five groups in politics. In September, students had forty-six contact hours of foreign language training, twelve hours a week (and now only four hours a week), which was a very good incentive for students, to help them understand lectures in English. Thank you! I'm ready to answer your questions.

Chairman: Thank you for your presentation. Now, dear colleagues you can ask Mrs. Shashikhina questions. Are there questions? If there are no questions, we are grateful to you for a very concise and precise statement.

The next issue deals with refresher courses, seminars and new tracks in the work of the ESI this year and next year. I think, Mr. Entin, you report on this, don't you?

Mr. Mark Entin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Colleagues, our Chairman has already mentioned today a certain political order to fill, so to speak, with the conferences and seminars of our Institute. It is mostly focused on the construction of the common spaces that have been defined in the Russia-EU documents, and the popularization of the results of the dialogue and the program of cooperation that Russia and the European Union have. These are the guidelines for our Institute, and today we have already established a system when on a regular basis we provide a course on the common space of security and justice, and cooperation between police, law enforcement and judicial bodies of Russia and the EU. This is

a very important track. This is the task, so to speak, that we receive from our ministries and agencies. This week a big group of people from different ministries and agencies is attending such a course. This time it deals with the legal issues pertaining to migration in Russia and the European Union. It's one of the new dialogues that have been launched in relations between Russia and the European Union. It also provides analysis for our judicial bodies of how the judicial system functions in the European Union and analysis of the whole variety of the latest cases that have been dealt with by the ECJ, by the judicial system of the European Union.

We have a very specific agreement with the Justice Ministry, on organizing seminars for all the ministries and agencies of the Russian Federation, in order to raise the standards in human rights protection, the implementation of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, and in order to understand better what the Russian obligations are, what has changed in the legislation of Russia, what is changing now for Russian legislation to be up to the mark. About a hundred and fifty people have come from different parts of Russia, and they are comparing the compatibility of Russian standards with European standards. We had a similar seminar last year, and this year we have decided to move farther. We have come to agreement both with our clients, so to speak, and with the lecturers, that there will be special round table discussions for different interest groups, from different agencies of the Russian Federation.

We have an agreement of cooperation with the Federal Antimonopoly Service. We are now working on what priority issues are for this Service, because of the dramatic changes which have lately been introduced into the antimonopoly legislation of the Russian Federation in order, on the one hand, to make the legislation more efficient, and, on the other hand, to get rid of the minor things that the regional bodies of the Antimonopoly Service and the federal bodies are being flooded with. This is similar to what the European Commission in her quality of European Antimonopoly Service did some time ago.

We have also planned a conference on the dynamics of relations between Russia and the European Union, including *Partnership for Modernization*, and issues of international security. Of course, the Foreign Ministry contributes significantly to holding these events. Our program also includes issues of the foreign policies of the Russian Federation and the European Union, and new formats of cooperation, with third parties, with different regions. Last year, we had a brainstorming session together with our partners from the BRIC countries and the members of the European Union, on the prospects of establishing direct contacts between the Russian Federation and the BRIC countries, on the one hand, and the European Union, on the other. And, as a result, we put forward a prospective agenda for the summit of these organizations and such an agenda would be very interesting. In holding that brainstorming session and organizing this conference we used the ideas of many people, including Mr. Nikonov. We are going to continue developing and facilitating such activities and establishing contacts between the European Union, Russia and other countries.

We spoke about relations between Russia, the United States and the European Union, and we are planning in May, I think, a new conference on this topic, because many issues of the global agenda, and many issues of current international relations, simply cannot be dealt with and resolved on a bilateral basis, and they should be dealt with in a trilateral format. The Russian Embassy to the United States of America gave a very high assessment of our initiatives in this field.

All the events that we are holding are always announced in advance on the site of MGIMO and the European Studies Institute. On the day the event takes place or on the next day, we place an account of what was discussed at these events, be it a short-term course or a conference, the description of what was said, and sometimes, the practical proposals that have been put forward. In order to make it easier for you to familiarize yourselves with all these materials, you will find a number of links in your dossier folders, and those links will take you directly to all those materials. We usually have on the site the plan of what we are going to do,

everything that the ESI is doing, and we have information on the future short-term courses and planned conferences. The only qualification I should make is that we cannot plan in advance ALL the requests and suggestions that would be made for our activities by the Foreign Ministry and other ministries and agencies.

