

# DRAFT

## Meeting of the ENAEE Administrative Council, acting **also** as Executive Group of the EUR-ACE Implementation Project

### Minutes

23 February 2007 - Brussels

Present:

Members of ENAEE Administrative Council (and substitutes):

Prof. Giuliano AUGUSTI (**President, Acting** Chairman)

Dr. Iring WASSER

Prof. Alan PUGH

Prof. Alexander CHUCHALIN

Mr. René-Paul MARTIN (representing Mr Siwak)

Mr Christian FORSLUND

Mr Philippe WAUTERS (partly)

Secretariat: Mrs Françoise DECLERCQ

Observers: Mr Günter HEITMANN (IAB)

### 1. Welcome and apologies

Prof. Augusti welcomed all participants and informed he had received apologies from Mr Siwak who ~~delegated is represented by~~ Mr Martin to represent him. ~~Since this body now acts also as Executive Group of the EUR-ACE Implementation project, Mr Borri is a permanent invitee: however, this time~~ Mr Borri had to cancel his participation due to unexpected commitments in Florence. Prof. Augusti ~~He~~ also explained that he ~~had~~ invited ~~Messrs Borri and~~ Mr Heitmann, member of the project International Advisory Board, ~~to the meeting~~ so that ~~they~~ the IAB is directly informed and can better evaluate the project and give their suggestions.

Prof. Augusti thanked Mr Wasser and the Label Committee for their good work ~~in setting the basis for the start of the EUR-ACE system (preparation of documents;~~ see item 6). He reminded that the AC is now also the Executive Group of the EUR-ACE Implementation Project and ~~in this capacity must has therefore to~~ report to the EUR-ACE Project Board.

### 2. Approval of the agenda

Prof. Augusti proposed to add after item 3) Mr Wauters' report about the financial situation and the ENAEE website.

He also suggested adding in item 12) the date and place of next General Assembly.

**The proposals were approved.**

### 3. **Approval of the minutes of last meeting (17 November 2006)**

The revised draft minutes, **already in the private section of the website**, were unanimously approved without any change. The Secretariat will put the final version (by removing 'draft' and adding the logo) on the website.

### 4. **ENAEE financial situation and website**

#### **Financial situation**

Mrs Declercq distributed to all members two tables with explanatory notes (**Annex 4a and 4b**):

- ENAEE results by 31.12.2006

- ENAEE results by 28.02.2007

#### ENAEE results by 31.12.2006

. Expenses: since last report, 3 invoices have been added in the item 'Others': lawyer, copyright and translation respectively.

. Income: as Romania has not **yet** paid its membership fee for 2006 (1000 €), this amount was withdrawn from 'fees from partners'.

The balance for the year 2006 is 1367,29 €.

Mr Wauters explained that the ENAEE results (list of expenses and incomes) will have to be transmitted on a yearly basis to the FEANI accountant and later to the legal authorities. The AC approved the results.

#### ENAEE results by 28.02.2007

Mrs Declercq distributed to all members the current list of payments of membership fee for 2007 (**Annex 4c**). It came out that, **despite after** a reminder, five partners have not paid their membership fee yet: CTI, EUROCADRES, OE, IDA and MÜDEK.

Concerning MÜDEK, the Secretariat had received an email from Mr Payzin, stating that "MÜDEK is in the process of transforming itself into a legal entity (association). It will be legally entitled to make the payment of membership fee once the new association holds its first General Assembly, sometime within the next 2-3 months." The **members of CTI and EUROCADRES present at the meeting (Mr Martin and Mr Forslund) representatives** promised to take care that the payment is made as soon as possible.

*Francoise, please note (also for future occasions) that AC members are elected individuals, and do not represent any single Institution, but the whole Association.*

The Secretariat will send a new reminder to OE and IDA, **urging asking** them to pay their membership fee as soon as possible.

Prof. Augusti reminded that, according to the ENAEE By-Laws, **payment is recommended within January but** a membership fee is considered overdue **only** if the booking on the ENAEE account is later than the 1<sup>st</sup> September.

Concerning the reimbursement by ENAEE of the costs of the Label Committee members, as agreed at the last EUR-ACE Implementation Board meeting, it was decided that ENAEE would reimburse not only travel costs but also subsistence costs according to EU

rules. The Secretariat will send an updated claim form to the LC members.

Most members suggested charging costs of the AC meetings to the EUR-ACE Implementation project as AC is the Executive Group of the project. Dr. Wasser proposed to ask reimbursement first from the EUR-ACE Implementation project and if there is no money left, ask ENAEE. Prof. Augusti ~~would~~ will check with Elisa Guberti, ~~the person responsible for the financing of the EUR-ACE Implementation project manager~~, to see how to proceed.

Prof. Pugh proposed to send the ENAEE yearly financial results to all ENAEE members. All members agreed and the Secretariat was asked to send the 2006 results (~~not the 2007 preview~~) to all ENAEE members.

### **ENAEE Website**

Mr Wauters explained that he contacted a company to implement the ENAEE website but this company, after postponing several times a proposal, recently refused to make an offer. He has therefore contacted another company ~~for an offer~~ to do the job. The implementation of a single website for ENAEE ([www.enaee.eu](http://www.enaee.eu)), similar to the FEANI website, should cost approximately 500 €.

Prof. Augusti referred to notes taken at the last meeting of the EUR-ACE Implementation project stating that 'FEANI would be very interested in submitting an offer for the creation of the EUR-ACE Implementation web'. At this stage, a discussion went on whether this meant extending the EUR-ACE information on the FEANI website, ~~which was done accordingly as it was done so far~~ and ~~this~~ was Mr Wauters' comprehension, or to set up a new EUR-ACE website. To Mr Wauters' understanding, a separate website for ENAEE with a link to the other projects (EUR-ACE Implementation, PRO-EAST and LEPAC) was foreseen only. He also pointed out that, in the meantime, and waiting for a separate website for ENAEE, the links were on the FEANI website.

