



Ref: DJS/EYCB/EURO-MED-ICD/2010/52

2 July 2010

[In search of]
**Indicators for Intercultural Dialogue in Non-
formal Education Activities**

Experts' Meeting
European Youth Centre Budapest, 19-21 May 2010

REPORT

Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
BACKGROUND OF THE MEETING	5
OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING	5
PARTICIPANTS IN THE MEETING	6
THE FEASIBILITY STUDY	6
EXISTING WORK AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS (SALTO, YFJ, NGOs).....	7
REFLECTIONS ON THE STUDY PROCESS	7
<i>General reflections</i>	7
<i>Purposes of ICD</i>	9
<i>Possible criteria for successful and quality intercultural dialogue process</i>	10
INDICATORS' DEVELOPMENT: WAYS FORWARD	11
<i>Timeline for a possible study</i>	11
<i>Further partners to involve</i>	12
CONCLUSIONS OF THE MEETING	12
PROGRAMME OF THE MEETING	133
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	144

[In search of]

Indicators for Intercultural Dialogue in Non-formal Education Activities

Experts' Meeting

European Youth Centre Budapest, 19-21 May 2010

Executive summary

Intercultural dialogue is, implicitly or explicitly, a common objective and purpose for all the partners concerned by international youth cooperation and, particularly, those involved in Euro-Mediterranean cooperation. The partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission in the field of Youth has embraced intercultural dialogue as a priority area within the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation strand of the activities. This has been carried out and developed with other stakeholders, notably the Anna Lindh Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures and the Salto Euro-Med Resource Centre.

Intercultural dialogue may refer to policies, educational approaches, programmes or simple activities. For the purpose of the experts meeting herein referred, intercultural dialogue embraces realities and concepts that are also found in intercultural learning, intercultural education and, obviously, intercultural dialogue. It also concerns social and educational policies other than those strictly related to education (formal and non-formal), such as youth policy, social policies and migration..

In this framework, the experts meeting had two main objectives to review existing practices and tools for defining objectives and evaluating results in intercultural dialogue activities, particularly in the European and Mediterranean contexts and to discuss the feasibility of a future project on indicators for intercultural dialogue for non-formal education activities in the broader Euro-Mediterranean cooperation framework.

The meeting brought together researchers, youth experts, trainers and institutional representatives experienced in intercultural dialogue and youth work. Their expectations from the meeting were related mapping of the existing processes, tools, trends, discourse focuses, the initiatives on European level towards developing indicators for intercultural dialogue.

One of the core elements of the meeting was the feasibility study made by Areg Tadevosyan, of the International Centre for Intercultural Research, Learning and Dialogue (Armenia). The purpose of the study was to explore the situation with criteria/indicators of successful intercultural dialogue and to assess the feasibility of development of such indicators. The study identified some of the challenges in designing and conducting the further study on indicators. The study also mapped the existing practices and work and tools already available in this sphere.

The meeting addressed both content of intercultural dialogue criteria and indicators and the political contexts of Intercultural dialogue. Some reflections addressed also the feasibility and need of developing quality standards for activities, understanding of culture in the current the intercultural dialogue discourse, levels of focus of the project, formal and non formal educational systems and their combination. Overall, the meeting tried to depict the purposes of intercultural dialogue itself, so the participants went

through the exercise of consolidating the understanding of the purpose of intercultural dialogue in different context, institutions and frameworks.

The process of developing of indicators requires patience and a considerable amount of work and resources. A clear approach and a conceptual framework to build the practice on are the necessary pre-condition. In order to develop indicators the work should start identifying the quality standards for a process to be successful in intercultural terms. Thus, it is important to identify quality criteria to be able to understand what one is looking for as an individual competence development, change or an outcome brought about through learning. The criteria will need to be based on the practice that exists in the youth field.

The work done so far is a good base on which a joint work and partnership can continue. The cooperation will need to be strengthen with SALTO RC Diversity, which has undertaken a similar project and other partners from other parts of the world.

