MINUTES
of the Consortium meeting
TEMPUS grant
145021-TEMPUS-2008-UK-JPCR
'New Masters Programme on Library and Information Science'

University of Parma
28-29 March 2011
Parma, Italy

Present:
Alan Hopkinson – project contractor, Middlesex University, London
Charles Strouthos – Consortium member, Middlesex University, London
Tigran Zargaryan – project coordinator, Fundamental Scientific Library, Yerevan
Albert Sargsyan - Consortium member, International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Anna Maria Tammaro – Consortium member, University of Parma, Parma
Natia Gabrichidze - Consortium member, Ilia Sate University, Tbilisi
Irakli Garibashvili - Consortium member, Georgian Library Association, Tbilisi
Veronica Korkla - Consortium Member, Rezekne Higher Education Institution, Rezekne
Ian Johnson – Consortium Member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
Simon Burnett - Consortium Member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen
Mario Pérez-Montoro - Consortium Member, University of Barcelona, Barcelona

Invited:
Monika Segbert – Project external expert
Elena Corradini – University of Parma
Florica Campeanu – University of Parma
Arusyak Harutunyan - International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Ingars Gusans - Rezekne Higher Education Institution, Rezekne
Vittore Casarosa – University of Parma

Absent:
Barno Ganieva – Tashkent Institute of Culture, Uzbekistan
Marat Rakhmatullaev – Consortium member, Tashkent Institute of Culture, Uzbekistan

1. Opening of Meeting
a) Welcome from University of Parma
b) Adoption of agenda
c) Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of previous meeting
a) Accuracy
b) Matters arising not covered elsewhere
3. Report (TEMPUS Activity 1.1/1.2)
a) Acceptance of report overseen by RGU
b) General progress report (Alan Hopkinson)
c) EU recommendations on monitoring visits: recent reports including Uzbekistan
4. Purchasing of equipment
a) Hardware and learning centres: short report from each country about use of the computerized training centres: (problems and progress) **(TEMPUS Activity 3.1)**
b) Implement servers for VLE and repository and hire technician **(TEMPUS Activity 3.1)**
c) e-resources **(TEMPUS Activity 3.2):** other materials
d) Co-financing (**3.2**)
5. Review of activities September 2010 to date
5.1 Develop curriculum document (TEMPUS Activity 1.3)
5.2 Review of QA Seminar
6. Financial issues
a) Financial report *(Charles Strouthos)*
b) Administrative regulations and procedures (travel, per diem, refunds, purchasing equipment)
7. Forthcoming activities 2010-2011

7.1 EU user services librarians to deliver courses in partner countries (TEMPUS Activity 3.3)
a) Selecting subjects and lecturers
7.2 Pilot Master's programme (TEMPUS Activity 2.3)
a) Progress report (*Partner country reporters should give a brief account of progress*)
7.3 Dissemination at Crimea Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.3)
7.4 Implement LIS modules on VLE (TEMPUS Activity 4.2)
7.5 Study Tour (TEMPUS Activity 5.3) (including QA, 5.2)
7.6 Final Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.4)
7.7 Report on Sustainability (TEMPUS Activity 6.1)
7.8 Placements (TEMPUS Activity 2.5)
7.9 Management meeting in Uzbekistan (TEMPUS Activity 9.3)
7.10 Extra workshop (TEMPUS Activity 2.2)
7.11 Consultant's comments (TEMPUS Activity 8.2)
8. Project administration tools
a) Website
b) Project handbook
c) Communications (e-mail, etc.)
9. Closure
a) Any other business
b) Date of next meeting

The Tempus Project representatives' Parma meeting was organised to discuss activities proposed in the project, to detail possible ways for successful implementation of the LIS curricula in the partner country universities, to plan the exact dates of meetings for the year 2011, and to work out other issues of the plan of work, relating to JEP 145021-TEMPUS-2008-UK-JPCR.

March 28 meeting.

1. The meeting began at 9:00 as planned.
(1.a) The vice rector of the University of Parma Professor Sandro Cavirani welcomed Consortium members and other participants. Participants introduced themselves to the Consortium.
(1.b) The agenda was adopted by all participants without changes. Alan Hopkinson and Tigran Zargaryan were appointed as Chair and Secretary respectively.
(1.c) Alan Hopkinson spoke on behalf of Uzbek colleagues Barno Ganieva and Marat Rakhmatullaev who could not attend the management meeting due to delays with issuing the visa. Alan regretted the absence of Uzbek colleagues which meant that we could not discuss the Uzbekistan meeting agenda in detail. Anna Maria mentioned that during the meeting we will have an opportunity to communicate with Uzbek colleagues via Skype.

2. The Tbilisi management meeting minutes were discussed with matters arising. Alan presented the Tbilisi Minutes, (circulated amongst the participants previously by e-mail) and asked for comments or suggestions relating to any inaccuracies. As none were raised, he went through the Tbilisi Minutes looking for any matters to discuss that were not on the agenda. Alan mentioned that Uzbek students visit to Parma is not a part of the project, nevertheless it adds value to the project and Anna Maria mentioned that UoP and she are working on this issue with Uzbek colleagues. Uzbek students will visit UoP as Erasmus students and for final arrangements she is in touch with Marat. She mentioned that first semester will start at the end of August and will end at February 2012.
Project web site: Tigran mentioned that the web site continues to be maintained; for example, 4 days earlier, in accordance with the request from Ian Johnson a new 'Bibliography' link had been added.
Summer school – will be discussed later. Alan mentioned that he will pass round the general progress report and Anna Maria mentioned that she will copy all materials and pass them around. Alan mentioned that the final meeting in Uzbekistan, study tour visit and student placements are on the Agenda. About sustainability Ian will make a presentation later.
Monica explained to participants why she has postponed her Uzbekistan visit. She will visit UZ during the final conference instead and that this decision was agreed with project grantholder and Marat. Such an approach is more effective and also will save money. She is therefore in Parma for project evaluation purposes, and as she lives very close to Parma, her visit would not be expensive.
Alan mentioned that he would speak about Commission recommendations later (3c). Study tour visit to the UK will be discussed later. He also mentioned that according to the project we do not have anything to do with English language training.
Later we will talk about the teaching aspect in this project. Purchase of the equipment by Georgian partners and situation

with e-resources, will be discussed later.

Activities within 2010: nothing further to add. Co-financing is on the agenda. About items 5.3-5.4 nothing to add.

Issue 5.5 – to develop QA document – later we will cover it.

Alan mentioned that currently there is no progress on visiting experts to partner countries, and he will report that in more details later in this meeting.

Issue 7.2 (report from partner countries) - we will discuss later. Crimea conference

10 weeks of technicians' time - we would be talking later (especially about the request from Georgia).

Robert Newton's visit to Armenia for QA and report on sustainability (#7.8)– will be discussed later.

Discussions regarding Archives – Alan mentioned that for this we have invited 2 people from Rezekne.

Issue 8. Web site and communication is generally OK. We have a new vice rector in Tashkent University of Information Technologies. It was mentioned that at the request of Marat we should remove Ahmed and Shukrat from the mailing list and all agreed to do this from their own lists.

Regarding the one day workshop in Tbilisi organised by Alan. Natia gave positive feedback about that event., mentioning that it was received well by all participants.

The Parma meeting participants accepted the Minutes of the Tbilisi meeting as a true record of the meeting.