Mrs. Elena Danilova: The Ministry of Economic Development, which I represent here, would like to stress how important this work is, and the ESI's contribution to working out strategic approaches to developing relations between Russia and the European Union. The promptness of organizing those conferences and brainstorming sessions helps us find responses to the questions that arise in the development of the world economy, the issues of interacting with the civil society, which we permanently discuss within the framework of our *Partnership for Modernization* process. We believe that we also contributed a great deal to the format that the Institute provides, involving a broad range of participants in those seminars and conferences. We see it as a very important contribution to the establishment and development of the civil society and the civil networks. We hope it will continue next year and it will help us in the work we are now doing. We are creating a site *Partnership for Modernization*, and I would like to inform you that the Ministry for Economic Development this year has appropriated five million rubles, and next year, nine more million rubles will be appropriated to create the site. We have agreed on the format with the European Commission, and we shall provide information on the dialogues we are working on, on the projects which are being implemented, information on the financial instruments which are available to the broad public. We see it as a very important way of interaction for the medium- and small-sized businesses. We also believe that this can provide a greater link to the civil society and the social networks. We would like to continue this work. Thank you.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: Я хотел бы поблагодарит представителей министерства, это действительно очень важно и повышает престиж Института, однако, для того, чтобы Руководящий Совет больше участвовал в разработке программ, я

хотел бы задать вопрос: нельзя ли на следующее весеннее заседание представить программу курсов, конференций и у меня бывает такое впечатление, хотя я приветствую все эти усилия потому, чтобы деятельность Института была более видимой, у меня бывает такое впечатление, что, может быть, было бы лучше сосредоточить программу этих курсов по какому-то более узкому кругу? И когда мы говорим о повестке дня, мы говорим, что будем разрабатывать программу исследовательской деятельности ЕУИ, и мне кажется, что мы хотели бы познакомиться и с учебной программой и может быть какие-то предложения в области приоритетов исследования и какие-то предложения по проведению семинаров на весеннем заседании. На меня глубочайшее впечатление произвело перечисление всех видов деятельности, но мне кажется, что, может быть, стоит сосредоточить внимание на каком-то ограниченном круге приоритетов, потому, что это было бы более эффективно, с точки зрения использования тех средств, которыми мы располагаем.

Mr. Mark Entin: I believe, we should agree with Mr. De Zwaan: such information should be prepared for the spring meeting of the GB. The only thing I would like to stress: I know it from practical experience that the agenda of a conference is very often defined in accordance with the requests which some of the ministries have expressed, because these are the issues that they are confronting in their practical dealings with the European Union, and they add their own concerns and topics. They usually do it shortly before the conference. It is the duty of the Director's Office of the Institute to define the agenda of the conference. Of course, we take these requests into account, but this does not make it unnecessary to select the focal points for planning our conferences. I would like to give you a few examples. Some time ago, the Ambassadors of some Central European countries turned to us asking for a crash conference, so to speak, on the situation in Belarus - and we did it. I hope, the Central European countries found it very useful and fruitful, and we also found it very fruitful and interesting.

I would like to add something to what Prof. De Zwaan said: we work out the education program jointly with the College of Europe and it is a matter of principle. It is not some abstract program, but we actually fill every line with the course and the name of the professor. At first, we have a talk with every potential professor and then, we make all the necessary changes in the curriculum and the syllabus. So, what we arrive at eventually, is the fruit of our joint work. Working out the syllabus and shaping the academic process are joint work done both by us and the College of Europe. Of course, the agenda for the ESI in general is shaped by both the Russian Federation and the European Union, so I believe that the recommendations on what the conferences should discuss, of course, should come not only from the College of Europe, but also from the Governing Board, because on your side, on the European Union side, you probably see it better what we are doing here in our research work in Russia, which could be useful for improving cooperation between Russia and the European Union, and your perspective may be different from ours.

Mrs. Elena Danilova: I agree with what has already been said, that sometimes we have too many topics included in the activities of the Institute, sometimes rather minor topics find their way onto the agenda. They may be useful, such things as a brainstorming session, for example, but of course require some funding and a lot of effort, but there are many other structures that deal with cooperation with the European Union, so of course the requests of the ministries, such as the Ministry for Economic Development and the Antimonopoly Service, should be met, because they are major ministries and agencies. I think we are all interested in having an agenda for the next year shaped jointly, taking into account the recommendations of the Governing Board members from the European Union.