A timeline for pursuing the work of the project was proposed by the meeting; key methods of work were identified and decided and recommended to the future teams working on the indicators development. A few guidelines or core principles were proposed to the teams as well. These included:

- Enough of financial and human resources in the project, enough time for development, testing and revision of the indicators (around 2-3 years)
- Research and solid evidence based approach to developing both indicators and the tools of its use. The solid evidence base makes the work reliable, defendable, re-checkable. "Bottom up" approach to information acquisition and knowledge building. The developed indicators have to be meaningful, understandable, and identifiable for the users. The criteria and indicators have to derive from, be coming from and based on real life experiences.
- The process should be open process for anyone interested to be able to share, feedback, comment
- Euro-Mediterranean presence in all the phases of the planned work should be ensured, if the work will be emphasising the Euro Mediterranean context

Participants of the meeting agreed that the meeting was important and very useful.

Background of the meeting

Intercultural dialogue is, implicitly or explicitly, a common objective and purpose for all the partners concerned by international youth cooperation and, particularly, those involved in Euro-Mediterranean cooperation.

Intercultural dialogue, whether referring to policies, educational approaches or programmes, for the purpose of the experts meeting herein referred, embraces realities and concepts that are also found in intercultural learning, intercultural education and, obviously, intercultural dialogue. It also concerns social and educational policies other than those strictly related to education (formal and non-formal), such as youth policy, social policies, migration, etc. The educational approaches and programmes where intercultural dialogue purposes can be found may or may not have "intercultural" as an explicit dimension, such as peace education, human rights education, global education, etc.

We share, to a large extent, the understanding that intercultural dialogue is the political expression and framework of educational programmes which have intercultural learning in their objectives or approach. Intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning are not competing and much less incompatible concepts and approaches; they are interdependent and inter-connected.

We are also aware of the risks carried by a narrow and restrictive view of intercultural dialogue, notably the risk of culturalising matters or of "reifying" culture. Intercultural relations and intercultural dialogue have to be, obviously, contextualized in a given social reality where tensions and conflicts of various nature interplay and where the role of "culture" may be less important or less evident than the adjective "intercultural" would suggest.

Finally, even if "intercultural dialogue" is a well known and probably accepted concept today – thanks notably to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (European Union) and to the Council of Europe's White Paper – we are fully aware that in many of the political, academic and social circles, "intercultural" is still often confused with "multicultural" and "cultural diversity".

Objectives of the meeting

In this framework, the experts meeting at the European Youth Centre Budapest had the following objectives:

- ⇒ To review existing practices and tools for defining objectives and evaluating results in intercultural dialogue activities, particularly in the European and Mediterranean contexts;
- ⇒ To discuss the relevance and feasibility of a common project on indicators for intercultural dialogue for non-formal education activities in the broader Euro-Mediterranean cooperation framework;
- ⇒ To make proposals for the conceptual and practical guidelines of such a project or, in alternative, of the ways through which the quality and standards for intercultural dialogue (youth activities) can be pursued.

The meeting was to be seen as a starting point for the project and, therefore, the situation in which questions directly and indirectly related to the study may be addressed and discussed.

Participants in the meeting

The meeting brought together researchers, youth experts, trainers and institutional representatives experienced in intercultural dialogue and youth work. Some of them are working in intercultural institutes, others coming from research organizations, some others from youth platforms working on the themes of migration, urban cultures, social inclusion. Experts from Anna Lindh Foundation, League of Arab States, SALTO Euro-Med, and Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth apologized and showed interest to be involved in the process.

Expectations

Mostly the expectations were relating to trying to see the “map” of the existing processes, tools, trends, discourse focuses, the initiatives on European level towards developing indicators for intercultural dialogue. Common vocabulary, similarities and differences in the approach, clarification and definition of concepts were also mentioned.

The Feasibility study

The idea of realizing a pilot feasibility study on criteria and indicators for Intercultural Dialogue was developed during the 5th Partnership Sectorial Meeting on Euro-Mediterranean Cooperation, Human Rights Education and Intercultural Dialogue in Molina (Spain) on 14th of September, 2009. During the meeting discussions it was pointed out clearly that Intercultural Dialogue is one of the core objectives of all the partners in Euro-Mediterranean cooperation. One of the main criteria assessing the international youth projects in the framework of Council of Europe’s activities as well as “Youth”/“Youth in Action” programme of European Commission and “Euromed Youth” programmes was (and still is) the successful inclusion and implementation of the component of intercultural dialogue/learning. The main purpose of the preliminary study was to explore the situation with criteria/indicators of successful intercultural dialogue and to assess the feasibility of development of such indicators. The study was done to help identify the challenges that would need to be addressed in designing and conducting the further study and work on indicators and determine whether there was any existing work, results and tools already available in this sphere. Three main objectives were defined for this research:

