

Working Group on Social Dimension

Twelfth Meeting, Belgium
24-25 October 2023

Minutes of meeting

List of Participants

Country/Organization	Name	Last Name
Belgium Flemish Community	Patrick	Willems
Belgium French Community	Justyna	Nerkowska
Belgium French Community	Caroline	Hollela
Croatia (Co-Chair)	Ninoslav Šćukanec	Schmidt
Denmark	Maria	Køpke
ESU - European Students' Union (Co-Chair)	Horia	Onita
EUA - European University Association	Gohar	Hovhannisyan
European Commission	Svein	Hullstein
EUROSTUDENT	Martin	Unger
Germany	Carlotta	Eklöh
Malta	Valerie	Attard
Poland	Krzysztof	Marcyński
Romania	Oana Alexandra	Țîntar
BFUG Secretariat	Oltion	Rrumbullaku

1. Welcome remarks and approval of the agenda

The Co-Chairs welcomed everybody to the twelfth meeting of the 2021-2024 work period. The minutes of the eleventh meeting were approved. Moreover, an outline of the agenda was provided, which was adopted without any changes. A tour de table took place, during which the members explained their respective roles within the institutions/bodies they represented, as well as on their contribution to the social dimension group.

For more information, please see:

2. Summary of the main conclusions from the last meeting: how will they guide our future work?

Ninoslav S. Schmidt (Co-Chair, Croatia) highlighted the WG's key achievements, including the development of new indicators and explanatory descriptors for the PAG. The indicators were designed to measure the progress in implementing the principles, while the explanatory descriptors provided in-depth attributes and characteristics for better comprehension and implementation. It was stressed that these indicators and descriptors are not rigidly prescriptive, allowing individual countries to adapt them to suit their national higher education systems. Additionally, the collaboration with Eurydice was mentioned as their report provided evidence-based support for the indicators. The expanded scope of the document enabled the establishment of monitoring systems at both the European and national levels. Consequently, it was concluded that this new structure for the social dimension represents a coherent system, which can be termed as the "Comprehensive EHEA policy framework for the social dimension in higher education."

Extensive consultations were organized related to indicators and descriptors, and in the introductory section, new elements were introduced. The document now includes a summary outlining its purpose, definitions of its main components, an explanation of the positive impact of the social dimension on societies, and an overview of the comprehensive framework for the social dimension. The document defines principles, guidelines, indicators, and descriptors, leading to the proposal of naming it "Principles, Guidelines, and Indicators to Strengthen the Social Dimension of Higher Education in the European Higher Education Area." The document underwent an ongoing



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

consultation process with other BFUG members and relevant organizations like the E4 members and Education International, receiving valuable feedback that significantly improved its quality.

2.1 Update and results of the consultative meeting on social dimension in HE with the BFUG members

To expedite the process and streamline the document, the group held an online consultation meeting with the BFUG on September 6th. This consultation focused on finalizing the content of the indicators and explanatory descriptors, as well as procedural discussions regarding the adoption process. The consultation involved participation from BFUG members, the European Commission, and consultative members, resulting in feedback on both content and procedural aspects. Regarding the adoption process, two options were considered: either adopting it as an annex to the communique or as a separate, standalone document to be adopted by the ministers with a link to the communique. The decision on the adoption modality will take into account past experiences and what is paramount for the EHEA and the development of the social dimension. Overall, the feedback was positive, recognizing the document's improvements compared to previous iterations. While no major revisions were necessary, some suggestions for fine-tuning were received. The deadline for submitting feedback by September 25th was set, but no written feedback on these specific suggestions has been received. Key conclusions included making the document more concise, avoiding repetitions, recommending the use of "descriptors" instead of "explanatory descriptors," and adding a brief description to clarify the document's purpose.

For more information, please see: [Main conclusions from the last meeting and new updates \(ppt\)](#) and [Meeting minutes of Consultative meeting with BFUG members and consultative members \(doc\)](#)

3. Update on the activities of the Erasmus+ project "PLAR-U-PAGs"

Ninoslav S. Schmidt (Co-Chair) provided information about the Erasmus+ project supporting the fulfillment of the Working Group's objectives on the Social Dimension through Peer Learning Activities and Resources for underpinning the Principles and Guidelines for the Social Dimension. He emphasized that these peer learning activities (PLAs) consistently address two to three principles and showcase best practices from various European regions. The third upcoming PLA is scheduled for December 6-7 in Ghent and will be hosted by SIHO, followed by the WG meeting. He conveyed that interested parties have the opportunity for two participants from each country to attend, with all expenses covered by the project.