The AC members then unanimously agreed that, ~~for the time being~~, the ENAEE Secretariat would temporarily update the EUR-ACE website by replacing the existing home page with information about the EUR-ACE Implementation project (to be ~~asked from sent by~~ Elisa Guberti), while keeping a link to the EUR-ACE 1 project. The link to the EUR-ACE Implementation project on the ENAEE website will also be changed and go directly to the project's home page. Prof. Augusti would ask Mrs Guberti to regularly send documents to the ENAEE Secretariat for insertion on the EUR-ACE website.

It was also decided ~~that the domain [www.enaee.eu](http://www.enaee.eu) will be the only domain for ENAEE and the related projects. The organization, design and maintenance of the whole site, links, etc. must be discussed: in view of the start of the EUR-ACE system, it is urgent that the site is appropriately implemented: e.g. it must contain ~~to add somewhere on the ENAEE website~~ that the AC has authorised 6 agencies to award the EUR-ACE Label and ~~add~~ a link to each agency. Prof Augusti will promote the necessary initiatives in strict collaboration with Mr Wauters; in the meantime, Dr. Wasser will ~~also~~ prepare a ~~text with~~ and send ~~it~~ to the Secretariat for insertion on the website ~~an informative text and the documents on how to become an authorised agency that will be discussed in the following of this meeting.~~~~

## 5. Membership of ENAEE and GA

Prof. Augusti stated that he has received a letter of resignation from UAICR (Romania): however, the UAICR President and Mr Manoliu expressed their intention of continuing collaboration with ENAEE. Prof. Augusti underlined his regret of losing a founding members of ENAEE, and asked the Secretariat to remove Mr Manoliu's name from the list of GA members.

Mr Martin confirmed that he is the ~~formal~~ representative of CTI ~~at~~ in the GA.

Prof. Augusti asked the Secretariat to contact CLAIU ~~and MÜDEK~~ to have the name of their representative ~~at~~ in the GA.

*Francoise note: Erbil PAYZIN has been nominated as the MÜDEK representative in an e-mail from Ayse Erdem-Senatarlar dated 14/12/2006.*

## 6. Report by the Label Committee

Dr Wasser reminded that six agencies have been authorized to award the EUR-ACE label for a period of 2 years (decision taken by the AC on 17 November 2006), which means that all accreditation decisions taken after that date may now be combined with the award of the EUR-ACE label.

Dr Wasser pointed out that all agencies had received a confirmation letter by Prof. Augusti authorising them to award the EUR-ACE label. However, he asked the Secretariat to re-send the letter to each agency with the only name of this agency (and not the list of all others) with a more attractive layout (the letter should be more representative).

He also stated that the LC has prepared three documents which were already sent to all AC members (~~no need of ratification by the AC~~):

- ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies
- Procedures for Evaluating Applications
- Application Form for Accreditation Agencies to award the EUR-ACE label

The final text of these documents will be prepared by the Label Committee. Dr Wasser maintained that their approval and application is within the domain of the "Terms of Reference" of the Label Committee already approved by the AC. Prof. Augusti expressed his reservations on the respective competences of AC and LC, but it was agreed to confirm to the LC the mandate to proceed so that the EUR-ACE system could be started as soon as possible.

### Logo and EUR-ACE label document

Dr. Wasser asked to develop a representative logo for both EUR-ACE Bachelor and Master, as the first accreditations could take place in June 2007 already. Prof. Augusti proposed to base this logo on the existing and already well know EUR-ACE logo.

Prof. Augusti, in order to avoid some contradiction with the names of the degrees, suggested to consider ~~proposed~~ to stick for the time being to the terms EUR-ACE First (FC) and Second (SC) Cycle and postpone introducing the terms EUR-ACE Bachelor and EUR-ACE Master.

After a short discussion, this possibility was discarded: the AC thus confirmed that EUR-ACE labels will be distinguished into EUR-ACE BACHELOR and EUR-ACE MASTER as stated in the ENAEE policy document.

Therefore, he Prof. Augusti then suggested to layout the EUR-ACE label document (which will be a separate document attached to the degree programme) for the next 2 years as follows:

Heading: EUR-ACE logo + European Accredited Engineering Bachelor (FC) / Master (SC) programme

Wording (text): This to certify that the programme..... fulfils the EUR-ACE Framework Standards at the First/Second cycle level.

Two signatures will be added at the bottom of the document: one for the ENAEE President and one for the accreditation agency.

The suggested layout was accepted by all members.

Prof. Augusti committed himself to **finalize the text**, design the ‘certificate’ and send it to AC members for approval. The Secretariat will then prepare it and send it to each agency, which will take care of the printing.

### **Budget**

The LC proposed that each authorised agency should be charged an annual fee of 1500 € and that 150 € should be charged for each degree programme for which the EUR-ACE label is awarded. As the per-course-fee might not be accepted in countries where currently no fee is charged for an accreditation (France for example), the LC recommended that this policy should be reviewed after 1 year.

Mr Martin confirmed that (CTI) is willing to pay the annual 1500 € charged to the agencies (for overhead costs) but disagrees to ask 150 € for each programme. He maintained that no one will ask for the EUR-ACE label in France and that another source of financing has to be found.

**It was argued** that if CTI refuses to pay for each accreditation, the other agencies **might** do the same. He wondered then how the 100.000 € scheduled in the EUR-ACE Implementation project (to be provided from external sources) could be reached.

As no agreement was reached, Prof. Augusti accepted CTI position and, **with regret**, confirmed that no programme accredited by CTI can get the EUR-ACE label **until this situation is solved**.

Finally, all the AC members, except Mr Martin, accepted the LC suggestion: 1500 € as annual fee for each authorised agency + 150 € for each EUR-ACE label. This decision will be reviewed after 1 year.

Dr. Wasser asked if new organisations, which want to become authorised agencies, have to pay a fee. Someone reminded that the 6 agencies have not paid anything for being authorised. .

Prof. Augusti suggested making a distinction between EUR-ACE Implementation project members and members outside of the project.

It was finally decided that the members of the EUR-ACE Implementation project willing to become authorised agencies (NVAO, MÜDEK and IDA for example) would not be charged any fee but only asked to refund the expenses incurred, providing they apply within 2007 in order to be **likely able** to conclude the procedure **within the lifetime of the**

project (July 2008). Prof. Augusti will inform those agencies accordingly.