3. **Report (TEMPUS Activity 1.1/1.2) .** a) Alan informed the meeting that the 'Needs Assessment' report prepared by colleagues from RGU will be presented by Simon. Simon mentioned that although the report is ready, still we see small omissions, so partner countries should check once more the report for errors and corrections. Alan mentioned that this document will help to evaluate the whole project process at the end of the programme, demonstrating how we started and what we have achieved. Simon introduced the content and thanks to everybody for participation and for great input. Ian mentioned that he has an idea to publish this report in one of the library journals.

b). Alan informed the meeting that he has already circulated the report amongst participants on Friday and started to present the report.

He mentioned that the project reached its two-third point at 15 January 2011 at which point about 57% of funds were spent (excluding commitments). Since then we have paid for certain costs relating to this meeting in Parma. Certain payments to Uzbekistan for staff costs have been requested but are outstanding. Alan mentioned that the report is based on the Tempus NMPLIS project documentation, with defined activities and outcomes, and the numbering in the Report reflects the numbering in the NMPLIS project. Alan added that he has placed first the Management of the Project, indicating what amount we have and what is spent. Unfortunately at the moment he was not able to indicate how much we have left for each item, and EU allows us to move 10% from one activity to another (excluding equipment purchase). Alan also mentioned that he had established quite regular communication with EU Tempus staff, discussing project status and financial issues. He informed the meeting that we have already received second tranche and the third tranche (60,000 €) we will receive at the end of the project. The curriculum document was not going to be made available in the form he had envisaged and we will talk about it during the meeting.

b) Alan introduced Activities.
Management of the Project
9.1 The Kick-off meeting took place at Robert Gordon University in Aberdeen in February 2009 and representatives were present from all participating institutions excluding Parma. It was agreed that the Masters should all be undertaken at RGU. Deadlines were proposed for the selection of the candidates and discussions took place on the format of the English language training to be undertaken by Middlesex. €11,609 was spent out of a budget of €13,260.

9.2 The second meeting was held at Yerevan. It was attended by representatives of all participating institutions.

The third meeting was held in Rezekne and made great progress in planning a course (see 2.2) which was devised by Anna Maria Tammaro from Parma and setting the date for the first two weeks in July. The third meeting was held in Tbilisi and the fourth was now here in Parma.

9.3 Meeting in Brussels: Shukhrat Kayumov, Tigran Zargaryan and Alan Hopkinson attended the meeting in Brussels called by TEMPUS. €2,084 was budgeted for this but the actual cost was €3,237 because TEMPUS requested we fund also a delegate from Uzbekistan. This is covered by the surplus from 9.1

Other activities
1.1/1.2 The Needs Assessment for Curricular Development and ICT Infrastructure:

The document was prepared by Simon Burnett with input from the other participants of the visit (Ingars Gusans, Florica Campeanu and Alan Hopkinson). We are waiting the final version.

The budget for travel for this activity was €13,000 actually spent €12,521.

1.3 Curriculum document. This was due to be ready by January 2011. We have €3,000 to print 600 copies!

1.4 English language training took place. Account in balance.

2.1 For attendance on masters course TEMPUS cut the funding by 50%. 10 persons attended. The participants all went to Aberdeen. **A fee 'Institutional Costs' needs to be paid to RGU of €2,865.85 (yet to be paid).**The total cost is €47,525.86. Original budget was €56,250, reduced to €28,125. So there is a deficit of €19,399.14.

2.2 A course took place in Georgia, in one location instead of 3. Staff costs were budgeted as €41,800 but cost €24,548 so there is a surplus of around €17000 for staff costs We budgeted for 2 people from RGU (and it had been agreed to replace them by others but we did not) and three from Latvia of whom one came, one bought tickets but did not come and a third was not planned. One Italian attended for only a short time. As far as travel costs are concerned we have spent €32,414.02 and budgeted €44,500 so we have €12,000 left for another course with perhaps 2 or 3 lecturers. If this was held in Armenia or Georgia costs would be lower. Alternatively we could use this sum to partially defray the deficit on 2.1.

2.3 Pilot course is under way in Armenia and Uzbekistan and just starting in Georgia.

2.4 Second year of pilot course: may not be within the timeframe of the project as it stands now. Alan posed a question to all members - should we extend the project?

2.5 We have the possibility of 15 student placements in EU libraries or archives in Italy, Spain, Latvia and the UK. These should be in libraries which are used for such placements currently by the institutions concerned. These should be students on a new masters who do not travel in this project otherwise. Note the placements have been budgeted for 20 days costs of stay at €40 per day. However they have to be of 4-weeks duration to qualify for funding according to TEMPUS regulations. If they are not four weeks long they will not attract any funding from TEMPUS.

3.1 Servers have been implemented in Armenia and Uzbekistan and technicians have been funded. Cofinancing is also demonstrated. The technician from Italy has not visited. It was never the intention that they should be a software technician but rather a VLE implementation expert. This visit is outstanding.

3.2 e-resources have been purchased: Emerald license and licenses to translate UDC into Armenian and Georgian.

3.3 We have so far had one librarian visit (Nazlin to Uzbekistan: €1,936.64) and so have room for 5 (€2050 per visit). Partner countries should make requests. We have the possibility of an expert on metadata who could hold a session in Uzbekistan during the final conference, Nazlin who could go to Georgia; a retired university librarian who could give a week on library management and a librarian from Parma who could talk about information literacy.

3.4 Other equipment purchased in Armenia and Uzbekistan, Georgia outstanding.

4.1 Training staff to use the VLE was intended to be Barcelona in April of this year. This was to be in Georgia with 8 visitors from the other countries. We could use the €15,000 euros towards 2.1 deficit. Anna Maria mentioned that Uzbekistan needs more through training on VLE and mentioned that Vittore Casarosa could travel to Uzbekistan. To this suggestion Alan replied that a problem with that was that Vittore's visit will be only for Uzbekistan. Simon added that for UZ case we must try to tailor something special and build some theoretical model. Alan replied that theoretical developments are out of project scope, and we can't go too far from the Information Science area.

Anna Maria mentioned that she has contacted Marat and he has mentioned that UZ are interested on having a visit of academic with good knowledge on Moodle, on fundamentals of developing technical infrastructures for VLE and pedagogy of distance learning. Anna Maria continued that problems in Uzbekistan are much more theoretical rather technical. Alan replied that originally it was proposed that the partner countries will need technical assistance from EU universities on installing Moodle, but now it is becoming obvious that partners need some methodological assistance and support. They need help in areas: pedagogical aspects of e-learning and usage of VLE in partner countries. We can allocate one person to visit all 3 partner countries. Simon said that Robert Newton would have been a good person to evaluate technical and learning infrastructures, and he would alert Robert to the fact that they were interested in that so he could talk to them about this when Uzbek colleagues visit RGU and they meet Robert. Charles suggested bringing everybody to London, instead of Aberdeen. Simon mentioned that RGU is better to see the technical infrastructure and Alan said it had been agreed that the Uzbek group would spend time there. Charles replied that PC visitors can discuss technical aspects of VLE from London remotely. Ian added that Robert Newton's time is very limited and he is too busy, so no guarantee that we can fix him for such meetings, and we must think to find some other candidate. Simon suggested for in that case we can ask DELTA department of RGU, who are responsible for VLE infrastructure in two dimensions: technical and pedagogical. Alan asked Mario if he had any suggestions on this. Mario replied that he would have to discuss this issue with UoB staff, responsible for VLE. At this point Natia replayed that GE also is very interested in pedagogical aspects of distance learning. Ian mentioned that it is pity that nobody from Uzbekistan is participating, and we can't hear their views on this. Tigran mentioned that technical aspects probably are not a problem, and are being solved in partner countries easily, but pedagogy of e-learning is really an obstacle for teachers from partner countries. All agreed with these suggestions, and Simon listed the names of possible candidates. Alan said that in MDX they have a department for quality of teaching, and unfortunately the head of that department has left MDX for a new position in Bath University so Middlesex could not contribute to this item. After discussion it was agreed that 8 people (4AM and 4UZ) would travel to Tbilisi to attend a workshop on pedagogical aspects of distance learning. Simon mentioned that he needs to check who will be available for such training from RGU. Alan added that in the budget of a project we have allocated €1,045 as staff costs plus travel costs. Alan asked Natia and Irakli if they were they ready to host such a workshop. Both agreed, and Natia suggested holding the seminar no later than mid-July. Then Alan raised another question: who must be participants since there might be a clash between activities. They could be academics who will be involved in developing VLE in partner countries. Ian mentioned that as for people coming from partner countries for this seminar , they must be interested in implementing distance learning programmes, must be able to reshape their thinking from F2F approach to online environment, must be able to understand