It was also informed that the third PLA will focus on key topics such as students' mental health, funding for the social dimension, and inclusion in mobility programs, addressing three principles from the Principles and Guidelines. The agenda for this event is well-prepared, and the official announcement is forthcoming, with a survey to be distributed, likely within the following week. Comprehensive information, including the due date, is available in the Google Drive folder dedicated to these PLAs.

For more information on the project, please see: Inclusivehighereducation.eu

4. Update on the activities of the Erasmus+ project "Inclusive engagement of the non-traditional students in professional higher education"

Horia Onita (Co-Chair, ESU) presented an update regarding the outcomes of the Erasmus+ project "Inclusive Engagement of Non-Traditional Students in Professional Higher Education." He shared that a policy paper had been developed and invited members to contribute their thoughts. The project's main goal is to improve student engagement in professional higher education (HE), with outputs including needs mapping, initiatives for engagement, the policy paper in discussion, a self-assessment tool, and a resource library. Aligned with the social dimension, it addresses student engagement issues. Emphasizing professional HE, the project highlights lower engagement in policy and student-centered activities compared to other types of degrees. It explores non-traditional student engagement, revealing a low participation level. The consortium has offered concise, practical recommendations for decision-makers based on survey findings, spanning institutional to European levels. These recommendations focus on outreach, participation, contact points, teacher training, integrating engagement into curricula, and visibility, specifically tailored for non-traditional students in professional HE. Finally, he emphasized that the overarching objective is to provide decision-makers at various levels with a practical tool to promote diversity and inclusion within organizational units in the professional higher education sector.



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

An inquiry was made on how closely are the project outcomes tied to the PAGs. The Co-Chair informed that the project emphasizes the importance of fostering synergies and avoiding the creation of conflicting policy tools. He explained that the mapping report incorporates data and recommendations from various projects, involving organizations connected to the BFUG and universities. While the project's conclusions are linked to the PAGs, the Co-Chair clarified that the document, focusing specifically on professional HE and non-traditional students, does not delve into extensive detail, resulting in some overlap but not to a significant extent.

For more information on the project, please see: *Inclusiphe.eu*

5. Update on the work of the BFUG Drafting Committee for the 2024 Tirana Communiques and its relevance for the social dimension in HE

Horia Onita (ESU) reported that the Drafting Committee (DC) has developed a draft zero of the Tirana communique, to be presented at the BFUG meeting. The DC initiated the process by analyzing past communiques, focusing particularly on the BFUG working structures. Recognizing the need for strategic alignment, the DC posed several questions to BFUG working structures, seeking insights into their main achievements, objectives for the upcoming period, concrete ministerial commitments for 2024-2027, and emphasis on priority or neglected areas post-2020. Specifically addressing the WG on SD, its achievements align with the overarching priority of achieving an inclusive EHEA by 2030, notably in relation to the PAGs and indicators. The current draft zero acknowledges progress in implementing the PAGs, adopting the EHEA policy framework for the social dimension, the integration of policies into national contexts, data collection practices, and European monitoring on the social dimension. Topics of discussion include policies for accessing and completing higher education, the impact of COVID, brain drain, cost of living crises, mental health, and support for higher education institutions (HEIs) promoting social dimension holistically. The Co-Chairs encouraged the WG members to discuss and work on clarifying how these commitments should be presented in the communique and refining them for the subsequent draft to be presented at the BFUG meeting in Brussels.

An inconsistency in policy levels regarding countries' commitments was observed, in the sense that commitments are rather general for the system as a whole instead of what governments would do, as well as implementation of previous commitments. Nevertheless, there was an acknowledgment that both previous commitments and the PAGs had received formal approval. The WG was advised to stay aligned with the implementation of these commitments in its messaging. The central question posed was whether the WG aimed to identify areas requiring urgent attention or specific aspects for improvement.