As for organisations, which are not EUR-ACE project members and/or outside EHEA (for example Malaysia), Dr. Wasser suggested to have personal contact with them and see what are the real possibilities. He added that ~~authorizing them could help it would be a good way~~ to collect money for the project: however, the AC was unanimous in recommending a strict selection in order not to devalue the EUR-ACE label.

### **Scope of authorisation**

Dr. Wasser informed the AC about the special situation regarding the accreditations issued by Engineers Ireland, which intends to accredit the Bachelor Honours Degree as second cycle degree for a transitional period. This is not in line with the ENAEE General Policy Statement, which foresees the award of the EUR-ACE Bachelor ~~of~~ and EUR-ACE Master label, clearly connecting to the designation “Bachelor” and “Master” to First and Second Cycle degrees respectively.

Prof. Augusti underlined that when an Agency is authorized to award the EUR-ACE labels, it is its responsibility to make sure that the programme outcomes corresponding to awarded label are satisfied: this trust and responsibility of the single Agency is the essence of the EUR-ACE decentralized accreditation system. In the unfortunate case that an Agency fails to fulfil its responsibilities, its authorization will not be renewed: the AC or the LC can do nothing else.

After discussion, it was ~~decided~~ agreed that Ireland should find itself a way of avoiding conflict of definition between Bachelor and Master on the same certificate.

Dr. Wasser stated that the LC has ~~decided~~ indicated that authorised agencies might also award the EUR-ACE label to degree programmes offered by HEIs in countries (within the European Higher Education Area) where no accreditation agency authorised by ENAEE exists.

Besides, the LC is in favour of awarding a certificate of substantial equivalency to the EUR-ACE label to degree programmes offered at HEIs outside the EHEA.

However, Prof. Augusti insisted on keeping this process under control and suggested that the AC should take such a decision case by case, and not the LC. ~~This decision was finally accepted even if there was some disagreement.~~ After discussion, it was agreed that the AC should be consulted and give its approval before an Agency starts an accreditation procedure outside its country; in case of urgency, the President will take care of the question and submit the decision to the AC for ratification.

### **Procedure for evaluating applications from agencies (document prepared by LC)**

The procedure to be followed for receiving, examining and deciding on the applications of organisations seeking authorisation to award the EUR-ACE label has been finalised by the LC. The same procedure will also be applied for confirmation or renewal of the authorisations already given.

However, in item 2.3, Prof. Augusti did not agree that the LC appoints one of its members as Chairman of the Review Team and insisted on having the AC appoint the Review Team. Dr. Wasser replied that this is in line with the Terms of Reference, which indicate a clear separation of tasks between AC and LC and that the AC may not have a say in the operational process of the LC. He added that the AC has anyway the final decision as appeal body.

Prof. Augusti expressed his reservations, but finally accepted the LC position.

## 7. Request from NVAO (Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders)

Prof. Augusti ~~explained~~ reported on the e-mails he had received ~~emails~~ from Mr Aelterman in which NVAO ~~expressed its desire to have authorisation~~ declared the intention to seek the authorization to award the EUR-ACE label. All members expressed unanimous appreciation and agreed that NVAO should be encouraged in that way. Dr. Wasser suggested that Prof. Augusti write a letter (~~or send an email~~) to NVAO in which he states that ENAEE is pleased of this request, that the LC has **agreed on the principles of** the procedures for evaluating applications from agencies and invite them to submit their application **in accord with the procedure just discussed in point 6 by the AC**, possibly within 2007, so that the whole procedure takes place before the end of the project. ~~He also suggested sending NVAO the 'ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies' by stating that the document is nearly finalised. NVAO would then apply to the LC.~~

## 8. ENAEE application for associate membership to ENQA

Prof. Augusti pointed out that it would be appropriate for ENAEE to apply as associate member to ENQA, **as suggested by Mr Peter van der Hijden in a recent e-mail**. Dr. Wasser replied that ENAEE should be sure that there is no financial obligation before applying.

As there is no information about the role of associate members on the ENQA website, it was agreed that Prof. Augusti **will take the necessary contacts and possibly would** send a letter to ENQA Secretariat stipulating that ENAEE is interested in becoming associate member of ENQA and asking for appropriate documentation. Dr. Wasser asked Prof. Augusti to **keep inform** the LC **informed before sending the letter**.

## 9. Techno TN Forum 2007

Prof. Augusti confirmed that ENAEE is now a member of Techno TN. He informed that the Techno TN Forum 2007 ~~would~~ **will** be held on 4-5 May 2007 in Brussels and that ENAEE is entitled to send a delegation of five people, **whose expenses can be covered by the EC grant to the Forum**. He proposed to **include in the ENAEE delegation have**-Dr. Wasser, Mr Wauters, someone from EC UK (Mr Freeston?), someone from Engineers Ireland (Mr McGrath?) and himself. ~~He will ask for their availability. In the end, it was agreed that Prof. Augusti will take care of finalizing the delegation and informing the Forum organizers.~~

## 10. TPU-RAEE joint CPD programme on internationalisation of engineering education

Prof. Chuchalin distributed a document detailing a course (to be started in autumn 2007), which will be aimed at retraining academic staff of Russian HEIs. The programme aims at professional development of deans, heads of departments and professors in curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of engineering programmes in view of current trends of internationalisation of engineering education and globalisation of engineering profession. It is assumed that the programme graduates would improve engineering programmes and their internal and external evaluation against RAEE criteria and procedure consistent with the EUR-ACE Standards.

~~He invited~~ ENAEE members ~~will be invited~~ as observers ~~and lecturers of this programme~~. Prof. Chuchalin ~~and~~ asked the AC for approval of the preliminary content of the programme and for granting the ENAEE labeling of this programme. He expressed the wish to have the ENAEE logo (RAEE is ready to pay for it) on the top of the certificate, which will be delivered at the end of the course, as well as the mention 'approved by ENAEE'.

Prof. Pugh argued that ENAEE could act as a sponsor but Dr. Wasser suggested first thinking about how to commercialise the ENAEE logo.