- A. To organize a mapping of the sphere of intercultural dialogue, its place and relations with Euro-Mediterranean/international youth cooperation, non-formal education as well as potential importance of indicators of intercultural dialogue in these fields.
- B. To study the possibility/feasibility of development of indicators of intercultural dialogue, to understand what is already available in other policy spheres, according to which principles these indicators can be designed in further study and how can they be understood.
- C. To study the existing body of practice and research on intercultural dialogue and its indicators by different institutions and to understand what is already done and what can be used for the further research work.

In general the study showed that there is a missing link between the existing research, practice and policy reflections of it. There are a number of issues, findings and recommendations the feasibility study brought up, among which:

- The study of the political documents behind Euro-Mediterranean cooperation, the resolutions and declarations of Council of Europe (Agenda 2020, Faro declaration, Opatja Declaration, White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue etc.) and other actors in international cooperation (UNESCO, Asia-Europe Foundation, Alliance of Civilizations, etc.) is giving us a high level of confidence that the process of intercultural dialogue indicators is backed up with solid political base.
- It will be a hard task to define expected results to be measured with intercultural dialogue indicators, but even if it will not be possible to develop an all inclusive list, the reflections on this topic will open up a lot of horizons for future assessment and evaluation.
- It will be extremely important to provide participation of experts from maximally diverse cultural backgrounds in the research process, to cover the multitude of the realities concerned.
- The recommendation of the feasibility study for this aspect is to carefully study the possible usage mechanisms of intercultural dialogue indicators developed, to have the practical implications in mind when designing the indicators themselves, as well as to plan a dissemination and implementation strategy alongside with the tool developed.
- It will be important to pay serious attention to setting adequate time-frames based on the resources available, level of dedication of all the partner institutions and experts involved and the scope of final research process decided.

Existing work and current developments (SALTO, YFJ, NGOs)

The SALTO RC on Cultural Diversity initiated a project on developing Intercultural Competences. A working group is set to work on it and will most probably finalise the work till the end of 2011. The work is similar to the process started with this study and has similar objectives at this stage. The main focus, though, is on individual learning outcomes and not on the criteria building on how intercultural dialogue events should be organized or how an activity should ensure intercultural dialogue processes and learning. The competences refer to the ones developed through Youth in Action activities on European level in the educational activities for youth workers, so the scope is very much on youth workers and trainers. The main discussions now are about the definition of intercultural competences. Some issues of cultural inequalities and justice issues are being looked at in the frames of intercultural competences leading to social cohesion as well. Another set of issues is about the people assessing, what is possible to assess and how. One of the challenges of the work is that the working group works on voluntary bases, and this sometimes can slow down the process.

Reflections on the study process

General reflections

Feasibility and need of standards

The need of quality criteria for intercultural activities is evident and more and more the standards should be developed, to not only reply on the persons delivering educational activities, but also the whole system and structure of this activities. Some expectations

were towards fundamental questions on what can and cannot be learned, how and when, who should be the person and institution teaching.

Understanding of culture in current the intercultural dialogue discourse

Nowadays, culture is more and more seen as a dynamic concept, not so much just connected only with ethnic or religious connotations. This opens questions about definition of the intercultural dialogue and a framework for development of indicators. Such can be "Learning to living together" in dignity and peace, which widens the concept of "culture" and makes it more acceptive towards the dynamism of the concept. The framework in which the "living together" is to be seen is living together as equals in dignity, based on universal human rights. Intercultural dialogue is very much linked with values, beliefs, and thus is has a big emotional component, which should be taken into account throughout the work on evidence collection and also indicator development.

Limiting vs regulating

By putting up standards, criteria, indicators is there a risk of limiting and directing what people should think, feel, know and behave as? Does this risk labeling people as "good" and "bad" performers of intercultural dialogue?