Ninoslav S. Schmidt (Co-Chair) informed that he submitted a three-part proposal to the DC. The first part centered on linking with the previous communique, emphasizing the goal of establishing an inclusive EHEA. He suggested underlining that the approved PAGs marked a significant stride in developing the social dimension and proposed incorporating the definition of the social dimension to address queries from countries seeking clarification. The second part aimed to highlight achievements related to the social dimension during the current working period, focusing on outlining the EHEA framework's main components and explaining how it facilitates customized implementation. In the third part, the emphasis was on ministers committing to enhancing inclusion and equity policies in line with the PAGs and specified indicators. Stressing the intention to measure progress in implementing these principles was underscored as part of this overarching vision. The Co-Chair concluded by emphasizing that these three parts should not lose sight of the macro vision and the established system, urging adoption and commitment by the ministers.

6. Presentation and discussion on the draft chapter on social dimension in higher education in the 2024 Bologna Process Implementation Report

David Crosier and Anna Horvath (Eurydice) presented the draft chapter on social dimension, part of the 2024 Bologna Process Implementation Report (BPIR). David Crosier provided insights into the process of conceptualizing indicators related to the PAGs, citing examples in funding and mobility, and highlighting challenges in data collection. They utilized data from two sources: Eurydice pilot indicators and the WG on SD indicator proposal. Data collection challenges included lengthy questionnaire, limited involvement from ministries, missed deadlines, and insufficient justifications for many answers. Internal coherence issues and time constraints in resolving data problems were also noted. He outlined anticipated findings, noting significant variation in scorecards across policy areas, with funding and guidance/counseling performing well, while strategy, lifelong learning, and inclusive learning environments showed difficulties. Mobility, community engagement, and policy dialogue were identified as the weakest areas.

The PAGs were emphasized for their user-friendly nature; however, the central concern revolved around securing political engagement to ensure that national strategies thoroughly incorporate all elements outlined in the PAGs.



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

Nevertheless, the flexible design of the PAGs allows for adaptation to diverse priorities in various national contexts. European-level monitoring predominantly concentrates on overseeing the actions of top-level authorities. In contrast, national monitoring serves a unique purpose, often encompassing institutions and their operations. This requires distinct indicators, and although the framework is broad, it was noted that it can be transformed into specific indicators suitable for application at the national level.

It was added that the BPIR aims to assess the availability and coverage of services such as academic guidance, psychological counseling, and careers guidance within national legal frameworks, along with evaluating the existence of quality assurance mechanisms. However, the current position does not allow for a comprehensive evaluation of whether these services effectively reach the students in need. This emphasizes the need for national-level attention, where countries should possess adequate information to assess whether publicly funded services are fulfilling their intended purposes. Furthermore, this showed that the indicators are more process-based rather than outcome based, and as such not capturing the effectiveness of policies in general, but rather their mere existence.

A suggestion was made to broaden the examination of mobility beyond the European level, considering that increased distance traveled by students intensifies the social dimension gap. Funding was examined as a base indicator, with proposals including incorporating a detailed map illustrating the percentages covering the cost of living, particularly focusing on students' coverage. The need for differentiation in the scorecard was acknowledged to delve into issues such as indexing and fund distribution.

Challenges were noted about the correlation between Principle One and the implementation of national strategies, particularly within the social dimension. The absence of stakeholder dialogue and strategies in some countries, highlighted by dark red markings, raised policy-related concerns. Questions were posed about targets, emphasizing the importance of assessing and monitoring them beyond mere existence to gauge the effectiveness of national monitoring systems.

Regarding funding, it was mentioned that data on the percentage of students receiving grants was collected to verify the understanding of universal grants. However, this information wasn't integrated into the scorecard indicator at this stage, aligning with specified principles and guidelines. Furthermore, the data doesn't delve into the quantity/coverage of funding, but rather its existence. Stakeholder involvement assessment data would be included in Chapter One of the BPIR, recognizing the complexity in reporting on strategies and specific implementations of principles and guidelines, which was attributed to adhering to the structure outlined in the PAGs.

A recommendation was made, suggesting that given the substantial evidence collected in the BPIR regarding produced strategies, it might be beneficial to create an annex to provide an overview of the strategies implemented by various countries. Another suggestion was put forth concerning the 3 Is (inclusive, interconnected, innovative) to emphasize them more in the upcoming working period, not as a standalone chapter but as integral components of a shared reflection throughout the report. Finally, members were encouraged to provide feedback and comments on both the chapter and the entire report by late November 2023, and send it via the Secretariat.

7. Improvement of the indicators for the principles of social dimension

The Co-chairs informed that there were not many comments received for the introductory part. However, a notable general comment from the September consultation suggested using only 'descriptors' instead of 'explanatory descriptors' throughout the entire document, which was approved.