I would also like to remind you that within the Partnership for Modernization Declaration, we have a plan of action and all the events we are to organize are mentioned there. On the 16 of November, coordinators will be meeting, and there is a large list of projects, some of them may be dubious, because they are very

weakly connected with partnership for modernization. Some constructive recommendations which the supervisory board members, or Governing Board members would make could be useful. We are going to discuss these issues in the regime of the Internet conference and we could take your suggestions into account. We could discuss them with our partners. We have some projects funded by the European Investment Bank, we have some funds provided by the European institutions and if it is part of the plan and if it has been selected, if it has been vetted, first there must be an application for holding an event, it should be endorsed by the representative of the dialogue, then it goes to the Commission for consideration, and the key events which you believe should be held next year could be added to it.

Chairman: Thank you, Elena Vladimirovna. Would anyone like to make any more remarks on this? Professor De Zwaan.

Mr. Jaap de Zwaan: Еще одно замечание, которое связано с краткосрочными курсами, которые вы организуете по просьбе третьих организаций. Я хотел бы повторить – в стратегическом докладе 2009 года указывалось, что эти курсы в какой-то степени должны быть на платной основе. Иногда у меня бывает такое впечатление, что можно было эти курсы действительно полностью финансировать за счет их платности.

Chairman: Thank you. Let us move further, if you don't have objections. The question of the new Deputy Director has already been resolved. The next issue is to create an association of the alumni of the European Studies Institute. Is that correct, Mark? Mr. Marchan has the floor.

Mr. Mikhail Marchan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Dear members of the Governing Board. On the 30th of September this year, the first meeting of the alumni of the ESI and the students of this Institute took place. It was organized by the Administration, by the Director's Office of the ESI, with the assistance of the European Delegation to Moscow and the College of Europe. More than 200 people

participated in it, including 80 graduates. You have a brief on this in your folder. The key event of the meeting was the establishment of the Club of Alumni of the ESI. The graduates of the Institute made a decision and took some practical steps to form such a club. First and foremost, the President and Vice President of the club were elected. They received *carte blanche* to set up an organizing group and work out a statutory document on the Club of Alumni, so as to be able to hold a meeting in the first quarter of next year, to have a meeting of the alumni and adopt this statutory document. These are people who are interested, they are people with real initiative. In the period since September 30 they have had two meetings to discuss various proposals, and they have elaborated draft provisions of the document. We have every reason to hope that this Alumni Club will not be just a nominal body, but a very live and creative body, which will pursue its main objective, that is, to contribute to the contacts between our alumni and to involve them in a more active form in the endeavours aimed at bringing closer Russia and the European Union.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Marchan. Are there any questions? Let's move on. The next point of the agenda is the work of the Committees of the European Studies Institute.

Mr. Mark Entin: Dear colleagues, at the previous session we decided that the Governing Board activity would be enhanced and complemented by the work of the Committees and by specific discussions of specific issues in the Committees. Now, we have a chance to see what concretely has been done by the Committees and, maybe, plan new structures. We decided not to introduce into our discussion the Committee on Student Selection, because we have discussed it. Mr. Mariusz Sielski in his presentation showed the results to you. The second Committee, on Faculty Selection, is now working in a depleted form, because most of our teachers, who come here, work permanently. We are very cautious in selecting the Faculty. We suggest that we should discuss other Committees.

Chairman: Now, I would like to give the floor for information on Publications and Visibility Committee to Prof. Hafner.

Mr. Gerhard Hafner: Спасибо. В вашей подборке материалов есть один отчет об этом заседании – комитета по редакционной деятельности, но это не самый свежий отчет, т.к. 1 июня у нас состоялось заседание этого комитета и, насколько я знаю, отчет был разослан членам Руководящего Совета. Три момента необходимо подчеркнуть, которые обсуждались на нашем заседании. 1. Это связь с общественностью, редакторская политика и вопрос журнала «Вся Европа». Вопрос, который затрагивал господин Де Цваан в отношении конференций, мы уже говорили об этом, когда обсуждали редакционные стандарты при подготовки конференций, связи с общественностью, то мы рекомендовали использовать интернет, чтобы на него могли выходить те, кто не говорит по-русски, поэтому надо усиливать английскую версию сайта. Также связь с общественностью расширяется благодаря включению в журнал «Вся Европа» информации об Институте. Что касается расширения информации об Институте, мы говорили о том, чтобы разослать соответствующее письмо в Европейские Парламенты и сообщать им о деятельности ЕУИ, так же можно это сделать через офис Представительства Европейского Союза здесь в Москве. Что касается редакторской политики, мы обсуждали, переводить ли нам учебник, который был напечатан в ЕС, на русский язык, чтобы показать российским студентам логику функционирования Европейского Союза, как это понимается в Европейском Союзе. Пока решение мы не приняли, и это проблема, конечно, финансирования перевода такого издания. Мы также обсуждали возможность анализа коллег из других мест тех статей и книг, которые появляются со стороны коллег из других стран. Что касается журнала «Вся Европа», мы высказывали озабоченность этим журналом и задавали конкретные вопросы Директору Института в отношении руководства этого журнала, и нам разъяснили, дали свое предложение по редакторской