how to develop and deliver online courses, how to develop particular skills for students working in online environment. He concluded that whole approach on teaching must be changed and revitalised. Alan concluded that selection of academics must be done from these perspectives. Ian asked would this gathering be for 2 weeks? Alan mentioned that we have proposed only for 1 week, so we need to find additional money for 1 extra week. It was agreed also that the seminar in Tbilisi will last for 2 weeks. Natia raised a question of Ilia State interest on developing institutional repositories. Is it possible to organise a lecture on concepts and best practices for information repositories. Monica mentioned that she can ask eIFL for such help, as eIFL is doing a lot in developing countries on spreading literacy on Open Access and Institutional Repositories and Copyright.

4.2 Developing 15 modules. We can pay 15 academics for 2 weeks each to work on Moodle modules with 150 days of technician's time and €7,504 available for translation work. We also have to find 25 days of time from EU as co-financing. Some of this could probably be put down to RGU who have put a great deal of unpaid work into the project already, and whose work is probably core to many of the modules. Alan asked can anybody remember any correspondence regarding this issue.

Alan mentioned that efforts should be done to translate developed modules from one partner country language to another. Simon added that RGU can offer some materials to partner countries, but most of materials will be as power point presentations, and after translation to who will go the ownership of the content. Alan mentioned that RGU can help on this allowing the downloading of that content from the RGU website. Natia mentioned that they still have access to RGU materials, and that they are grateful to RGU staff for keeping open these materials for them. She also mentioned great input from RGU during developing VLE in Ilia State. Alan suggested Monica to mention Natia's introduction in her report. AM is wishing to have access to the materials as well. Ian suggested to AM, GE, and UZ participants to come back to this resources and contribute.

5. Validation and quality control. Robert Newton led this in Armenia. The participants will meet again 24 June with Robert.
5.2 suggested a workshop adjacent to the management meeting in Parma. RGU felt this not necessary after 5.1 so combined with 5.3.
5.3 is a study tour. It will include inter-Tempus coaching from Middlesex (Elli Georgiadou from Engineering and Information Science who is one of the Middlesex experts on Bologna). This needs to be planned in Parma. Alan mentioned that the day when Robert Newton must be in London is 24th June, Elli will also join us, she is involved in the Yerevan State University (Armenia) project as an expert, and she is also the MDX expert in Bologna and she will do a workshop on 22nd of June. Alan also added that MDX is having a European week each year, first week of June. Alan wouldn't be during that PC representatives study tour visit, but it was agreed that Charles will welcome the visitors.
6. Dissemination: payment for the website design; printing of leaflets has not been spent; final conference (to be discussed in detail in Parma).
7. Sustainability: a document from UZ and RGU at the end of the project. Alan mentioned that still nothing is spent on dissemination. Ian and Marat are doing a paper for sustainability and Ian will present the draft of the report later.
8.1 Inter TEMPUS coaching involves, as well as Elli, someone from Armenia on the QA side attending in month 27 the meeting planned for Parma. However it is costed to take place in Armenia as there is only an honorarium of €100 for the expert from Armenia and no travel costs!

After introducing the Report, discussions started on more global topics. Charles was interested in possibilities for grant extension, as all PCs still have problems to solve. Alan replied that he thought that it would be advantageous to request an extension well before the project was due to come to its end. To this reply Charles mentioned that we need to understand what is happening in UZ currently. Monica proposed an idea to organise a Skype conversation with UZ participants. Anna Maria mentioned that she will send an e-mail to Marat, and they will make an arrangement for Skype. Ian explained EU regulations for grant extension. He mentioned that this is possible, but the extension wouldn't mean any additional funding, and the Commission agrees if there is a good ground for that. Alan agreed with Ian and mentioned that we will come back to this later. Charles suggested discussing this issue again after the Skype session with UZ colleagues.
Alan mentioned that we would discuss 3c later.
At the end of his presentation Alan mentioned that this is his general report, and apologised that he had not prepared full financial report on expenditures.
c). Alan mentioned that Monica has done 2 monitoring visits, and her reports help us to control project status. Her first visit was to Armenia and the second to Georgia. Local NTO staff and Commission also RE monitoring project status, and all 3 partner country organisations have passed such monitoring. Natia mentioned that they have had one local NTO visit and the second will happen during April 2011. Tigran mentioned that FSL and ISEC have been visited by local NTO and EU Commission representative. Monica asked Natia how they (local NTO) are reporting. Natia replied that no idea on this, but is confident that project participants can't have access to these reports. Monica recommended that during 2nd NTO visit to check with local NTO about writing report to Brussels, which could be helpful for her. Alan informed the meeting that UZ has already been monitored twice, he thought once by the Brussels staff with the local NTO and once by the local NTO alone, and he has received a report from Tempus about UZ. Ian mentioned the inconsistency between the fact that Alan has

received Tempus report for UZ and nothing from GE. Tigran reported that the local NTO has monitored the project once, and he is having regular discussions and meetings with local NTO, updating the staff on project status. Monica and Alan mentioned that we must be careful to follow up criticisms from NTOs and suggestions made by EU experts. Monica suggested also partner countries to check the possibility of having a view on the reports.

Alan reported that we still have a lot of work on documentation. In the NMPLIS project we are keeping money centrally and do not send tranches to the partners. Monica mentioned about her view and impressions from the project, and mentioned that the issues raised by her during visits seem to have been taken up and dealt with. She said she was interested to listen to the discussion about sustainability, which is an extremely important component of the project, and we are approaching the end of a project. I must evaluate why you need an extension? I'm happy if you will stress any issues which you think are important and I will try to work out those. Alan added that on December 2010, (Sarah Moffitt of the TEMPUS office visited MDX for monitoring purposes, and discussed with staff MDX experience of working in Tempus. That was an informal visit (she was from Brussels, and is ordinarily responsible for Russian Federation projects). She met with Alan as a grantholder, to find out any problems with the project, with internal financial regulations, and met also with Elli Georgiadou who was involved in a Russian project. Basically the meeting was most useful. Alan reported that he has discussed project extension possibilities with Sarah, explaining how the project time scale was developed by him and Armenian colleagues and he has explained to Sarah that in Georgia the educational year starts at a different time, and that Georgian colleagues will start the piloting from Spring 2011, so will be good to extend the project. She had agreed with Alan's idea on extension, and now Alan can l apply for an extension. So later, during our Parma meeting, we will discuss this aspect As a conclusion to this topic Alan mentioned that this is everything which I want to say about the monitoring visits.