Levels of focus of the study

One of the challenges and open questions was to realise on what level the indicators should be developed – personal learning (process and content of the competence building) or activity/ organization (context for supporting learning and development). Or should the work be focused on local/national/regional/European levels as contexts which have to be measured in terms of intercultural dialogue supportive?

Content vs context

Obviously in order to be tangible, the work needs, at least on this stage, to be focused on one or two areas only. A good and a feasible starting point, can be the issues of learning on individual level and the quality of the activity promoting intercultural dialogue. One main question around this is whether the correlation between the extent of individual learning possibility with the context and quality of the activity promoting intercultural dialogue is clear and obvious to all the parties involved.

Formal vs Non formal Education

ICD and competence development is not solely a non formal education activity goal. In fact only through a consolidated work with both formal and non formal fields it is possible to talk about sustainable results. Formal educational systems tend to have curricula developed to answer the challenges faced by growingly multicultural societies and will also be able to contribute to the work done. So it is important and can be useful to include the formal systems as well in the work. On the other hand, the formal educational system should also be addressed and reflected in the work done, and the results of the study should be possibly transferable to the formal system as well. A big challenge with work on indicators for the non formal field is the fact that many organization lack resources to be able to follow up participants of their event in a long term manner and it is often hard to assess and evaluate any possible impact. It seems that in the formal system, this might have more possibilities, which can be good to use.

Impact of non-formal education with youth on intercultural dialogue issues and competence development (impact on an individual vs impact on the society)

Is it possible to measure, filter what changes are brought in by non-formal education and youth work? How much an international activity develops intercultural dialogue competences? How is it possible to record, show the added value of the non-formal education for intercultural dialogue and make it recognised and visible for both institutions on different levels, the young people themselves, the society in large?

Exclusivity vs transferability of indicators developed

One of the questions for consideration is how much the indicators, criteria, standards will be specific and tailored, and thus usable only in Euro-Mediterranean cooperation context and activities. Is there a possible need for contextualised definition of indicators or criteria? Do we need or not transferable indicators, is it possible to develop rather universal guidelines, standards, criteria, indicators? How much of it should be context specific and what is the adaptability niche and possibility.

Usage of indicators

It is important to understand what will the indicators serve for, who and how will use them, what tools will exist to do that. Will they be used in formal or non formal settings, will they be used as self assessment tool or will be used to measure quality? How can we ensure that the indicator by groups it is for and what does this usage give as added value for the users, how it is recognised elsewhere. One of the questions to be decided is whether the indicators should be reflected in the wider life long learning framework or not. Incentives for people to use the indicators will be another area which needs to be looked at.

Political will of partners

In order to enter such a process one has to make sure that the partners institutionally are willing, ready, convinced to support the work and also make sure the results are followed up and get reflected in the policies to be developed or changed. Unless this will exists from all the involved partners the work will not be sustainable. The commitment also means securing enough financial resources to support the process throughout a few years.

Duplication vs consolidation

There are a few processes which are going on European level based on the need to see the impact of the work done in the field. What seems to mainly exist is the studies on competences needed for the intercultural dialogue which can be developed during educational activities on mainly individual level. It is important to make sure that the study will be pulling resources, using and enriching, expanding the work done, instead of starting a new autonomous process in parallel with the existing ones, without using the experience and work conducted.

Purposes of ICD

The meeting participants went through an exercise of trying to consolidate the understanding of the purpose of intercultural dialogue in different context, institutions, frameworks, to get a base of common understanding of the concept of intercultural dialogue. There were a number of elements listed as being the core of the concept, such as:

- understanding and accepting human rights and their universality (living together as equal in dignity)
- promotion of social cohesion and integration
- prevention/transformation of conflicts
- awareness of diversity, respect for diversity (including minority, migration, refugee issues)
- fight against prejudice, stereotypes, racism, xenophobia, anti-semitism
- religious tolerance
- recognition and management of multiple cultural affiliations
- promotion of the sense of solidarity
- prevention of discrimination and hate speech
- prevent terrorism and extremism
- strengthening of democratic stability
- active citizenship
- responding to global challenges (MDG, etc) and global solidarity, global interdependence
- increasing level of social trust
- developing a sense of a common purpose (e.g. MDG)
- raising people's intercultural competences for living in diverse multicultural societies
- redressing inequalities
- address historical, social injustices and diverse perspective on history
- promote innovation and creativity