Prof. Augusti suggested ~~to accept the request for preliminary approval, and to first negotiate in~~ the financial questions with the RAEE President ~~and prepare a respective decision by the AC~~. This proposal was unanimously accepted.

## 11. Date of next AC and GA meetings

No decision was taken during the meeting.

Prof. Augusti informed the AC that the EUR-ACE Implementation Project Board will meet in Florence on either 12 or 13 April 2007, and confirmed that he intends to convene the AC regularly at least every 2-3 months.

The AC meeting ended at 17.45.

## List of Actions

- **Minutes of last meeting**

The Secretariat to put the final version of the minutes on the private section of the website

- **Finance**

- The Secretariat to send again a reminder to OE and IDA **asking** them to pay their membership fee for 2007 as soon as possible

- The Secretariat to send to all Label Committee members an updated claim form for reimbursement of their costs (including subsistence costs)

- Prof. Augusti to check with Mrs Guberti, the **person responsible for the financing of the** EUR-ACE Implementation project **manager**, how to deal with reimbursement of AC costs

- The Secretariat to send the 2006 ENAEE financial results to all ENAEE members

- **ENAEE & EUR-ACE websites**

- The **President and** Secretariat to continue investigating on the implementation of the ENAEE website

- The Secretariat to update the EUR-ACE website by replacing the existing home page with information about the EUR-ACE, while keeping a link to EUR-ACE 1 project

- Mrs Guberti (EUR-ACE Implementation project) to regularly send to ENAEE Secretariat documents for insertion on the EUR-ACE website.

- The Secretariat to add on the ENAEE website the list of the 6 authorised agencies with a link to each agency. Dr. Wasser to send to ENAEE Secretariat, for insertion on the website, a text with information on how to become an authorised agency.

- **ENAEE membership**

- The Secretariat to remove Mr Manoliu's name from the list of GA members.

- The Secretariat to contact CLAIU ~~and MÜDEK~~ to have the name of their representative at the GA
  
- **Label Committee**
  - The Secretariat to re-send the confirmation letter to each agency authorizing it to award the EUR-ACE label with the only name of this agency and with a more attractive layout ~~and the President's signature~~
  
  - Prof. Augusti to send an email to NVAO/MÜDEK/IDA stating that the LC has finalised the procedures for evaluating applications from agencies and inviting them to submit their application within 2007 ~~and also attach the 'ENAAE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies'~~
  
  - Prof. Augusti to design the EUR-ACE label certificate and send it to AC members for approval. Once approved, the Secretariat to prepare and send it to all authorized agencies.
  
- **Membership to ENQA**

Prof. Augusti to ~~send, after consulting the LC,~~ take the appropriate contacts and possibly send a letter to ENQA Secretariat stating that ENAAE is interested in becoming associate member and asking for appropriate documentation.
  
- **Techno TN Forum 2007**

Prof. Augusti to contact potential ENAAE delegates to the Forum
  
- **TPU-RAEE joint CPD programme**

Prof. Augusti to negotiate the financial question of ENAAE sponsoring with the RAEE President

1 March 2007



European Network for Accreditation of  
Engineering Education

# ENAE

## Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies

### Table of Contents

1. Introductory Note .....	2
2. Review of Accreditation Agencies – Procedure.....	3
3. Evaluation of Accreditation Agencies – Standards and Guidelines.....	6
3.1 Accreditation Standards (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”).....	6
3.2 Accreditation Procedure (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”).....	7
3.3 Institution (Compliance with the European standards and guidelines for external accreditation agencies).....	7

## 1. Introductory Note

The EUR-ACE project (2004-2006) has proposed to the Engineering Community a European system of accreditation of engineering programmes at the First and Second Cycle level based on the award of the EUR-ACE label to accredited programmes. The system also allows accreditation of “Integrated Programmes” (i. e. programmes leading directly to a SC degree), if the EUR-ACE program outcomes of the combined levels are achieved.

The EUR-ACE Implementation project (2006-2008) at present aims at implementing the results of the EUR-ACE project and establishing on a permanent and self-supporting basis the proposed European accreditation system of engineering programmes, as a decentralised system in which national (or regional) bodies will accredit the programmes and mutually recognize a common quality label, namely “EUR-ACE Bachelor” (European Accredited Engineering Bachelor) and “EUR-ACE Master” (European Accredited Engineering Master), corresponding respectively to First-Cycle and Second-Cycle accredited degrees in Engineering.

To operate the system, the ENAAE (European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education) has been established. It is an international non-profit association setting up the necessary organization, planning and accreditation system. The ENAAE, via its Administrative Council, appoints the members of the EUR-ACE Label Committee, composed of representatives of European engineering accreditation agencies. The EUR-ACE Label Committee is tasked with recommending to the ENAAE Administrative Council accreditation agencies for authorization to award the EUR-ACE label.

Accreditation agencies from countries within the European Higher Education Area are eligible to apply for the authorization to award the EUR-ACE label.

This document describes the standards to be met by applicant agencies to be granted the right to award the EUR-ACE label to degree programmes in engineering. The guidelines provided are not part of the standards themselves, but should be considered in conjunction with them. Next to the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes”, the “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area” adopted by the Bergen Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education on May 19-20, 2005, were taken into consideration when formulating this document.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ENQA Report “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, 2005, [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main\\_doc/050221\\_ENQA\\_report.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050221_ENQA_report.pdf).

## 2. Review of Accreditation Agencies – Procedure

The review will generally consist of five phases:

### 1. Application

Engineering accreditation agencies seeking the authority to award the EUR-ACE label must formally apply to ENAAE by:

- Submitting to the EUR-ACE Label Committee a self-evaluation report in English indicating the compliance with the standards and criteria laid down in this document.
- Submitting the current version of the agency's standards and procedural guidelines as well as any other relevant documents in English (existing documents can be used).
- Submitting a formal commitment to the mutual recognition of the EUR-ACE Label accreditation decisions of all other authorized agencies in case of a positive vote of the ENAAE Administrative Council within the legal scope provided by national legislation.