4. Purchasing of equipment.

a) Alan asked all partner country representatives to update the Consortium on the status of hardware purchase and establishing a learning centre. Natia reported that still they are facing problems with hardware purchase. They have announced a tender twice, and as are planning to obtain computers and servers with very specific parameters, both times nobody has been able to meet the requirements of the tender. Natia had asked Charles to help to organise a tender in the UK, after a few months she has received a reply from MDX, that they can't help them. Charles explained the real situation and suggested Natia to cooperate with Armenia for hardware purchase. Natia mentioned that it seems that for now all problems are solved since a few days ago they received permission from the Government on VAT exemption, so local vendors now can participate in the tender. Also she mentioned that as prices for hardware had gone down, now they are able to obtain within the same amount of money more equipment. Ilia State is planning to establish a new computer lab and a learning centre. Alan mentioned that this is good news for all of us. Charles added that he must have a tender documentation, and that Natia should announce a new tender and MDX must receive that document. Natia replied that she will send for Charles revision tender announcement with hardware specifications. Natia explained the procedure of organising tenders in Georgia, which must be fulfilled through the State Procurement Agency, which is in charge of such operations. Monica asked how long it will take? Natia replied that tender announcement will take maximum 5 days, and we hope that during one month we will receive the equipment. Natia asked a question to Alan and Charles how they will transfer the money for the hardware. Charles replied that they will do a direct transfer to the tender winner. Also Charles added that for Armenia case they have done 50% prepayment, and after receiving the goods, remaining 50% was done. Natia mentioned that in Georgia no need for prepayments, all amount should be transferred when equipment will arrive. Tigran reported that all computers are installed and are in active use by the students. Server is in use for VLE purposes.

b) Alan asked Albert has ISEC received a payment for technician. Albert replied yes. Alan mentioned that UZ also has established computer labs, and is asking for a technician payment, and that MDX will proceed with this operation. Natia mentioned that they do not want to pay money for server maintenance, as Ilia State servers are virtual and outsourced to some US based organisation and the project can use these. She mentioned that they are planning to spend allocate money for establishing institutional repositories and for developing distance learning infrastructure. Irakli mentioned that from that amount, according to the project, some part must be allocated tot he Georgian Library Association. Tigran presented the budget allocation for GE:
- for Ilia State 115,855€.
- for GLA 9,156€

Irakli mentioned that GLA is planning to install a server and use that for training purposes. Natia explained that there was no need to obtain a server, as GLA can use the VLE server being in use in Ilia State University. Alan said that this needs to be resolved between the partners from Georgia

c) Alan informed the meeting that all partner countries had subscribed to the Emerald e-resources (from each country 4 institutions). Monica raised a question about negotiations with Emerald. Tigran replied that Marat has negotiated with Emerald, and they have compared the price with the one which Emerald is suggesting for eIFL countries. The price negotiated by Marat is lower. Alan also informed the meeting that in accordance with the request from UZ, they have made a subscription to a Russian database, which has high usage in Uzbekistan. Natia asked a question, if it is possible to subscribe to the guidelines 'Resource Development and Access' developed by the Library of Congress. Ian asked Natia what happens when the project comes to the end, and should you do to have access to those materials. Irakli mentioned that in some cases Georgian librarians are asking GLA for help in using such materials and GLA is paying from its own budget.

Monica was interested in the annual subscription price for RDA [for the purposes of eIFL]. Natia informed the meeting that the price is ca. $350 per year. Monica mentioned that eIFL is having very good relationship with ALA 'International Relations' department, and that eIFL can help to solve this problem without any payment. She informed the meeting that will send an e-mail request to ALA and will be back with the answer. Ian mentioned that it is important to recognise that RDA is developed for very specific purposes (for English speaking countries), and that he is not sure how useful are RDA standards for the countries with multiple scripts. Alan asked a question from the University of Parma: has anybody participated in RDA work. Anna Maria mentioned that some of her students have been involved in the project, and Vittore can tell more. Discussions started about EAD (Encoded Archival Description) and RDA. Alan said he thought we were not discussing EAD. Natia added that her interest is to understand and explore the usefulness of RDA for GE, and decide should they use RDA. Irakli mentioned that in GE they are using UNIMARC which he thinks is more useable than MARC21. Some of our libraries are using MARC21. So we must adopt our cataloguing rules to MARC21 and we are working on that. Ian suggested that somebody should write to CILIP asking for free evaluation for AM, GE, and UZ. Monica agreed with Ian's suggestion. Tigran suggested contacting CILIP for an online training course on RDA for project participants. Alan asked Mario about Spanish view on RDA. Mario replied 'nothing to say. No idea'.

Tigran suggested to allocate some money for printing UDC, and AM and GE are interested on this. Irakli supported the suggestion. Alan asked Simon about RGU usage and interest on UDC. Simon mentioned that it is a part of the curriculum in RGU. Alan mentioned that when he was himself at library school UDC was used as a part of curriculum. Another question to Simon was, is it possible to transfer UDC course module to Moodle. Simon answered 'YES'.

Natia mentioned that they have prepared a list of books (not e-books), and can we purchase them. Charles answered that we can purchase the books form UK. Alan suggested sending the list of the books. Arusyak mentioned that ISEC also have prepared a list and will provide with them within a 2 weeks. Alan suggested the deadline – before the end of April and to send the lists to Charles attention. Alan mentioned that UZ also must inform the meeting about this and they should prepare bibliography lists as well.

d) Alan reported that co financing is a very bureaucratic activity. Some staff costs are calculated as co-financing, and Charles must go through the project and prepare the forms for staff co-financing. These forms must be sent to the partners for signature and be returned back to him. Tigran will prepare a letter to EBSCO on co-financing and send the letter to Alan. After a break, Alan once more returned to 4b. He mentioned that the money for servers for AM and UZ is already spent. Natia has reported that GE has €6,000 for server implementation, but GE did not need real servers (as Ilia State is hosting virtual servers in US), and Natia mentioned that they need to obtain an equipment. Tigran reported that according to the initial plan €1,250 is allocated to GLA for technical purposes, and €6,000 to Georgia to maintain technical resources and classrooms. So GE must decide how to allocate that amount between GLA and Ilia State.

5. Review of activities September 2010 to date

5.1 Ian reported that they haven't produced a curriculum document. The original document, which must be developed by PCs and must be available through the institutional web sites, and nobody can produce a curriculum for all 3 PCs identical for each of their purposes, so it seems that it must have a module that comes from 3 partners, and this must be produced by PCs, and this is a standard curriculum. Simon mentioned that Peter also did a session in RGU for PC students, on how to produce the curriculum document. Alan introduced what is written in his (grantholders report) document, and said we must be able to produce the curriculum and print it. Natia mentioned that if we are discussing what must be produced, GE team has prepared some material and has sent it for Alan's attention. This document was produced in RGU with the help of Peter in 2010. Alan mentioned that he must check once more and redirect this activity. Ian made an addition that in the RGU they have done such an introduction, Irakli also approved that. In any case all participants agreed that the curriculum document is ready in English and in Georgian, and Tigran will check the situation in Armenia, and Marat must check in UZ. Alan also noted that the printing budget was reduced by the commission so we did not need (in order to use the money) to print a 'curriculum document'.

Charles pointed that the previous minutes (5.5.) mentioned that 3 documents must be prepared and presented to the Parma consortium meeting. Natia mentioned that she can print and demonstrate GE document as one of expected results from RGU study tour. Monica asked that somebody should check the status of this document with Marat, and report back. Arusyak mentioned that in AM we have a curriculum as a list of subjects, and we must think about the details for each subject. Alan suggested to continue discussions on 5.1 and Monica suggested to decide a deadline for presenting that document for AM and UZ. Irakli proposed that if during these 2 days we will prepare such document for AM, GE and UZ, then we can close this issue. Alan and Monica mentioned that we must wait for a documents from AM and UZ. Ian mentioned that the documentation from Armenia will demonstrate that the document is very close to Bologna requirements, and Uzbekistan is operating with different guidelines and so could be not very close to Bologna requirements as Central Asian republics still are not applying Bologna fully. Ian continued that Marat's institution has already started developing new curriculum and other is planning to start, which means that UZ already must have something developed.