деятельности. Спасибо Вам за письмо, которое вы направили мне лично в отношении редакторской деятельности. Хочу вас заверить, что я очень серьезно отношусь к вашему письму, оно заслуживает серьезного обсуждения. Вопрос также затрагивался в отношении того, создать ли редакторский комитет по редакторской политике, в отношении журнала «Вся Европа». Мы не подошли к концу всех этих обсуждений, нам необходимо их продолжать, необходимо продолжать работу нашего комитета. Мы хотели провести заседание после заседания Руководящего Совета, но нет некоторых членов нашего комитета. Может быть, краткое проведем, по техническим вопросам, но не более того. И определим дату проведения следующего заседания и убедимся, что члены комитета смогут принять в нем участие. Я буду очень благодарен за ваше будущее участие в этой работе. Спасибо.

Chairman: I would like to thank Professor Hafner for this important information. Do you have questions or comments? If not, I would like to give the floor to Prof. Tarschys.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys: У меня уже была возможность представить этот доклад на предыдущем заседании, поэтому предложение можно рассматривать на заседании рабочей группы.

Chairman: Thank you. We had another item, on setting up a Committee on Ethics. Maybe, it should first be discussed by the Executive Committee. We do not reject this Proposal (this is Mr. Entin's initiative). We take seriously all the initiatives of the Russian and European participants, so we take note of his initiative, and Academician Torkunov and I suggest that we discuss it at a later date.

A question for clarification: on Executive Committee.

Chairman: The creation of the Executive Committee. We have already exchanged views on this, we have adopted a decision, this item of the agenda does not require further consideration.

Now, the date of the next session. Dear Members of the Governing Board, please, put down in your calendars two possible dates – these are the dates that we suggest – April 12 or April 26. If you don't have any major events and engagements that can prevent us from holding our session on one of these dates, add them to your calendars. And please allow us to make the final decision in a couple of weeks.

Preference for April 26th is expressed.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela: Я тоже предлагаю 26. Извиняюсь за осложнение ситуации, но хочу затронуть другой вопрос. То, что касается следующего заседания. Может быть, обсудим дату позже, после того как обсудим пункт «Разное». Я хочу затронуть момент, который связан с руководством. Это не критическое, не негативная оценка, но было бы правильно, я считаю, чтобы не было руководства Института в этом зале, когда мы будем обсуждать их деятельность.

Chairman: It was so diplomatically expressed, that nobody understood what you meant. There was a time when we made a consensus decision about the second term for the director of the European Studies Institute. His second term is to expire next September. And our Statute only provides for two terms, so we have to think about the next director. We have to make our decision. Mr Valenzuela, is this what you had in mind but expressed in such a diplomatic way? We don't want to ask Prof. Entin to leave the boardroom, and I will make things easier by saying that he has told me in advance that he does not plan to run for another term, and we have to select another person, anyway. Therefore, it is very tactful and ethical of you to suggest that we should not subject him to the torture, so to speak, of listening to our discussion of what is to be done about him, but your fears are unwarranted. Did I understand you correctly, Prof. Entin, that you do not plan to run for the third term? Please, confirm to our colleagues that I understood you correctly.

Prof. Entin: Dear colleagues, I have a year left and I would like to ask you all, and first of all, the European Union delegation, to provide maximum support in

our setting up the Board of Trustees, so that when I leave the European Studies Institute at the end of my term, it should have a good financial base. And I hope that this idea, setting up the Board of Trustees, could be the first one to be discussed by the new body, i.e. the Executive Committee. Have I answered your question?