The application should be addressed to the EUR-ACE Label Committee and sent to the ENAAE Secretariat (c/o FEANI<sub>AISBL</sub>, avenue Roger Vandendriessche 18, 1150 Bruxelles, Belgium, E-mail: ...@feani.org).

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will review the application for formal completeness and asks the applicant to provide additional information, if necessary. A complete application is the precondition for the initiation of the review process.

### Structure of the report to be submitted

The application to be submitted should as an introductory note include a paragraph on the history and development of the institution as well the reasons for the application.

The report should be structured according to the template provided in the document "Application Form". Any supporting documents that will be provided should be referred to in a clear manner. All documents submitted must be paginated and clearly indicate the name of the respective agency at least on the title.

No other specifications need to be addressed.

### 2. Nomination and appointment of Assessment Team

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will appoint a team of at least three people (one member of the LC + two other experts), which will be responsible for the evaluation of the agency. The members of the panel must be completely independent of the agency under review and have a sufficient level of knowledge, experience and expertise to conduct the review to a high standard.

Nominations of experts will be sought from a wide range of sources – including agencies, stakeholders, local authorities, etc. – but the selection process will be carried out by the EUR-ACE Label Committee to preserve the integrity of the process. The applicant agency may request that auditors be replaced where a suspicion of bias exists.

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will assign the assessment team with:

- critically evaluating the submitted report and documents;

- critically evaluating an accreditation visit of at least one FCD and at least one SCD program, or at least two integrated programs, as appropriate;
- critically evaluating the decision making process by attending one meeting of the decision making body of the agency (desirably the one, in which the decisions on the attended accreditation visits are to be reached);
- submitting a final evaluation report to the LC.

### **3. Site-visit by the Assessment Team**

The details of the duration and schedule of the site visit may vary between reviews. The length of the visit will be determined at the beginning of the review process when terms and conditions are being decided upon. It is likely that a duration of at least two days will be necessary for a review panel to validate fully the self-evaluation and clarify any points at issue. Evaluation visits in general will be performed in English.

The date of the visit and its agenda will be coordinated by the Chair of the Review Team. The date depends on the availability of the Review Team; the applicant agency may indicate convenient dates when submitting the application. Arrangement of accommodation and local transport falls under the responsibility of the applicant agency.

Applicant agencies may ask for an advisory visit by at least one member of the EUR-ACE Label Committee (who is not a member of the Assessment Team) during the evaluation process.

### **4. Production and publication of a final report**

After the site-visit the Review Team will draft a report on the applicant agency's meeting the requirements laid out in this document. The draft report will be submitted to the the agency under review is provided for comments and checking the contents for errors of fact.

The final report including the comments of the agency under review and the recommendation of the Review Team will be submitted to the EUR-ACE Label Committee.

### **5. Decision on Authorisation**

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will decide on its recommendation for authorizing the agency to award the EUR-ACE label and submit it to the ENAAE Administrative Council in writing.

Possible votes are:

- "recommended for authorization", or
- "not recommended for authorization".

The applicant agency will be informed about the result of the evaluation by the ENAAE Administrative Council and receive a final version of the report. Subsequently the EUR-ACE Label Committee offers to the applicant agency a feedback on the reasons underlying its recommendation to the Administrative Council.

The institution of appeal is the ENAAE Administrative Council.

On case-by-case strategy the EUR-ACE Label Committee might decide on a shortened procedure for re-applications in case of a negative vote.

### **Re-authorisation**

Any authorized agency must at a no more than five-year interval be re-evaluated and must prove the compliance with the possibly refined EUR-ACE standards and procedures. A shortened procedure might apply.

### 3. Evaluation of Accreditation Agencies – Standards and Guidelines

#### 3.1 Accreditation Standards (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”)

##### (1) Programme Outcomes

**Standard:** The programme outcomes published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with each of the six outcomes in Section 1 of the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes”.

**Guidelines:** Programme Outcomes must form a part of the accreditation standards. Demonstrate the compliance of the programme outcomes against which degree programmes are accredited by aligning them with the EUR-ACE programme outcomes, for example by listing them side-by-side in a tabular overview. A template for the alignment can be found on the ENAAE website (<http://www.enaee.eu>).

The six EUR-ACE programme outcomes of accredited engineering degree programmes are:

- Knowledge and Understanding;
- Engineering Analysis;
- Engineering Design;
- Investigations;
- Engineering Practice;
- Transferable Skills.

Although all six of the programme outcomes apply to both First Cycle and Second Cycle programmes, there are important differences in the requirements at the two levels. These differences in the levels of First and Second Cycle accredited engineering programmes should inform the interpretation of the programme outcomes by HEIs and by accrediting panels. The differences are particularly relevant to those learning activities that contribute directly to the three programme outcomes concerned with engineering applications, Engineering Analysis, Engineering Design, and Investigations.

Integrated programmes leading directly to a qualification equivalent to that of a Second Cycle qualification will must be assessed against the programme outcomes for both First and Second Cycle Degree Programmes.

##### (2) Programme Organisation

**Standard:** The accreditation criteria published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with the Guidelines for Programme Assessment and Programme Accreditation for Accreditation as set out in the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes” (Section 2).

**Guidelines:** This question is about the course structure, content and organisation to ensure that the students that enter the programme are able to achieve the Programme Outcomes detailed in Question II.1. The specific information we are seeking is tabulated in Section 2 of A1 (EUR-ACE Framework) under five headings:

1. Needs, Objectives and Outcomes
2. Educational Process
3. Resources and Partnerships
4. Assessment of Educational Process
5. Management System.

and your reply should be organised under these headings. The third column of the table in A1 lists the questions to which we would like answers, and the fourth column indicates where we would expect the evidence for the answer to be found.

### 3.2 Accreditation Procedure (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”)

**Standard:** The procedures for program assessment and accreditation published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with the procedures for programme assessment and programme accreditation as set out in the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes” (Section 2).

**Guidelines:** Procedural guidelines for programme assessment must be specified in written form. Demonstrate that the procedure for programme assessment (based on self-assessment of the HEI followed by external assessment) correspond to the EUR-ACE standards.