Alan mentioned that it should be useful for UZ case to have something and circulate that amongst participants, and there would be no problem if these documents were not in English or Russian, in any case we must demonstrate that this process is ongoing. Ian asked Alan about the visa situation for entering Uzbekistan. Alan mentioned that Simon and he collected the visa from Uzbekistan Embassy in London, and you must go yourself to receive the visa. Monica asked to check and report

about the procedure of preparing invitation letters for the Uzbekistan Embassy.

Natia started to explain the structure of the GE curriculum document.

Veronica mentioned the Rezekne experience on developing curricula.

Alan thanks everybody for input. Alan asked to contact Marat for curricula document. Anna Maria will keep records what to ask Marat using e-mail or Skype if we were able to do that.

For AM deadline for presenting curriculum document – end of April.

5.2 QA seminar. Simon mentioned that he had only a verbal report from Robert Newton and apologized that he had not had any written report, and in that report he has indicated number of sessions provided, and Robert also indicated good level and understanding of QA by participants from 3 PCs. Monica mentioned that during her visits to eIFL countries she found it really useful to have a dialogue with participants. Ian mentioned that QA is a learning session which must be added to the project report, and the experience of Robert Newton would be useful for other projects. His preparation was done very quickly, he didn't have enough time for it. Natia mentioned that the basic problem with QA is that we all from partner countries have some basic awareness about the topics being covered during QA seminar, and all also all these issues were in any case covered during RGU lessons. And this was a weak point of the seminar. Her expectations were to learn more, but Peter had already done such training for us. Alan mentioned that Natia and David (GE) have been in Aberdeen, so may be for them that seminar (QA) was not so useful, but for others that might have been more useful. Ian agreed with Alan, mentioning that Peter had done a very deep introduction regarding QA, which was additional to the masters course. Alan mentioned that according to the project initial plan the first year is introduction, 2nd – curriculum preparation, and 3rd – piloting. The weakness from Alan's point of view for QA is that as he is not an academic and not an expert in QA it would have been better for this part of the project to have been written by an academic. Ian mentioned that when looking into the project activities it is difficult to say what will happen after one year of project.

Discussions started on the matter of how to strengthen the QA component.

Arusyak mentioned her impressions. She reported that in AM they do not follow the same QA procedures as in GE. For AM all higher educational institutions must fill in questionnaires for the National QA agency, in accordance with QA standards developed in Armenia. But Robert Newton gave lot of useful information on QA. Alan asked Arusyak if she found the 5 day QA seminar useful. She replied, Yes, especially exchange of experience, and especially with GE participants, was the answer. Natia mentioned that if Prof. Newton had contacted them in advance and they had given their suggestions for topics to be covered, then the meeting on QA would be more useful and productive. Ian mentioned that for the Commission and for further projects two things must be remembered: one – when you write these proposals, you do not have a certainty that you will win, and you are not going into the depths. So you must have an initial meeting and you must reshape. Monica mentioned that she agrees with Ian and the kick off meeting is of vital importance. Secondly 3 year is too long time to decide at the beginning how the project will proceed. Monica added that the people from our PCs are very polite; they have to leave a space for local visiting. They are trying not to overload the visitors.

Alan – in Western Europe (reflecting Monica) we always allocate extra time such as in the evening for other activities. This is a cultural thing for such countries. Monica said we must keep this in mind for final conference.

At this point Florica Campeanu joined the meeting. Alan suggested Anna Maria introduce Florica. She mentioned that Florica has participated in the first part of the project, and Florica joined in to the discussions. She mentioned that is very happy to see all of us once again, she has gained a big experience from participating in this project, and she hopes somehow to contribute to the project. Alan asked about Florica's new job in Rome. Florica explained that this is in a research centre in economics, and that she is developing a thesaurus in an agrarian subject, and also is responsible for the new repository. She is also in charge of harvesting web sites in this discipline.

6. Financial issues.

Charles presented spreadsheets describing the financial situation with the project. He reported that MDX has created a new project number for the project half way through, and this made some extra work for financial management. Alan mentioned that he is also keeping a spreadsheet recording each mobility, and expenditures for living costs. Charles mentioned that by October 2011 we will have a clear picture on expenditures. Ian raised one technical question. How is MDX financial office working with daily exchange rates. Charles gave detailed explanation. Ian added that EU is publishing daily rates for currency exchange. Alan mentioned that those changes were monthly, and the problem is that at the beginning of the month you do not know changes for the end of the month. He then corrected himself that the rate was published at the end of them previous month Charles added that when the transfer happens more or less could be added to the basic amount. He also informed the meeting that during the coming months we will have big mobilities of project participants, so he must be informed in advance about the travel dates He urged coordinators to pass him the names of travellers ASAP to be able to organise ticket issuing and hotel reservations..

6b Monica said she was just interested on the relationship between extensions and remaining money. For extension you will need some money. Are you thinking that now you need to look how much money will remain and apply for extension? I am just curious what the strategy for extension is – you have unspent money and because of that are asking for an extension? Alan replied: it depends on the remaining activities. He did not see the need for money for extension. One thing we can do is to do the final management meeting later, after the Tashkent conference. Charles- I think Monica is asking to not go into

the extension with a budget deficit. By the end of October we will do due diligence of finances.

Alan: at that time (October) it will be clear are we going for extension.

Monica and Alan exchanged ideas on possibilities for extension and money saving.

As a result, Alan mentioned that he can't see a problem with the extension. Monica said in any case you must have a baseline for extension, if you do not have money, it will be difficult to start an extension. Ian shared with the participants his thoughts about the Tempus funded Syrian project experience. For the NMPLIS we can go for an extension as GE hasn't stared piloting yet, so we can't submit the final report, and the extension will give us an opportunity for this without additional input of money. Alan and Charles agreed with Ian's conclusions. Alan also mentioned that Tempus requirements are moving more closer to FP7 requirements, and of course Ian and Monica were mentioning how the kick off meeting is useful. For FP7 during kick off meeting somebody form EU is participating and helping project development.. Monica shared another thought. Extension should give another opportunity for dissemination activities, and could have a positive impact on sustainability. So you must think about additional activities (and money) for these activities. All participants agreed with Monica.

