

# Task Force Rules of Procedure

REPORT TO BFUG BOARD

---

2 SEPT 2023

# Work of the TF

---

- Document: Rules for the Ministers and Rules for the BFUG
- Document: Permanent Secretariat

## Issues to be considered

1. Further development of the documents
  - General approach
  - Comments, need for further clarification
2. Process of discussion with the BFUG
3. Consideration of overall schedule – to ensure that
  - ROP are ready in time
  - EHEA does not stay without a secretariat

# Rules for the Ministers and Rules for the BFUG

---

## **Work since Stockholm**

- Revision in consideration of comments received
- Development of Rules for BFUG
- Relation between the two doc – avoid repetition
- Retaining present practices, processes and terminologies but making them more aligned & congruent
- Some decisions (“meeting reports” instead of “minutes”)
- Footnotes
- Partially left open: issues concerning Secretariat – and budget

## **Questions to the Board**

- One document
- Voting regime
- Board
- Budget

## **Further development of the document**

- Consider comments of today
- Written submissions (Fri 6 Oct.?)
- Send out in good time for the BFUG in Madrid

# Secretariat: Document

---

1. Background & Rationale
2. Tasks & Responsibilities of any Secretariat
3. Pro's and con's of the current & a permanent Sec
4. Principles of a perm Sec
  1. Independence / accountability
  2. Sustainability
  3. Staff
  4. Location
  5. Non-profit
5. Possible legal forms
  - 5.1 4 scenarios
    - A. **private non-profit legal law entity**
    - B. **existing European organisation**
    - C. contracted service
    - D. intergovernmental organisation
  - 5.2 staff needs
  - 5.3 budget
  - 5.4 **Three concrete options**
    - Private non-profit legal law entity
    - External office of COE
    - Integrating EQAR & the Sec

# Secretariat: Permanent secretariat – yes or no?

A first decision to be taken

---

- TF sees a clear potential
- feasible, different models
- further exploration needed – in particular regarding the three options
- “Full-cost” approach: somebody has to pay
- BFUG would need to decide on
  - Whether it wants a permanent secretariat – in view of the financial and governance implications
  - Directions in which it wants the TF to continue working

## Madrid BFUG: Discussion on the EHEA Secretariat

---

### Step1: Decision on whether or not to establish a Secretariat

on the basis of the requirements, conditions and scenarios set out in the document (no decision on a concrete model or provider/host)

*Once this decision is taken, we can further discuss & explore the model and the selection process of the provider/ host*

### Step 2: Further exchanges on the model and process for its establishment

- could start in Madrid
- not enough time
- premature for a decision: further clarification on the **three Options** needed

# Towards and after Madrid

---

## ROP

Parties to provide comments before & after Madrid

Identification of contested points

Post Madrid: parallel of

- text improvement (incl. editing)
- discussion on contested points – which cannot be solved by the drafting group

## SECRETARIAT

Parties provide comments before & after Madrid

Madrid: Principal decision on whether or not

- Financial implications
- Governance implications

Post Madrid: Discussion on models

- Better understand open issues, concerns, but also preferences
- Next round