Individual accreditation agencies may add further requirements to those standards to adapt to nationally and culturally distinctive features of Higher Education in engineering and to ensure compliance with national legislation. At least the following aspects need to be addressed:

- Documentation to be provided by HEIs
- Composition of accreditation team
- Duration of the accreditation visit
- Structure of the accreditation visit
- Verification and validation of the report by the accreditation agency/commission
- Decision on accreditation
- Publication of results
- Procedures for appeals

### 3.3 Institution (Compliance with the European standards and guidelines for external accreditation agencies<sup>2</sup>)

#### (1) Official status

**Standard:** Agencies should be formally recognised by competent public authorities as agencies with responsibilities for the accreditation of study programmes in the field of

---

<sup>2</sup> This section is based on the “European Standards and Guidelines for External Accreditation Agencies” adopted by the Bergen Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, 19-20 May 2005, which in turn is based on the ENQA Report “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, 2005, <http://www.enqa.net/files/ENQA%20Bergen%20Report.pdf>.

engineering and should have an established legal basis. They should comply with any requirements of the legislative jurisdictions within which they operate.

## **(2) Activities**

**Standard:** Agencies should undertake accreditation activities (at programme level) on a regular basis. These should be part of the core functions of the agency.

## **(3) Resources**

**Standard:** Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their accreditation process(es) in an effective and efficient manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes and procedures.

## **(4) Mission statement**

**Standard:** Agencies should have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work, contained in a publicly available statement.

**Guidelines:** These statements should describe the goals and objectives of agencies' accreditation processes, the division of labour with relevant stakeholders in higher education, especially the higher education institutions, and the cultural and historical context of their work. The statements should make clear that the accreditation process is a major activity of the agency and that there exists a systematic approach to achieving its goals and objectives. There should also be documentation to demonstrate how the statements are translated into a clear policy and management plan.

## **(5) Independence**

**Standard:** Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

**Guidelines:** An agency will need to demonstrate its independence through measures, such as:

- Its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instruments of governance or legislative acts).
- The definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its accreditation processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence.
- While relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of accreditation processes, the final outcomes of the accreditation processes remain the responsibility of the agency.

## **(6) Accountability procedures**

**Standard:** Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

**Guidelines:** These procedures are expected to include the following:

1. A published policy for the assurance of the quality of the agency itself, made available on its website;
2. Documentation which demonstrates that:
  - the agency's processes and results reflect its mission and goals of accreditation;
  - the agency has in place, and enforces, a no-conflict-of-interest mechanism in the work of its external experts;
  - the agency has reliable mechanisms that ensure the quality of any activities and material produced by subcontractors, if some or all of the elements in its accreditation procedure are subcontracted to other parties;
  - the agency has in place internal quality assurance procedures which include an internal feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from its own staff and council/board); an internal reflection mechanism (i.e. means to react to internal and external recommendations for improvement); and an external feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from experts and reviewed institutions for future development) in order to inform and underpin its own development and improvement.
3. A mandatory cyclical external review of the agency's activities at least once every five years.



European Network for Accreditation of  
Engineering Education

## **EUR-ACE Label Committee**

### **Procedures for Evaluating Applications from Agencies.**

Abbreviations used:

A1. Framework standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes.

AC. Administration Council of ENAAEE.

CRT. Chairman of Review Team.

LC. Label Committee.

SGA. Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies.

#### **1. Application received.**

1.1. Applications are sent to the ENAAEE Secretariat c/o FEANI (address in SGA Section 2.1) accompanied by the appropriate fee.

1.2. Secretariat sends acknowledgement of receiving application and fee to the Applicant Agency.

1.3. Secretariat distributes copies of the application to the members of LC.

*Q1. How many copies are required? Should we ask for electronic and paper versions?*

*Q2. Is it agreed that the Secretariat does not send the application to the Label committee until the fee is received?*

#### **2. Appointment of Review Team.**

2.1. The LC decides if the application is acceptable; is it incomplete or incorrect in some way?

2.2. If it is incomplete the LC drafts a reply to be sent to the applicant by the ENAAEE.

2.3. If the application is acceptable, the LC appoints one of its members to be the Chair of the Review Team (CRT) who will have responsibility to take the application through the necessary stages.

2.4. The LC appoints a Review Team composed of the Chair and at least two others selected for their expertise and experience.

2.5. CRT will ask the applicant if they have any grounds to object to any member of the Review Team, and will negotiate dates of visits to the applicant agency and to observe an accreditation visit by the applicant.

## **DRAFT 2007-02-01**

2.6. CRT will write to the applicant to confirm the membership of the Review Team and the dates of visits, and ask the applicant to provide details of the arrangements for accommodation and local transport.

*Q3. If an application is unacceptable, should the fee be refunded?*

*Q4. Should the application form (Section 4. Appendix of SGA) ask for indications of convenient times for a visit?*

*Q5. Should we include in Section 2 of SGA information about the responsibilities of the applicant for the local arrangements for the visit?*

### **3. Visits of the Review Team.**

3.1. The Review Team assess the application and decide what are the important issues to be raised during visits.

3.2. CRT prepares an agenda for visits and informs the applicant.

3.3. The Review Team carries out visits in line with the procedures agreed by the LC.

3.4. The recommendation of the Review Team must not be communicated at the end of visit. CRT can outline what the Review Team thought were the strengths and weaknesses of the application.

*Q6. Should we prepare a brief guidance note on visits for the Review Team based on the relevant parts of A1, including a check list of what is to be assessed, suggestions for conduct, etc?*

### **4. Report on Visits.**

4.1. As soon as possible after the visits the Review Team prepares a report on the application and visits. This is a report to the LC and will form the basis of the recommendation on the application. CRT has the principal responsibility for preparing the report but it must be agreed with the other members of the Review Team.

4.2. The report, without any recommendation, should be sent to the applicant for correction of any factual errors.

4.3. The corrected report with the recommendation is sent to the LC.

*Q7. Should we indicate timescales for the stages in the report preparation?*

*Q8. Should we develop a format for the final report following the order of the evidence in the application?*

### **5. Decision by LC.**

5.1. The decision of the LC on the recommendation to the AC will be based on the report from the Review Team. The report must be presented to the meeting by CRT, and the decision must be made in the meeting.