Issue 6. Extra presentation by Natia. She presented 3 documents Activities. Work plan. Budget distributed according to the countries. Natia mentioned that she has done these spreadsheets for GE internal use and decided to present to the project participants to give figures what is spent so far. Alan made an addendum to Natia's tables. How many students visited RGU, the policy of EU on reducing the amount of participants etc. At the end of the presentation Alan thanks Natia for the spreadsheets and mentioned that these could be a useful addendum to existing papers

7. Forthcoming activities 2010-2011

7.1 Alan mentioned that in the general report under 3.3 was mentioned Nazlin's visit to UZ, and still we have 5 more visits. All of these are indicated in the general report. He mentioned that Elena also can act as a trainer. We have 2 weeks summer school in Georgia, and for second week we can organise 'Information literacy' course for all participants. Anna Maria mentioned that this is part of LLL programme, and she suggested to organise a parallel session. It was agreed that 1st week will be devoted to Moodle, and 2nd week for Information Literacy, and these lectures will be delivered by 2 specialists. Ian suggested that if we have 2 topics, then will be good to involve 3 lecturers. Alan mentioned that could happen that some of participants will be interested only in Moodle pedagogy, and no need to involve them in Information Literacy courses, and Nazlin. Elena and Rosemary McGuiness can participate in the lecturing. Alan mentioned that during previous Tbilisi Summer School many lecturers were involved but were not fully occupied so it might be advantageous to have fewer. Arusyak added that taking into account experience of previous Summer School will be useful to receive lectures beforehand. Natia suggested adding more practical training sessions, with less theory. Alan mentioned that now practitioner librarians will be involved, such as Nazlin and Elena. Monica mentioned that GLA could involve more public libraries in such lectures, which will be useful. Irakli also agreed that 2 weeks visit of EU specialists will be useful for practitioner librarians. Natia mentioned that during the 2010 Summer School they invited 8 librarians from National Assembly library and academic libraries. Arusyak asked if it was possible to have different participants for the 1st and 2nd week sessions from Armenia. Alan replied that as transport expenses are not very high from Yerevan to Tbilisi it is possible for AM to participate in that format. Alan announced that we have a possibility to organise some more courses by Prof. Rosemary McGuiness in AM and UZ on Information Literacy. Ian said that he is just wondering whether whole week on Moodle is too much, maybe we need 2 lecturers for 1st week. Aruisyak suggested another proposal on linking Moodle with Intellectual Property Rights. Irakli suggested involving a specialist from eIFL for IP and Copyright. Monica suggested discussing this issue with eIFL and Teresa's possible involvement. Alan mentioned that he will contact Teresa and check her availability. Arusyak asked approximate time of Summer School, and Natia replied - till the mid of July. Alan added that Simon Francis could deliver a series of lectures on library management for UZ and/or AM. Tigran suggested receiving proposals from lecturers to understand the topics to be covered. Alan promised to ask the lecturers to prepare and send a syllabus (Professor Rosemary McGuiness and Simon Francis).

7.2 Alan mentioned that partner country reports should give a brief picture on what is happening on places. Tigran presented LIS situation in ISEC. Tuition fee is 1000 euro for 2.5 years. Biggest obstacle is bad knowledge of English. He mentioned the courses, duration, and implementation of ECTS model or LIS. Ian suggested mounting some of the courses on the Web. Natia introduced the situation in Georgia. She mentioned that they have 17 students. They have selective and mandatory courses. Now we will announce the second admission and will see what happens. We have announced 10 stipends for MA students (one semester is ca. 500 euro), for the entire course 2,000 euro. The argument for 10 stipends was that this is a first pilot year and could be no any students will apply, so the University has allocated additional funding. We do not know how the developments will be for this year, we have started to promote our faculty. Alan added that the EU representative had said that normally in projects they should not charge the students during pilot, and Alan has replied   that the teachers are not being paid from the project money. So some tuition fees must be charged from the students. Ian mentioned that if the teachers are being paid for teaching the pilot, could this go as a co-financing? Alan explained that co-financing is stated already in the project, and there is no room for this. Alan and Charles could make a proposal next time for this kind of project for co-financing of teachers' time.

Monica raised a question about sustainability for the next round of students. Natia mentioned that at the moment nobody can tell what will happen on October.

Natia mentioned that they can't do any discounts for further students. 10 stipends were an exception. Tigran explained that he is very optimistic, that NAS institution librarians will be involved in the courses, and also interest has been shown from regional libraries. Arusyak mentioned that Pedagogical University is giving classical library education, without involvement any modern subjects. ISEC is more specialised on digital libraries. Ian explained that with the Pedagogical University ISEC must be careful, as they also will start teaching digital libraries. You need to work more closely with the Pedagogical University, and you should cooperate.

March 29 meeting.

7.3 Crimea conference. Alan reported that he didn't participate in 2010 in the Crimea conference due to the volcanic ash problem, and he proposed to go this year. Monica asked a question – have you submitted for participation. 'Yes' was the answer. His paper had been accepted.

7.4 Implement LIS on VLE. Natia and Tigran reported that we have modules placed on Moodle in GE and AM. Possibilities for paying technicians and academics. Alan mentioned that also there is €750 for translation activities and also we have some co-financing from EU. Simon will be eligible for co-financing. Tigran raised a question: modules which will be developed from the NMPLIS budget should be connected with NMPLIS or be in general subject coverage. Alan mentioned that developed modules must belong to NMPLIS. Natia as for translation – can we translate an article or a chapter? Alan said yes. Ian added that it is important if anything goes on the VLE, we must have the publishers approval for translation. They are very sensitive. They like to be acknowledged. Alan mentioned that you could produce some publications using the money from hardware purchase.

7.5 It was reported that Marat and his colleagues have requested to go to Aberdeen. Alan mentioned that the study tour is 2 weeks and visit will be to London, and Marat could visit Aberdeen for 2 days. UZ people must be careful with visas and ticket booking. QA participants will meet with Robert Newton. First component of study tour is QA visit for 2 weeks 1 week in UK and 1 week in University of Barcelona or University of Parma. Alan asked Anna Maria and Mario about the possibilities for QA seminar. Mario mentioned that he must speak with his dean. Anna Maria replied that she will be happy to host participants. It was decided to select University of Parma, and if possible Mario would attend in order to ensure Barcelona input into the activity. That would be the 3rd week of June. 2 people from each country should participate. Irakli asked Alan is it possible to publish Robert Newton's presentation online? Alan and Simon mentioned that firstly this must be checked with Robert Newton.

Discussion with Uzbekistan using Skype

At this point Marat joined the meeting via Skype to discuss open questions remaining from the 1st meeting day.
Alan and Anna Maria started discussions via Skype with Marat and Maksim.

1st question. About the visit of a technician. We have in the project a visit for a technician for Moodle. We have an offer from RGU of Roddy Smith, who could deal with pedagogy and Moodle. Is this what you need? AM and GE are interested in this, and participants from UZ must be involved.
Marat replied that this is fine for them.

2nd question. Report on use of equipment. Marat reported that the server with Moodle is installed, computer labs in TUIC and TUIT are functioning.

3d question. Please circulate to us all your curriculum as we are supposed to provide a curriculum document. We have agreed it will consist of the three curricula (AM, GE, UZ). And as a suggestion from Alan: a short version of both will be useful.

Uzbek colleagues informed the meeting that they have some questions: They had created a module 'Archives and Electronic Documents'. We need some advice from Latvia. Is it possible to receive some help? After consultation it was agreed it should be in the summer school

UZ: will be useful to have training from Rezekne, because of communication with them in Russian as well.
Alan asked the UZ participants to prepare suggestions and send them next week.
Veronica mentioned: they can organise such a course for participants in Rezekne, that is not a problem,. They can send also an academic for GE Summer School.
Alan agreed with Veronica's suggestions. And referred to the project document (see Tempus activity 2.5)
Alan suggested that we can include 'Electronic Archives' for GE Summer School.
Veronica suggested naming the course 'Document Systems and Digital Archives', the course will be prepared and presented by Peter Grabus from Rezekne Higher Educational Institution.
Alan also informed the meeting UZ colleagues that the summer school will be held during the first 2 weeks of July after visit to Parma, RGU and MDX.
Another question from UZ: what language will be used during Summer School. Natia – English. But there could be a parallel session in Russian.
Alan: Another possibility for Uzbekistan is for 2 students to go to Rezekne under Tempus 2.5 section.

UZ: and at what time?

Alan: this is flexible as it is under student placements. We are seeking for project extension, but we should still try and do things in this year. We have 5 student mobilities for each country.

UZ: So can we send 2 students and 3 academics?