A comment was noted about the explanatory descriptors being phrased as actions. Members were encouraged to offer suggestions on enhancing the understanding that these descriptors are recommendations rather than prescriptive actions, given similar feedback from several others on this remark. It was suggested to add that each indicator has its descriptor in which the attributes, features and characteristics of the indicators are described. Regarding the consistency of formulations in the document, all indicators under Principles 3 and 5 were harmonized, aligning them with the language used in the remaining indicators.

Specifically in Principle 4 - Indicator 5, the sentence "Public authorities should consider participating in European Higher Education Area surveys on student characteristics (e.g., Eurostudent survey) and in graduate surveys (e.g., Eurograduate survey)" was revised to read, "Public authorities should participate..."

In Principle 4 - Indicator 2, the descriptor "They should translate results of surveys and administrative data collection into student support measures, including counseling and guidance services for the identified underrepresented, disadvantaged, and vulnerable groups" was modified to "They should translate the results of surveys and administrative data collection into student support measures and strengthen the social dimension practices for the identified underrepresented, disadvantaged, and vulnerable groups."



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

For Principle 5 - Indicator 1, the reformulated version is, "Public authorities ensure and support the provision of free, accessible, and timely academic and careers counseling and guidance services to all potential and enrolled students in higher education." The corresponding descriptor now reads, "Public authorities should ensure the provision of free and inclusive academic and career counseling and guidance to all prospective and current students in public centers and/or contact points within educational institutions. They should facilitate cooperation among all providers of academic and careers counseling and guidance for higher education to enable the exchange of good practice and eliminate duplication. Public authorities should consider funding higher education institutions that provide free and inclusive academic and careers counseling and guidance to potential and current students."

Similarly, Principle 5 - Indicator 2 has been revised to state, "Public authorities ensure and support the provision of free, accessible, and timely psychological counseling and guidance services to all potential and enrolled students, as well as to staff in higher education (Eurydice, 2022)." The descriptor was revised as well to be consistent, specifying the inclusion of contact points within educational institutions.

In Principle 6 - Indicator 2, the descriptor which read, "A student's local socio-economic context" was changed to "a student's regional socio-economic background and the place of study."

It was proposed to remove Indicator 3 in Principle 6 due to perceived similarities in content with Indicator 2. However, it was argued that Indicator 2 addressed direct methods of covering indirect costs, while Indicator 3 focused on indirect support. Consequently, the descriptor text underwent a modification. The original statement, "There should be a top-level policy regarding raising accessibility, affordability, and quality of higher education through covering indirect costs," was amended to read, "There should be a top-level policy regarding raising accessibility, affordability, and quality of higher education through indirect support,".

Principle 7 - Indicator 1 has been revised to state, "Public authorities empower higher education institutions to provide training on diversity, equity, or inclusion to academic and administrative staff, as well as students (Eurydice, 2022)."

For Principle 7 - Indicator 4, the descriptor text now reads, "Public authorities should offer financial support to higher education institutions to ensure universal accessibility of their buildings and infrastructure. Monitoring the implementation of this indicator is essential, ensuring that the instituted improvements align with established accessibility standards and effectively address the needs of underrepresented, disadvantaged, and vulnerable students and staff."

Principle 9 - Indicator 2 was removed because its content was already covered by other indicators. Additionally, Indicator 5 was also erased, given that monitoring could effectively encompass the majority of the Principles.

Principle 7 - Indicator 1 has been revised to state, "Public authorities empower higher education institutions to provide training on diversity, equity, or inclusion to academic and administrative staff, as well as students (Eurydice, 2022)."

For Principle 7 - Indicator 4, the descriptor text now reads, "Public authorities should offer financial support to higher education institutions to ensure universal accessibility of their buildings and infrastructure. Monitoring the implementation of this indicator is essential, ensuring that the instituted improvements align with established accessibility standards and effectively address the needs of underrepresented, disadvantaged, and vulnerable students and staff."

Regarding Principle 10 - Indicator 2, the descriptor text was revised by omitting the final sentence, "By participating in these international initiatives, public authorities could harness a wealth of international expertise, enrich their strategic approach, and amplify their positive impact on the social dimension in the higher education landscape."

The Co-Chairs thanked the members for their contribution and informed that they will amend the document and incorporate the feedback received, to present the revised PAGs in the upcoming BFUG meeting LXXXVI in Madrid.