5.2. The possible decisions of the LC are “recommended for authorization” or “not recommended for authorization”. The decision “recommended for authorization” must be unanimous with all members voting.

5.3. The decision “recommended for authorization” is for five years.

5.4. In the case of “not recommended for authorization” the LC can decide not to forward the recommendation to ENAEE for up to one year, and consider what information should be communicated to the applicant, including any advice on re-applying.

**DRAFT 2007-02-01**

5.5. The recommendation of the LC will be sent in writing (email acceptable) by the Chairman of the LC to the AC of ENAEE, and copied to the members of the LC.

*Q9. What fee should be charged for re-applying?*

*Q10. Do we agree that an appeals procedure is for the AC to implement?*

## **ENAAE**

### **EUR-ACE Label Committee**

## **Procedures for Evaluating Applications from Agencies.**

Abbreviations used:

A1. Framework standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes.

AC. Administration Council of ENAAE.

CRT. Chairman of Review Team.

LC. Label Committee.

SGA. Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies.

### **1. Application received.**

1.1. Applications are sent to the ENAAE Secretariat c/o FEANI (address in SGA Section 2.1) in four hard copies and electronically

1.2. Secretariat sends acknowledgement of receiving application to the Applicant Agency.

1.3. Secretariat distributes electronic copies of the application to the members of LC.

1.4. The LC appoints a Chair of the Review Team (CRT) who will usually be one of its members and will have responsibility to take the application through the necessary stages and informs the secretariat to send one hard copy to the CRT.

1.5. The CRT decides if the application is complete.

1.5. If it is incomplete the CRT LC drafts a reply to be sent to the applicant by the ENAAE.

### **2. Appointment of Review Team.**

2.1. If the application is complete, the LC appoints a Review Team composed of the Chair and at least two others selected for their expertise and experience.

2.2. CRT will ask the applicant if they have any grounds to object to any of the Review Team, and will propose dates of visits to the applicant agency and to observe an accreditation visit by the applicant.

2.3. CRT will write to the applicant to confirm the membership of the Review Team and the dates of visits, and ask the applicant to provide details of the arrangements for accommodation and local transport.

2.4. CRT will inform the secretariat of the postal addresses of the members of the Review Team for the secretariat to send out the hard copies of the self-report.

2.4 CRT will prepare a brief guidance note on the visit based on the relevant parts of A1 and sends it to the Review Team.

### **3. Visits of the Review Team.**

3.1. The Review Team assesses the application and decides what are the important issues to be raised during visits.

3.2. CRT prepares an agenda for visits and informs the applicant.

3.3. The Review Team carries out visits in line with the procedures agreed by the LC.

3.4. The recommendation of the Review Team must not be communicated at the end of visit. CRT can outline what the Review Team thought were the strengths and weaknesses of the application.

#### **4. Report on Visits.**

4.1. The Review Team prepares a report on the application and visits. This is a report to the LC and will form the basis of the recommendation on the application. CRT has the principal responsibility for preparing the report but it must be agreed with the other members of the Review Team. It should be sent to the LC no later than 4 weeks prior to the LC meeting at which the recommendation to the AC shall be formulated.

4.2. The report should follow the order of items set in the SGA and without any recommendation should be sent to the applicant for correction of any factual errors.

4.3. The corrected report with the recommendation is sent to the LC.

#### **5. Decision by LC.**

5.1. The decision of the LC on the recommendation to the AC will be based on the report from the Review Team. The report must be presented to the meeting by CRT, and the decision must be made in the meeting. The LC may ask for clarification of certain issues and postpone the decision if necessary.

5.2. The decision "recommended for authorization" must be unanimous with all members voting.

5.3. The decision "recommended for authorization" is for five years.

5.4. The recommendation of the LC will be sent in writing (email acceptable) by the Chairman of the LC to the AC of ENAEE, and copied to the members of the LC.

## **Memo and questions of the LC to the AC based on the LC meeting of April 19, 2007**

### **(1) Documents**

Taking into consideration comments received on the latest drafts the EUR-ACE Label Committee has refined and updated the following documents:

- ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies (external document)
- Procedures for Evaluating Applications (internal document)

The LC kindly asks the AC to decide, if a formal commitment should be provided by the applicant to the mutual recognition of the EUR-ACE Label accreditation decisions of all other authorized agencies within the legal scope provided by national legislation, if the ENAEE Administrative Council decides that the Applicant is authorised to award the EUR-ACE label.

The LC removed all financial aspects from the documents and refers them to the AC in line with its financial responsibility.

### **(2) Clarification of financial issues**

The Label Committee kindly asks the AC to clarify the following points concerning financial issues of the review of applying agencies (unanswered questions from memo of 2007-01-24 and a few new questions):

- (a) The LC suggests to the AC to reconsider its position of not wanting to ask fees of the applying agencies.

*The LC's position is that facing at least 2 to 3 visits to the applicant agency and taking into account a couple of days preparation each plus the time needed to draft the report it might become difficult to find appropriate evaluators, if ENAEE is not prepared to pay them in addition to reimbursing their actual costs. Based on the national experiences of the agencies represented in the LC, a fee of ca. 2000 Euros per peer seems to be the minimum. An equal amount should be paid to the organizing agency to cover their expenses. The LC, on the other hand unanimously argues that their fees for the review process in line with the SGA (to be terminated within the lifetime of the project) should be waved for the time and work already put into the system, e.g. in form of trial accreditations during the EUR-ACE-1 project.*

If a fee should be raised:

- Should the Secretariat does not send the application to the Label committee until it is received? (*The LC's position: yes*)

- Should the fee of half of the fee should be refunded if the application is judged to be unacceptable or withdrawn? *(The LC's position: only a certain amount should be refunded)*
  - Should there be a fee for re-applications after a first application has been rejected or withdrawn? *(The LC's position: yes)*
- (b) How is the reimbursement of incurred expenses to the members of the review team to be organised? *(The LC's position: It must be ensured that the review team does not have to lay out substantial amounts of money from their own pockets).*
- (c) The LC proposes to include information about the responsibilities of the applicant for the local arrangements for the visits in a proposed external statement on fees: *"The arrangements of accommodation and local transport for the visit are the responsibility of the Applicant."* Should this alternatively be included in the letter sent to the Applicant by the secretariat or in the SGA?
- (d) The LC kindly asks the AC to develop and implement an appeals procedure.