Alan: or 3 and 2

UZ suggested organising in September.

Veronica mentioned that for Rezekne September also is fine.

UZ asked for accommodation for Parma, how the payment is proceeded.

Anna Maria mentioned that they would pay for their own accommodation but Parma will organise cheap accommodation 400 euro per month.

UZ: how long will be the stay?

2.5 months mentioned Anna Maria. Also UZ can share the rooms and this will be much cheaper.

UZ: when should the course start.

Anna Maria: August 25. But she can make the beginning of a course more flexible for UZ.

4th question. 2 lecturers are available to go to Armenia and Uzbekistan: one is Simon Francis who is retired university librarian. Other is Rosemary McGuiness who can do information literacy. Simon could travel any time Rosemary would be less flexible.

UZ: What topics will Simon cover?

Alan: University library management.

UZ agreed with this proposal subject to receiving an outline of the course

Alan mentioned that he will send the syllabus for the week for each and after negotiations we will decide who goes to Uzbekistan and who goes to Armenia.

Alan - we have sent you all our questions now, we will send syllabus for you to see.

.

Resume: library management and electronic archives are very important for UZ students and academics.

Charles requested the names of people who are coming to UK by the end of next week, e.g. 8 April, to start visa issuing process. Simon: we were expecting more academic content in the conference. This is important for many participants who need to justify their being away by attending an academic conference. Also some people from MDX would be funded by themselves.

Skype is ended.

Study tour 7.5: Anna Maria mentioned that from Parma there is a direct flight to London, which she uses and is very cheap so participants could use that as well.

Alan added that in MDX they are hosting a person from Finland, and she is involved in LLL exchange programme, and is spending 2 days per week with Alan, and she will be involved in this activity.

Robert Newton is coming to MDX and people will fly to London (arrival to Parma - 12 June and leave from Parma Saturday June 18th and departing to London) for 1 more week.

Charles asked coordinators to send the names and details of travellers as quick as possible.

7.6 Alan mentioned that he has sent the final conference programme recently. Monica questioned the aims of the conference? From her point of view it was very important also to support Marat to receive visibility because he is doing a lot in Uzbekistan. Another question from Monica. Is this dissemination at the local level or should it be for beyond? Alan agreed with Monica and added that Marat will invite many people from neighbouring countries.

Monica said some advocacy is needed to introduce the project outcomes. Ian mentioned that we must demonstrate the outcomes of the project and look to the future not just report on what has happened.

Charles: this is a final conference and we should demonstrate the positive aspect of the project and to have a place for further projects.

Alan: agreed and added that people from the EU and PC must contribute to demonstrate achievements in Information Literacy. LLL, library and archives management etc.

Ian suggested that most activities in Uzbekistan happen in Tashkent, so by selecting 2nd city (Samarkand) will help to extend project visibility which is in line with EU policy. He agrees with Marat's approach to open the door for that region. During Soviet time students could travel anywhere, but now people leaving in remote areas can't participate in such events and this is a good opportunity for them to participate, to listen to share. People from rural areas also need retraining.

Monica: I think that some people from international organisations also will visit the event.

Irakli agreed with all ideas and suggestions.

Ian – my impression (from the literature analysis) is that library development has been relatively well supported in UZ, and the system functions well. School libraries are being modernised.

Monica mentioned that are we spending whole half day during the conference visiting officials, which is important, but no need to visit all of them with a big group. So this could be done with a smaller group, and we could devote the whole of

October 11 to discussions with librarians from rural areas, with academics involved in Bologna, and with local Tempus NTO. This will save a half day, and we will have an extra room for our work.

Participants agreed with Monica's suggestions.

Monica: for Samarkand we must clarify who are attendees, which libraries we are visiting. And this we should discuss with Marat. Awareness raising also is important, what is modern library, what are the resources, and this kind of things, what message we want to go across to academics. And conference participants are academics and must be ready to participate.

Ian – another issue also is here. Not too clear about the situation in Uzbekistan, but I suspect in the Universities they have very fragmented library and IT services and somebody must very gently help them in budgeting, system development, and if they are going to have a good work for future then they must be able to work with international organisations. On selecting materials, managing funding and collections, subscribing to e-resources etc.

Irakli: we have to combine whatever is useful to be in coherence with the cultural background of the country.

Anna Maria: can we involve also students in the final conference?

Ian – the conference will have hopefully simultaneous interpretation and we must check that. The students will be a member of an audience and they are going to be advocates for modernising LIS services and they need to have some ownership on modernising, and most of them are not very good with English, so the interpretation should be very important. Alan said we have no funding to pay for students to travel from outside the country.

Natia added it will be good to send the materials in advance (to interpreters) which will help to the success of the conference.

Alan – refereed to Elli's experience. She can visit UZ to tell about Bologna (with other funding), but Ian mentioned that UZ government is not committed to Bologna.

Monica: in that case it will be interesting for UZ to listen the principles of Bologna process.

Irakli mentioned that this must be checked with Marat.

Alan continued that the final conference is for everybody and not only for UZ cases. We can mention that we must have a whole day conference instead of a half day.

Irakli again insisted we discuss all of this with Marat.

After lunch discussions on final conference were continued. Ian mentioned that we must think about sustainability and how NMPLIS will sustain after the end of a project. We need to flash out.

Monica – improvement to education and research.

Alan agreed with the comments of Ian and Monica's ideas. Alan suggested Tigran to give a paper in UZ about FOSS/OER, and how this concept will support building the modern library.

It was agreed in general that participants must suggest some ideas for papers for the UZ conference.

Ingars: during the final conference how the students will be involved. Anna Maria suggested involving them with the help of poster session.

Alan mentioned that we can organise 2 kinds of poster session: just standing near the poster and answering questions, or just hanging the poster.

Alan informed the meeting that he will contact Marat and tell him about the suggestions and concerns.

Ian – we must remind UZ that it is obviously to briefly report 'what has happened' and 'what will happen next'.

Alan suggested that during the next week he will contact Marat and suggested meeting participants to e-mail him with any suggestions and new ideas.

7.7 Sustainability. Ian mentioned that this is a task that Marat and he were working on. He had circulated a paper to Consortium members, and now will demonstrate some results using Power Point presentation. He said participants all have a role to play in this document and should make comments on anything which they think is wrong.

The report is needed because the EU is having expectation for sustainability, and one of the great problems for such projects is that when the funding stops the project also stops. It describes what is the situation in countries, (Ian apologized that at the beginning of the project he was ill and didn't manage to visit all PCs). So he started from am literature analysis, reading Minutes and reading country reports from participants. – the final report will go to EU and to NTOs.

He intends that this report should be published in an International Library journal. a) people will have a clearer picture on the country situation b) other people starting new projects will have no excuse that are not familiar with the country situation. c) He had described the country situation during Soviet era.

We must update country papers. This is an ongoing process: please send comments. He wanted to receive some input from PCs with recommendations done on behalf of the PCs as an initial step.

Everyone should contribute, provide references to documentary evidence. The Commission is looking for sustainability identifying the broader environment which library exist and are interested how to make project to sustainability. We need to identify how the LIS is seen on national support level and to describe elements external to the project

Ian described 'context level sustainability factors'.

GE mentioned that many school libraries are closed in Georgia, but private schools do have good libraries.

Monica commented most countries do not have libraries as political priorities. Is it a case for looking for such a priority? And secondly can librarians advocate for the libraries with political structures? So maybe we must look for other priorities for the libraries? Were they can contribute.

Irakli mentioned that for GE we must understand what is the political priority for the libraries.