Possible criteria for successful and quality intercultural dialogue process

Level of individual learning and competence

In order to be able to develop indicators the work should start one step before to try to identify what would be quality standards for a process to be a successful intercultural dialogue process. Thus, it is important to identify quality criteria to be able to understand what one is looking for as an individual competence development, change or an outcome brought about through learning. The criteria will need to be developed based on the practice that exists in the youth field at the moment. Possible areas to look at can be:

- Critical thinking
- Ability of reflecting on own learning, in different settings, situations
- Ability for autonomous learning
- Global outlook
- Respect for diversity
- Openness to learning
- Commitment to life long learning
- Ability to deal with strong emotions
- Ability to challenge own comfort zone
- Qualities to take the learning from the training environment to own everyday life and their daily practice
- Qualities to deal with ambiguity
- Disposition to recognise the universality of human rights

Indicators' development: Ways forward

The process of developing of indicators proves to require patience and a considerable amount of work, resources, commitment, scientific approach and a conceptual framework to build the practice on. The meeting agreed that a few principles should be ensured, in order for the work to be coherent, based on quality, sustainability, trustworthiness:

- enough of financial and human resources in the project
- realistic and pragmatic approach
- concentration at the moment on indicators for individual learning and activity development areas
- criteria as framework, and people involved in the process of evidence collection will help to determine what the indicators can possibly be
- research and solid evidence based approach to developing both indicators and the tools of its use. The solid evidence base makes the work reliable, defendable, re-checkable.
- The developed indicators have to be meaningful, understandable, identifiable for the users
- the criteria and indicators have to derive from, be coming from and based on real life experiences
- "bottom up" approach to information acquisition and knowledge building
- enough time for development, testing and revision of the indicators (around 2-3 years)
- open process for anyone interested to be able to share, feedback, comment
- ensuring Euro-Mediterranean presence in all the phases of the planned work, if the work will be emphasising on the Euro Mediterranean context

Timeline for a possible study

Task	Resources base	Timeline	Responsible
Complete the mapping of the existing experience, tools, documents, processes; check a conceptual framework to systemise the indicators/criteria in	EYF, YiA applications and final narrative reports	By November 2010	Areg Tadevosyan
Identify the criteria for ICD (checked against objectives and purpose of ICD)		By February 2011	One or two experts
Evidence data collection	Focus groups, personal testimonies, and experiences, questionnaires of participant and trainers, trainer interviews, possibly observing at the courses by professionals or event the team members themselves	By July 2011	Experts
Drafting the indicators		By December 2011	
Testing the indicators	Through a possibly an online tool	January – July 2012	
Expert meeting		Sept/Oct 2012	
Revision of the indicators		By November 2012	
Usage of the indicators	Tools for using it will be developed on the way	By March 2013	
Developing ways and tools of using the indicators and distributing them to wider public, institutions, etc			
Online consultations	Through an ICT tool	Ongoing	

Further partners to involve

The work done so far is a good base on which a joint work and partnership can continue. The cooperation will need to be strengthened with the SALTO RC Diversity, to pursue and follow the work on developing intercultural learning competences, since this is the area which is similar to the individual learning indicators' development. There is a number of resources created by the SALTO which can and should be shared in the project as well. It can be beneficiary, that SALTO Diversity invites the Council of Europe to participate in the expert group who are working on the ICC development study.

It is needed and possible for the participants of this experts meeting to keep in touch, informed, connected and involved in the works of the project. It is suggested that an online platform on ACT-HRE platform can be created to further chances of communication and sharing.

There are a number of possible interested stakeholders, in addition to the Anna Lindh Foundation, who can be invited to the project such as

- the North South Centre of the Council of Europe
- the Directorate of education and languages of the Council of Europe
- the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF has a publication with real life experiences of intercultural dialogue compiled, and can be potentially interested to share experiences)
- the League of Arab States
- Universities working on the theme
- Youth in Action programme actors (especially taking into account that in 2013 the current programme will finish and there will also be need for evaluation and assessment, so the work can be beneficiary both ways)

Conclusions of the meeting

Participants of the meeting agreed that the meeting was very useful, and not only in providing answers, but also in identifying questions to consider about own work, impact of own activities, focus of work, goals and objectives, to give a chance to go out of traditional approaches to culture and did not get stuck in the dilemmas and dichotomies existing in the current discourse.