### **(3) Publishing results**

The LC agrees on the responsibility of the awarding agency to contact the ENAEE secretariat for inclusion in the list of study programmes having been awarded the EUR-Ace label. The LC suggests that a link should be established in the list leading to the summary of the programme according to the template published in EUR-ACE 1. The summary itself should be located on the awarding agency's website. It is suggested that no results should be published before the fee of 150 Euro have been paid to ENAEE.

### **(4) EUR-ACE certificates**

The LC discussed the draft certificates provided and in principle agrees with the content. Nevertheless, the following suggestions are made:

- include the final EUR-ACE Bachelor and EUR-ACE Master logo to be developed on top
- include the ENAEE logo on bottom
- remove bottom line
- include the date of the national accreditation
- adopt the wording to clarify that the duration of the label is according to the duration of the underlying national accreditation

Düsseldorf, April 26, 2007

Iring Wasser

**ENAE Results - Year 2**  
**30.04.2007**

	Costs estimated and agreed by EUR-ACE 1 PB	Forecasts Year 2	Cumulative results (€) 30.04.07
<b>EXPENSES</b>		<b>22122.50</b>	<b>6079.64</b>
<b>Office Renting and Maintenance</b>		<b>975.00</b>	<b>354.54</b>
<b>Operating costs</b>		<b>1350.00</b>	<b>490.90</b>
<i>Insurance</i>			
<i>Heating/Electricity/ Water</i>			
<i>Office Stationary</i>			
<i>Telecommunications</i>			
<i>Post/Mailing</i>			
<b>Capital expenditure</b>		<b>750.00</b>	<b>272.72</b>
<i>Office Furniture, Machine &amp; Equipment</i>			
<b>Services</b>		<b>1500.00</b>	<b>580.80</b>
<i>Accounting /Audit AISBL</i>		<i>1000.00</i>	<i>580.80</i>
<i>IT Development (DB &amp; Website) and Maintenance</i>		<i>500.00</i>	
<b>Staff expenditure</b>	<b>86000.00</b>	<b>5087.50</b>	<b>1850.00</b>
<i>Secretary + Secretary General</i>		<i>5087.50</i>	<i>1850.00</i>
<b>Travel &amp; Subsistence Costs</b>		<b>8360.00</b>	<b>617.38</b>
<b>Publication</b>	<b>20000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Marketing and PR</b>	<b>25000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Seminars / Workshops</b>	<b>25000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Review process</b>	<b>15000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>External experts</b>	<b>9000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Internal meetings costs</b>		<b>1600.00</b>	<b>307.30</b>
<b>Others</b>		<b>2500.00</b>	<b>1606.00</b>
<b>INCOME</b>		<b>30000.00</b>	<b>28000.00</b>
<b>Fees from Accreditation process</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Fees from Partners (accreditation agencies)</b>		<b>12000.00</b>	<b>10000.00</b>
<b>Fees from Partners (other than accreditation agencies)</b>		<b>18000.00</b>	<b>18000.00</b>
<b>Seminars/Trainings</b>		<b>0.00</b>	
<b>Review Process</b>		<b>0.00</b>	
<b>Grant from the European Commission</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>BALANCE</b>		<b>7877.50</b>	<b>21920.36</b>

27 April 2007

<b>ENAEЕ cumulative results by 30.04.07</b>
---

**Remark:**

A new column has been added on the table in order to indicate the costs estimated and agreed by the EUR-ACE 1 Project Board for some items.

**I. Expenses: justification****- Costs for office renting, operating and capital expenditure**

Calculation based on:

1. ENAEЕ Financial Plan Year 1
2. Number of days worked for ENAEЕ (3 days)

• Office renting:	6500 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		<b>354.54 €</b>
• Operating costs:	9000 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		<b>490.90 €</b>
• Capital expenditure:	5000 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		<b>272.72 €</b>
		Total	<b>1118.16 €</b>

**- Services (Accounting)**

The fees asked by the accountant for the closure of the 2006 figures amount to **580.80 €**

**- Staff expenditure**

3 days/month (2,5 for the secretary and 0,5 for Mr Wauters) have been taken into consideration.

2,5 days staff (secretary) at 125 €/month			= 312.50 €
0,5 days staff (Mr Wauters) at 300 €/month			= 150.00 €
		462.50 €	
	x 4 (months)		
			<b>1850.00 €</b>

### ***- Travel and Subsistence Costs***

A reimbursement of 481.28 € (travel and subsistence costs) has been made to Mr McGrath for his attendance to the Label Committee meeting in Düsseldorf, which makes a cumulative total of **617.38 €**.

The forecasts for this item have been slightly modified in order to integrate subsistence costs. If we consider that the 6 LC members meet 4 times a year and have an average of 140 € for daily allowances, we have a total of 3360 €. This added to the already calculated forecasts for travel costs makes a total of **8360 €**.

### ***- Internal meetings costs***

A new item entitled 'Internal meetings costs' has been added at the end of the section 'Expenses' in order to cover renting of meeting rooms and bills of restaurants connected with AC meetings.

Two bills connected to the last AC meeting at SEFI Headquarters have been already recorded for a total amount of **307.30 €**.

The forecasts for those costs have been calculated on the basis of 4 AC meetings per year, 8 people attending each meeting and an average of 50€ per person for subsistence, which makes **1600 €**.

### ***- Others***

The amount of **1606 €** corresponds to the registration tax for the EUR-ACE trademark.

## **II. Income**

All members, except MÜDEK, have paid their 2007 membership fee.  
(Remark: Romania is no longer an ENAEE member)

## **III. Balance**

On 30.04.07, the balance shows a positive result of **21920.36 €**.