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela: Только частично. Я попросил администрацию выйти потому, что когда мы обсуждаем вопросы, связанные с человеком, который отвечает за эту работу, – он не находится в зале, но я не буду создавать эту проблему, потому что я не хотел критиковать. Если в сентябре следующего года у нас будет новый директор, надо начинать задумываться, как надо поступать. Поэтому я и говорил, что это связано с датой проведения следующего заседания Руководящего Совета, потому что нам будет нужно рано провести, чтобы одобрить процедуру отбора нового директора. Именно это я и хотел сказать, что необходимо провести обсуждение и, наверное, апрель это слишком поздно, потому что если отсчитать время для отбора, то с апреля по сентябрь слишком мало времени, чтобы выбрать нового директора

Chairman: But as far as I understand, we don't have a fixed selection procedure, and in appointing Prof. Entin there was no bidding procedure, no tender. Of course, there should be some selection procedure, and maybe the Executive Committee should be entrusted with this task and come up with a proposal. I think it would be a correct approach, a very substantive thing to do for the Executive Committee: how we should organize this selection process. Mr. Gromyko, do I understand correctly that you want to support this idea? Mr. Tarschys has the floor.

Mr. Daniel Tarschys: Абсолютно тот же подход и у меня. Мудрость создания Исполкома сейчас подтверждается этим решением, потому что у нас будет возможность доверить Исполкому всю необходимую подготовительную работу, с тем, чтобы к следующему заседанию Руководящего Совета мы были готовы принять решение. Поэтому нам не

надо фиксировать на заседании Руководящего Совета всю процедуру отбора нового директора, мы можем доверить это рабочей группе, которая потом превратится в исполнительный совет.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: Then we shall leave these two dates, and for our April Session the Executive Committee will have done the preliminary work, and members of the Executive Committee must be appointed through the Internet when in three weeks we adopt the provisions on the Executive Committee. I suggest putting this to a vote. As to the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee after we adopt the provisions, we already have two candidates from the European Union, we have one from the Russian side and we shall take a decision on the second candidate from the Russian side after consultations. So, members of the Working Group, you could start your work in this composition, and work for, maybe, a month or six weeks. Once the provisions on the EC are in place, we'll adopt them by e-mail... Is it OK, Mr. Valenzuela? Are you happy with this approach?

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela: Я считаю, что правильно. Я считаю, что надо составить описание обязанностей директора и сдать какой-то набор кандидатов. Вопрос в том, можно ли в письменном виде решать эти проблемы.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: I think we have the job description in the Statute, in our rules. We only need provisions on the selection procedure.

Chairman: Thank you.

Mrs. Tamara Shashikhina: This is something where I disagree with the Rector. I would like to ask Members of the Governing Board to recall that the first contract was signed for three years and it was extended for a year. That is why the previous contract lasted four years, and we saved money in this way. The term of the current director expires a year earlier than the second project ends. But we must understand that in terms of the financial responsibilities and accounting, these must

be done by the same person who was responsible for the expenses. Therefore I want the Committee and the Governing Board to take this into account.

Chairman: I think we'll find a technical solution, which will coincide with the political objective of ensuring the continuity, coherence, and also take into consideration the legal obligations of our partners, as far as the accounting business is concerned.

As we are looking so much into the future, in the item Miscellaneous, I wanted to focus on an issue which was touched upon in several presentations and comments today and ask you the question: what is to happen to this child of ours after 2013, taking into account in advance the need to include the expenses into the respective budgets of the European Union, of the European Commission and the Russian Federation? I will take the responsibility and say that during the Brussels Summit - if I am not mistaken, on December 15, between Russia and the European Union - we are prepared to reconfirm the interest of the Russian Federation in this form of cooperation, which proved worthwhile, but we need to feel a similar interest on the part of our partners. Do you follow me, do you agree with me? We must do it well in advance. And we must take a decision to this effect not later than the spring of 2012. Our final decision whether it has been worthwhile, because we have a three year budget planning process. Of course, we will be able to find a way out, but it's better to deal with such things in advance. And I would like to ask Mr. Valenzuela: please, keep this in mind when you prepare your information, your proposals, which you are going to send to Brussels in preparing for the next Russia-EU summit.