Natia mentioned that for Ilia State University the library is the top priority. The ministry is pushing the rectors to have good libraries for accreditation. Also Ilia State rector was educated in the West and understands the importance of the library.

So we have: external elements; national support, academic and/or institutional support, socio-economic support.

Tigran mentioned that starting from 2011, AM government increased salaries for the librarians.

Then Ian described 'project level sustainability factors'.

Anna Maria and Irakli made some comments and suggestions for these level factors. Especially to build good human relationship between PCs.

Alan mentioned that, thanks to the project, two institutions inside UZ now are cooperating in the field of building modern LIS curricula for both Universities,

Ian suggested they should establish a closer relationship between ISEC and State Pedagogical University in the field of LIS curricula.

Ian introduced executive summary of the report, actions by the European Commission, actions by international agencies (Monica mentioned eIFL experience in this field) and also her past experience of Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Library support project, especially in the fields of sustainability and advocacy. US libraries are facing a sustainability problem. Ian answered questions:

- Actions by the national governments. Monica raised a question is Tempus funding study activities? Ian replied that Tempus will support for HE, which may indirectly led to education. But no direct support. Alan mentioned that he never has thought about this as this is a field for public libraries. And maybe it will be useful to ask Tempus about this.

 - Actions by higher education institutions.

- Actions by HEI's libraries

- Actions by the teachers of the new programmes

After questions Ian continued that in accordance to the recommendations from the participants he and Marat will review the report.

7.8 Contribution of Rezekne. They will accept students starting from September. 1st question was about what AM and GE want to do on student placements.

Natia: now we have 17 candidates and we must select for the placements and in selection may English language be a criterion (maybe an IELTS test) since the students are otherwise of equal merit. As for the period of time from October to December 2011. As for the institution she would be happy for Aberdeen.

Simon – we have a issue of our own student placements. So RGU must find a place in Aberdeen for own students. If we will extend the project then we will be able to divide the group onto 2.

Alan mentioned that it was not intended that Aberdeen would contribute to this activity

We can host people in Middlesex, and also Tony Olden can help (Thames Valley University).

Also UoP can accept, using the University library or different libraries.

Also we are now recording courses and you can be involved.

Alan: we must ask Simon to explain what happens in UK. We have placements between 4 and 6 weeks. They could be split between institutions. During the placement they are practicing in different areas.

Natia: will they have a chance to listen to the lectures of Professors?

Simon replied that yes they can do. For example they can attend for evening sessions. Others can apply to go for the specific institution. Alan mentioned that that was not the idea. These were working placements and the students would work the hours as in a normal job.

Tigran: our students spend one month's placement in FSL working with digitisation equipment, metadata and e-catalogue,

Simon: all partners must have a clear picture of what they expect from the students. Students must first have information about host institutions.

Arusyak suggested that host institutions should send brief information about what are the requirements. There should be some guidelines on participation.

Alan: for the students going to Rezekne, do the Latvian colleagues have a placement policy? Ingars mentioned that they haven't any special requirements so they should prepare some special guidelines.

Veronica suggested defining interests of students for placement and they can organise 2-3 days practical work in institutions with archives.

Ingars: For UZ they have a language problem (as Marat has mentioned) so they can deliver some modules in Russian.

Alan: we need requirements from Armenia to specify which organisations they need to visit.

Ingars: if money is limited then Rezekne is a good solution.

Tigran: did not think that for archives we will have students.

Alan asked to specify what AM will need.

Tigran: we will be interested on repository building, on Information Literacy courses for academics, on preserving cultural heritage, on metadata creation etc.

Alan mentioned that the duration should be for 4 weeks

Anna Maria mentioned that it could be not enough.

Alan mentioned that these 4 weeks is just to become familiar with organisation of the work. Natia must check availability of GE students for archival placement. Natia also mentioned that they will be happy to start placement in the 3d semester, but this could happen only if extension will start.

Ian – students shouldn't go for placement if they are not ready. They must understand what they learned in the classroom and how to apply it..**7.9** Alan: we do need a management meeting in UZ, and with Charles we will work out agenda for the management meeting. Maybe, if we will extend the project, then we can organise another management meeting.

Ian – we have the dates for UZ conference and when the management meeting will take place? Alan mentioned that during the conference time. We must think about an extra day for this meeting.

The conference programme draft is prepared by Marat and nothing about the management meeting dates. So we need to discuss this with Marat

7.10 Alan mentioned that we have already talked about this.

7.11 Alan mentioned that we have listened to the consultant's comments..

Alan suggested once more discussing archives placements in Rezekne.

Veronica: I looked through whole project and see that changes in archives are going slower rather changes in the libraries. We must concentrate our attention to the changes in the archival work. In Latvia we have moved a long way for accreditation of these courses. Now I think that we can see in this situation that the next stage is to release this new Masters programme in relation with digital archives, with information management, and after that to connect this 2 directions into one. Now when we speak about our work, we can organise some archival courses for PCs. I will discuss this with my colleagues and be back.

Ingars: in general it depends which PC wants to participate in the courses.

Alan: we are quite fortunate this morning having discussed with Marat UZ needs.

Now we need to discuss the reason for extension. The project was developed 3 years before, and only later did we discover that in GE the Masters cannot start before March 2011, and we can't evaluate the pilot for GE. The course will be completed in May 2012, students will defend the thesis in June 2012, and in autumn we will be able to evaluate. Perhaps we need more 10 months.

Ian – we should have a time for report writing and it is clear that we must go for extension. Particularly in the light of discussions relating student placements. I want to understand extension and management meeting, budget, and format in which project can seek to evaluate the project for piloting. We must be able to demonstrate the impact of the project to Commission.

Alan: in this report we can also have an opinion of visitors to EU institutions, the value of placements, relationship with summer schools – how that helped, also what advantage the equipment brought. Tigran asked how the project will be monitored during extension time.

Alan reported that no any clear picture just for now, but it could happen that at a final management meeting we might for example invite not 2 persons per country but 1 person. We must explore how much money we will have at the end of the project.

Ian – also you should make a request for extension to Commission as soon as possible, to know the opinion of Tempus on this. If this will happen then Charles must revise the budget and we should try to be more economical during project life time to have some savings for extra management meeting.

Alan informed the meeting about the letter from NTO UZ, explaining regulations how to enter the country, and how to obtain a visa, and what type of invitation letters are required.

It was decided that EU partners should try to apply for visa as soon as possible.

Issue 8a. Website. Tigran gave a short update on the website. Ian; asked a question - are Internet search engines searching and indexing NMPLIS web site. Natia, Alan, and Tigran reported that indexing is being done. Search by term NMPLIS is bringing the project web site. Tigran also added that we have created a project site on Facebook to give additional visibility to the project.

Ian – the point is that if search engineers are indexing, then the page information will be accessible for large professional community.

8b. Project handbook. No discussion.

8c Alan reported about request from Marat to remove 2 UZ participants from e-mail list, Ian added that Jean Day (she is retired) also should be removed.

9a. Any other business

There was none. Alan on behalf of project management team asked UoP colleagues for comments. Elena hoped that we will have more opportunities for cooperation after the project end.

Florica gave thanks for inviting her to this meeting. She proposed to herself and the participants that this is a strong project. We must think about doing a joint project on thesaurus development.

If we will get an extension we will think to include something from thesaurus as mentioned to Alan.

9b. Date of the next meeting is already defined.

Alan declared the meeting closed.

Closure. Alan expressed on behalf of all participants gratitude to colleagues from University of Parma for hosting this meeting and its excellent organisation.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Alan Hopkinson (Chairman)
Tigran Zargaryan (Secretary)

</div>