For more information, please see: [Monitoring the implementation of the PAGs: BPIR 2024 social dimension chapter](#) and [Presentation of the draft chapter on social dimension in higher education in the 2024 Bologna Process Implementation Report](#)

8. Discussion on the future of the social dimension within the BFUG in the period 2024 - 2027

Ninoslav S. Schmidt (Co-Chair) emphasized the limitations identified in the social dimension chapter, specifically in mobility, Principle 10 on consultations, and community engagement. He highlighted the necessity for higher education institutions (HEIs) to establish systemic links with their external environment to address community needs, particularly during crises like environmental issues, climate change, health crises, war, and migrations. He underscored the potential negative impact of these crises on education and stressed the importance of HEIs engaging



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

with external communities to effectively tackle Equity and Inclusion challenges. The Co-Chair proposed the establishment of mutually beneficial systemic links between HEIs and external stakeholders as a crucial strategy for addressing these challenges, emphasizing the significance of Community and Civic Engagement in creating a more supportive environment for the social dimension of higher education in the coming years.

He suggested a scenario for the future, recommending the maintenance of the WG on SD but with an expanded objective focused on 'Social Dimension and Community and Civic Engagement in Education.' He outlined potential future objectives, including the evaluation and monitoring of the implementation of principles, with collaboration from the WG on Monitoring. This proposed approach aimed to address evolving needs over the next three years and potentially until the end of the decade. The second objective involves conducting an impact assessment for the principles of the social dimension, aiming to analyze the actions taken by countries in implementing these principles and assess their effectiveness. Simultaneously, the third objective focuses on delineating the dimensions of community engagement and determining the appropriate metrics for measurement. The subsequent step is to establish connections between the social dimension and community engagement, exploring how these aspects can mutually support each other. The final objective involves the continuation of PLAs for both the social dimension and community engagement.

Horia Onita (Co-Chair) underscored the significance of monitoring, including through outcome-based indicators, and of impact assessment. He mentioned that these aspects should be included in the agenda for the upcoming WG meeting. He provided several reflections for the upcoming working period. Firstly, there is potential to explore the intersection of lifelong learning and the social dimension. Although previous work has been undertaken in lifelong learning, there are unexplored aspects, particularly concerning the flexibility of learning paths. Another consideration is the principle on inclusive mobility, which is perceived as lacking technical depth. Additionally, in the realm of recognition, there are emerging elements, particularly related to the recognition of refugees and Article Seven of the Convention. The scope for further work on general well-being and immediate attention to mental health was also highlighted. Finally, the Co-Chair observed that there has been limited recent progress in terms of enhancing student support services.

The Co-Chairs indicated that they will be tasked with proposing Terms of Reference for the upcoming working structure in the next working period, and this proposal has the potential to shape the trajectory of the upcoming period. Members proposed a focus on ensuring the effective implementation of the PAGs and enhancing visibility. Additionally, the idea of compiling an annex containing all strategies across various countries was suggested. There was also a recommendation to enhance collaboration through the Global Policy Forum, in line with the proposal from the Coordination Group on Global Policy Dialogue to strengthen connections between BFUG working structures in the upcoming period. This could involve organizing events on the social dimension and integrating international partners from Asia and Africa for dialogues, contributing to the goal of increasing visibility. Thus, the importance of dedicating a session on the social dimension at the Global Policy Forum in Tirana was emphasized. The intention is to present achievements and future plans, providing an opportunity for stakeholders to understand how to establish cooperation with the future working structures.

Concerns were raised about the challenges of linking implementation with community engagement due to difficulties in monitoring. Additionally, there was a discussion about the complexity of deciding what data to collect. A suggestion was made to develop guidelines or recommendations on the indicators countries should start collecting.

Horia Onita (Co-Chair) provided a brief summary of takeaways from the BFUG Board meeting, emphasizing the continued importance of addressing the social dimension. He reported that inquiries surfaced regarding the structure of the group for the upcoming period, specifically focusing on the orientation of work, particularly the reliance on monitoring from a policy perspective. The discussion raised the question of whether maintaining a separate Working Group on the Social Dimension is optimal, given the existence of a dedicated Monitoring group that can oversee monitoring efforts.