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela: Есть еще два-три момента. Считаю, что очень правильно, что вы задаете этот вопрос, его необходимо обсудить на Саммите, это проект, который заслуживает политического внимания. Но сейчас я хотел бы коснуться другого момента. С одной стороны, в зависимости от планирования наших расходов, возможно, конечно, продлить подачу заявки, с определенными ограничениями, нельзя продлевать бесконечно, но на

какой-то период времени можно продлить. Другой момент, возможно, это наша последний взнос в бюджет, потому что такие взносы производятся одноразово, но учитывая важность этого проекта и то, что этот проект работал хорошо, чрезвычайное решение внести второй вклад в этот проект. Нельзя считать, что полностью невозможно дополнительное финансирование и в будущем, но необходимо рассматривать этот проект с другого угла. В то время, как у вас есть механизм постоянного финансирования, т.к. это российский институт, в рамках Европейской Комиссии, которая финансирует этот проект с нашей стороны, в ее задачи не входит постоянно финансировать учебные заведения ни в ЕС, ни в других странах. Этот проект должен иметь временные ограничения, и Европейская Комиссия не может продолжать финансирование, потому что нам скажут, что это не наша задача. Конечно, в будущем мы можем найти какие-то модальности решения этой проблемы. Госпожа Данилова говорила о возможных проектах, других вариантах, которые могут соответствовать данной концепции, которые необходимо изучить на будущее. Но, если проект подходит к концу, то это связано с взносами из бюджета. Конечно, возможны политические обсуждения, но я думаю, что торопиться не надо, потому что мы только начинаем вторую фазу нашего проекта, время у нас еще есть. Но, как и многое другое, такие вопросы надо обсуждать на раннем этапе.

Chairman : Mr. Valenzuela mentioned some difficult, complicated, hard things for us to comprehend. If this is the attitude of the European Union, then what do you understand as the end of the project? That we must prepare in advance to close up the European Studies Institute if this is the end of the project? Or that we won't have the Governing Board, no lecturers will come from the European Union? What are we to get ready for? Let's call a spade a spade, let's be blunt: we have a joint Russian-European academic institute. It's up to the competent bodies of the European Union to finance it or not, we cannot ask them for it. Then we must prepare ourselves to close up the project. If I heard you correctly, you said that

every project has to come to an end, and this must affect our activities. There are other programmes here, in Russia, where we hope for the parity contribution on the part of the European Union. If we must prepare for the end of the project, then this applies to the Members of the Governing Board as well. That's rather unexpected for me, unexpected wording for me, because we do not tell you how much effort it takes on my part to keep this organization afloat. That's my impression, if I understood you correctly. But, maybe, I didn't understand you correctly?

Mr. Fernando Valenzuela: Может быть, я нечетко себя выразил. Мы не говорим о конце Института, мы говорим о конце финансирования, это совсем разные вещи. Мы вносим свой вклад в этот проект, в проект по сотрудничеству с Россией, но это должен быть российский институт. Так планируется, мы сотрудничаем с самого начала, как планировалось на три года, уже продолжается четыре и решение, учитывая важность проекта, было принято продолжить еще на новый период и одобрить новое финансирование, но в какой-то момент должен наступить конец. Европейская Комиссия не имеет полномочий постоянно поддерживать академическое учреждение ни в ЕС, ни в других странах. Я не знаю, какова будет продолжительность, но Институту необходимо становиться самостоятельным и идти на своих ногах. Мы помогли и в финансовом плане начать работу Института, а также своим участием, участием ученых со стороны Европейского Союза и сотрудничали, но наступает момент, когда природа характера должна меняться.

Chairman: We are not asking for money. A question was raised by you on the procedure of selecting the next Director of the European Studies Institute. If in 2013 the European Union stops its funding, then why should we consult you on the selection procedure and the appointment of a new director? What will be the relation of the European Union to the appointment of the Director of a Russian educational institute? If all this is only until 2013, why are we all thinking about the long-term prospects, speaking about the publishing activities and regional

activities? I am thankful to you for saying it in a straightforward way. But then we should probably somehow regroup our forces... We are taking all the opinions of the members of the Governing Board into account, because we understand that these are people who are responsible, to some extent, for how the money of the European taxpayers is spent, but if it comes to an end, then - I shall say it again in a straightforward way - then we will appoint the Director.