The meeting was both full of vagueness but also a lot of concreteness which was opening new fields to explore but also coming back to practical and pragmatic work to do in coming times. There has been a lot of personal learning and discussions, helping to identify the different elements present and important in the youth work related to intercultural dialogue. Personal commitment of the meeting participants is strong and they are ready to continue and contribute throughout the process. For all of them the topic is something they work on daily basis and there is a great personal interest and motivation in the outcomes of the work. There is a hope that the process will not be dropped and will continue as planned.

Programme of the meeting

Wednesday, 19 May

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
2. Introduction of the participants in the meeting and their expectations
3. Background and purpose of the meeting
4. Review of the objectives and expected results of the meeting
5. Presentation of the Feasibility study on indicators for intercultural dialogue in non-formal education activities by Mr Areg Tadevosyan, consultant
- Discussion

Thursday, 20 May

6. Report and discussion on related projects undertaken by partners in the meeting
7. Indicators intercultural dialogue in Euro-Mediterranean non-formal education activities: how relevant? how feasible?
 - in working groups
8. Feed-back from the working groups

Friday, 21 May

9. Summing up of the work done
10. Conceptual and practical guidelines for continuing the project (in working groups)
11. Presentation and discussion of the conclusions of the working groups
12. Evaluation and follow-up to the meeting
13. Closing of the meeting

List of participants

Name	Organisation/affiliation
Ana Azevedo	Trainer
Areg Tadevosyan	Organizations: International Center for Intercultural research, Learning and Dialogue, National Pool of Trainers, Armenian UN Association 12 Nor-Aresh 32 Str. Yerevan 0075, Armenia Tel: +374 93 05 05 60 Fax: + 374 10 28 07 41
Bryony Hoskins	Project Leader: Inequalities and social cohesion LLAKES Institute of Education University of London Email: B.Hoskins@ioe.ac.uk Tel: +44 20 7331 5108
Ingrid Ramberg	Mångkulturellt centrum 147 85 Tumba, Vårdshusvägen 7 Fittja gård, Fittja Sweden info@mkc.botkyrka.se
Farah Cherif D'Ouezzan	Center for Cross Cultural Learning Av. Laalou, Derb Jirari, Zkt Hassani # 11 Rabat Medina, Morocco Tel: 212 (0) 537 20 23 65 Fax: 212 (0) 537 20 23 67 Website: www.cccl.ma
Kateryna Shalayeva	Trainer
Oana Nestian	Trainer Intercultural Institute of Timisoara www.intercultural.ro
Marco Perolini	European Youth Forum Rue Joseph II, 120 1000 Bruxelles, Belgium Tel. +32 2 286 9414; Fax +32 2 230 2123 www.youthforum.org

Marius Jitea	Trainer //PHARE Implementation Unit Public Policy Division General Secretariat of Romanian Government Tel: +40722660105
Rui Gomes Zara Lavchyan	Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe European Youth Centre Budapest H-1024 Budapest, Zivatar u. 1-3. Hungary. Tel: +3614381030 www.eycb.coe.int
Viktoria Karpatska	Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission in the field youth c/o: Council of Europe European Youth Centre Budapest H-1024 Budapest, Zivatar u. 1-3. Hungary Tel : +3614381030 ; Fax: +36 1 212 4076 www.youth-partnership.net; www.eycb.coe.int
<i>Excused</i>	
Ahmad Alhindawi	League of Arab States Population Policy and Migration Department 22 (A) Taha Hussein St., Zamalek, Egypt Tel. +202 2735 43 06 Fax: +202 2735 14 22 E-mail: youth@poplas.org www.poplas.org/youth
Bernard Abrignani	Salto-Youth Euromed Resource Centre Paris, France
Sarah Zaaïmi	Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures P.O Box 732, Mansheya Alexandria 21111, Egypt Phone: +203 48 31 832/953 Fax: +203 48 12 734 www.euromedalex.org
Teresa Cunha	