It was agreed that additional information should be gathered before the next WG meeting to better inform on the formulation of future objectives. It was determined that a survey would be devised and distributed among WG members, specifically those representing ministries. The survey would focus on gauging their perspectives on the implementation of the PAGs and gathering insights on how they envision support for the upcoming cycle.

Ninoslav S. Schmidt (Co-Chair) mentioned that within the Erasmus+ project "PLAR-U-PAGs," a significant outcome is the development of a toolbox that aims to provide a self-assessment tool for ministries, assisting them in understanding their current status and identifying future steps for implementing the PAGs. He informed that the development of this toolbox is underway and is expected to be finalized by the end of next year or by June 2025. Further details about this initiative may be discussed at the next WG meeting. Drawing from a recently attended meeting, the Co-Chair added that he would share diverse sources that include various surveys and compilations of



Ministry of Education and
Science of Georgia

best practices from around the world. These resources have been gathered from a range of stakeholders in Latin America, North America, Australia, Asia, and several African countries. The key takeaway from this is the importance of sharing the produced resources globally. The meeting concluded with the recognition that there are stakeholders worldwide engaged in similar efforts. The collective learning from these initiatives can contribute to influencing the policy agenda on a global scale.

The discussion centered on the effectiveness of quality assurance (QA) mechanisms in European and national contexts, emphasizing the success of QA in the presence of established infrastructure within ministries, agencies, and HEIs. However, it was noted that there is a lack of infrastructure in the social dimension. The members considered the need for infrastructure for the social dimension and discussed whether its implementation would positively impact its development. The case of Flanders was highlighted as an example where the Ministry of Education and SIHO function as infrastructure for social inclusion and equity in higher education. Another suggestion was to integrate the social dimension into the QA process, advocating for institutions to be assessed not only on academic standards but also on their social dimension. Consideration of social dimension and other policy areas as part of QA was proposed as a potential future scenario. Discussions with ENQA were also mentioned as an option for the future alignment of QA and the social dimension.

In conclusion, the Co-Chairs informed that they would provide additional materials for consideration in the upcoming WG meeting. They encouraged members to participate in the PLA before the WG meeting, aiming to collectively decide on a proposal for advancing the social dimension in the next cycle.

For more information, please see: [Discussion on the future of the social dimension within the BFUG for 2024 - 2027](#)

9. Preparation of the sessions related to the social dimension at the Tirana Ministerial Conference/Bologna Policy Forum (June 2024)

Horia Onita (Co-Chair) discussed two potential platforms for showcasing the work on the social dimension. One option is a session within the Global Policy Forum, which involves stakeholders from various parts of the world. He emphasized that there is considerable interest from global stakeholders in the unique initiatives undertaken in Europe. The idea is to allocate a maximum of one hour for a session explaining the creation of the PAGs and indicators, as well as detailing how countries are implementing them. The participants in this session would be global partners interested in the social dimension.

Additionally, the Co-Chairs expressed the desire to have a brief session within the Tirana Ministerial Conference framework to explain the social dimension's significance and outline future implementation plans, as well as how they see the future of the WG.

A primary objective is to ideally secure a dedicated session on the social dimension at the Ministerial Conference. The Secretariat advised the Co-Chairs to submit a formal request for this session, with the intention of sharing it with the BFUG Co-Chairs. Additionally, the Co-Chairs have expressed their aspiration to organize a session within the Global Policy Forum focused on the social dimension, contingent upon approval from the Co-Chairs of the Global Policy Dialogue.

10. Concluding remarks: division of tasks for the next WG's meeting and meeting conclusions

The Co-Chairs communicated that the upcoming meeting is scheduled to take place in person on December 7-8 in Ghent, with a proposed hybrid format for those unable to attend in person, if feasible.

They outlined that the PAGs would be introduced at the BFUG meeting in Madrid in November. Subsequently, in December, the WG would deliberate on suggestions and feedback received during the BFUG meeting, concluding with final remarks. The finalized document is anticipated to be presented at the February BFUG meeting, should it not be formally adopted in November.

The Co-Chairs emphasized the importance of the first WG meeting in 2024 being in person. This meeting is crucial for establishing the terms of reference for the next period and making substantial contributions to the communique. To tackle these priorities, a suggestion was put forth for a WG meeting either at the end of January or in early February 2024, with considerations for online or hybrid formats. A doodle poll will be circulated to finalize the dates for the 2024 WG meeting.

The Co-Chairs thanked everyone for their contributions. No other discussions were put forward and the meeting was successfully concluded.