We do not have contract for a year and a half, that probably would be contrary to the Russian legislation. If we have to appoint a person for a year and a half, then we shall come to MGIMO, or Moscow State University. I want you, Mr. Valenzuela to understand it.... Well, your political information will have to be followed by some practical steps by us. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Daniel Tarschys: Разрешите, во-первых поддержать инициативу российской стороны поднять этот вопрос на саммите 15 декабря Россия-ЕС, потому что действительно Институт работает хорошо, и нужно, наверное, это сделать. Посол Валенсуэла абсолютно справедливо говорит, что обычно Европейская Комиссия не поддерживает на протяжении какого-то времени какие-то учебные заведения. Есть очень много таких учебных заведений, которые хотели бы иметь такую поддержку. Но Европейская Комиссия говорит, что мы помогаем в создании таких учебных заведений, мы помогаем им на протяжении какого-то времени, а потом мы надеемся, что они станут на крыло и станут самостоятельными, тогда мы пакуем свои чемоданы, а вы продолжаете свою деятельность. Но этим я хотел бы сказать, в европейском ландшафте мы можем найти несколько таких институтов, которые на постоянной основе финансируются из европейского бюджета. Не буду сейчас называть их конкретное название, но они есть и в сфере высшего образования, и в исследовательской сфере. Европейский Союз не отказывается от идеи более долгосрочного финансирования, но решение должно приниматься на достаточно высоком уровне, оно должно быть на более прочной основе. И нужно очень осторожно подходить к этому вопросу.

Посол Валенсуэла совершенно справедливо говорит о том, какова обычно позиция Европейской Комиссии. И здесь надо сказать о том, что есть необходимость в творческом подходе, и я думаю, что мы начали очень хороший проект, и мы должны найти какие-то источники финансирования, и это одна из причин создать Попечительский совет. То есть будет дополнительная поддержка, и надо подумать вместе с российскими властями о внешнем финансировании, например, третьими сторонами, найти такие возможности, полностью или частично. Есть веские причины рассматривать это в самом широком контексте, и нужно также рассматривать и в панорамном виде и, в том числе, в вопросе европейского финансирования.

Chairman: If I may, I would like to respond to Mr. Tarshys. Neither I, nor the Russian members of the Governing Board, nor the Russian leadership doubt in the least the importance of this Institute and the need to maintain it, in order to provide training for our civil servants, but the modality of all the decision-making, internal decision-making at the ESI will change if the funding by the European Commission stops. I hope you will take it with understanding. I'm very grateful to you for coming to the ESI twice or three times a year, because you help us - and I am not speaking of Mr. Entin personally, but about myself, too - you help us overcome a certain inertia, you take a fresh look at things, and you help us as partners. What I'm saying is that with the decisions that have been suggested, that is, to accelerate the appointment of the future director of the ESI, we should change the modalities of decision-making. It should reflect the objective situation. I think Academician Torkunov wants to correct me or to support me...

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: Definitely to support you and support the idea that there is the need to raise the issue at the Summit in Brussels, because ours is not simply an educational project, it probably is the only project which is funded on a parity basis by the European Commission and the Russian Federation Government. It serves both the interests of Russia and the interests of the EU, because in this case we are participating in the implementation of many plans declared by the

Russian Federation and the European Union, - the dialogue, the common spaces - and we are training people for working with the European Union.

Since we also set ourselves the task of inviting foreign students here, we can speak of this Institute as one where not only Russians are trained for work with the EU, but also where people from the European Union are to be trained for cooperation with Russia. Such training could also be fruitful and useful for personnel working on Eastern Partnership. Maybe, some students from the Baltic countries will be interested in our training, maybe, from some Central European countries. So, I think that if there is a will, we will always be able to find some modalities for funding the project without speaking about this being an educational project, which will be forever funded by the European Commission and the Russian Federation. It could be a versatile project - educational, research and so on...

I think, we all understand the Institute should be earning money, too, - it goes without saying, you are absolutely right - on the basis of fee-based short-term courses and by admitting fee-paying students. There are now several, not many. This practice could be expanded. But we did not invite fee-paying students mainly because we were training people for the government agencies, because, of course, many people can be recruited from the private sector, but we deliberately were giving preference to the civil servants, to people working in the government ministries and agencies. That was done on the decision of the Governing Board, and I believe it was right at the stage when our cooperation with the European Union is still not very well understood by our civil servants - and it requires a lot of knowledge. There is a very complicated mechanism - sometimes people even speak of a monster mechanism - which exists in the European Union, which should be understood by our people dealing with the European Union in their practical life.

I think we would have to ask Mr. Prikhodko to help us find new possibilities of funding. I hope, I'll be supported by the Russian members of the GB and our distinguished professors from the European Union. Mr. Entin should also consider

in more detail other modalities, as Mr. Tarschys said, in order not to infringe the rules that exist in the European Union, of how to find the possibilities of further funding. We probably don't even understand fully the importance of what the Institute is doing. Now the people we are training are working in lower-to-medium positions, but in five or ten years they will be in the leadership positions in their ministries, and what they know about the European Union will play a most important role in our cooperation. I would like to say that one of the heads of a federal agency is actually studying here.

I would also like to mention the following: the unique nature of the ESI consists not only in what the Institute teaches - it's the only project where in one project we combined two legislations. I was involved in the project since its inception, and I remember what political will was necessary in order to establish in the Russian territory, on the basis of Russian legislation, an Institute that would serve both Russian and European interests, and which would meet the standards of the European Union. If we lose this platform, it will be very difficult to recreate it. It is a unique achievement, and a lot of experience and effort was put into it.

Chairman: Dear colleagues, I would like to express my gratification at this useful and fruitful discussion of all the issues. I'm very glad that we managed to discuss them in a very open way. I hope that our discussions in the European Union will help our colleagues from the European Union to better understand our view of the problems, as seen from our angle, - and then probably the European Union will have a better idea of this. I would like to thank very much everyone for a very constructive, critical and friendly approach to these issues of the functioning of the ESI. I would like to call on all of you, colleagues from the European Union, to use every possibility, to leave no avenue unexplored, in order to be able to find new ways to continue this cooperation. It is not only a question of money - it is a question of jointly managing and jointly administering the ESI, deciding on the key issues of training the personnel for the civil service. All of you and all of us are engaged in one thing: we are training and creating a new stratum of our civil

servants, we are managing this project jointly. There are some faults in the system of jointly managing and administering this project. I appeal to you, if someone asks you whether the project should continue to function, to use every possibility to argue that it should. Mr. Tarschys, would you like to say something else? So, let us so far reserve two possible days for the next GB meeting, April 12 and 26. Or do you prefer April 26?

GB Member from the EU: Я выступаю за двадцать шестое и я считаю, что лучше назначить одну дату.

Chairman: Let us mention these two dates, let us compare notes in a week. I simply want you to take a week. Then, by default, so to speak, if you don't say that you have some objections to April 26, this will be final date for which we fix the next meeting of the GB and, of course, we must inform the other members of the GB. Academician Torkunov is always right: of course, this will make it possible for us to get their consent to this date. Is that OK? Well, thank you very much, everyone. Yes, you are welcome.

Member of the GB from the EU: У меня два вопроса: 1. Я помню, что был вопрос, не встретиться ли нам в Брюсселе в следующий раз?

Chairman: Well, I did not say that the next meeting of the GB should take place in Brussels. I was simply suggesting that one of the meetings of the GB could be held in Brussels. Well, of course, here, in Moscow, we cannot take a decision on when we shall meet in Brussels, we must get an invitation from Brussels. I believe, that a meeting in Brussels could be useful for the ideas which, I hope, the leadership will formulate at the December Summit, because then it will be possible to better familiarize the Brussels bureaucracy with our ideas. We can hold the meeting in English, we can invite everyone who interested to take part in it. This would be interesting.

Member of the GB from the EU: рабочая группа сегодня еще встретится, так? В 2.30 в офисе Ректора? У меня в три часа запланирована одна процедура открытия испанского центра.

Rector Anatoly Torkunov: If you have time during lunch... OK, at 2:30 at my Office.

Chairman: Did you want to contribute to our discussion, Mr. Entin?

Prof. Entin: I want to speak to the Working Group, Rector Torkunov has a number of events today. Maybe, Tamara V. Shashikhina will take part in the WG meeting and contribute to it? And one more question which also stems from what we are discussing now, in light of the need to step up the self-funding of the ESI, the issue of the Board of Trustees becomes ever more urgent. So, maybe, the delegation could consider taking some steps which could accelerate this? The Status has already been defined in the Statutory Documents of the ESI; we have already discussed our proposals at the GB meetings and in other ways. In order to continue moving forward, the co-Chairmen should be appointed. Well, we agreed that the status should be defined after we establish the Executive Committee. We shall not delay this.

Chairman: Thank you very much for you efforts, for you participation in the meeting and for you patience.

And thank you from all of us to the Chairman, for his focused attention and for his patience.