



AS/Cult/Inf (2017) 08rev

20 November 2017

Or. French

COMMITTEE ON CULTURE, SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND MEDIA

The protection and promotion of Regional or Minority Languages in Europe

Rapporteur: Ms Rózsa HOFFMANN, Hungary, Group of the European People's Party

Appendices to the report

- Appendix 1: Member states that have ratified the Charter
- Appendix 2: National reports of member states that have ratified the Charter
- Appendix 3: Languages protected by the Charter
- Appendix 4: Council of Europe member states in central and eastern Europe
- Appendix 5: Answers from members states to the questionnaire
- Appendix 6: Answers from NGO to the questionnaire
- Appendix 7: Expert report
- Appendix 8: Fact-finding visit to Latvia
- Appendix 9: Fact finding visit to Italy (Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol region)

Table of contents

Appendix 1: Member states that have ratified the Charter	3
Appendix 2: National reports of member states that have ratified the Charter	4
Appendix 3: Languages protected by the Charter	11
Appendix 4: Council of Europe member states in central and eastern Europe.....	15
Appendix 5: Answers from members states to the questionnaire	16
Appendix 6: Answers from NGO to the questionnaire.....	17
Appendix 7: Expert report	20
Appendix 8: Fact-finding visit to Latvia	27
Appendix 9: Fact finding visit to Italy (Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol region)	30

Appendix 1: Member states that have ratified the Charter

List of 25 member states that have ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML)

- Armenia
- Austria
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Finland
- Germany
- Hungary
- Liechtenstein
- Luxembourg
- Montenegro
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Poland
- Romania
- Serbia
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Ukraine
- United Kingdom

List of 22 member states that have not ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML)

- Albania
- Andorra
- Azerbaijan
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Estonia
- France
- Georgia
- Greece
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Malta
- Republic of Moldova
- Monaco
- Portugal
- Russian Federation
- San Marino
- "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
- Turkey

Appendix 2: National reports of member states that have ratified the Charter**1. Armenia**

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st May 2002</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/05/2003 submitted on: 03/09/2003	adopted on:25/11/2005	adopted on:14/06/2006
2 nd cycle	date due:01/05/2006 submitted on: 15/02/2008	adopted on:22/04/2009	adopted on:23/09/2009
3 rd cycle	date due:01/05/2009 submitted on: 11/10/2012	adopted on:20/06/2013	adopted on:15/01/2014
4 th cycle	date due:01/05/2012 submitted on: 29/09/2015		
5 th cycle	date due:01/05/2015		

2. Austria

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st October 2001</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/10/2002 submitted on: 14/02/2003	adopted on:16/06/2004	adopted on:19/01/2005
2 nd cycle	date due:01/10/2005 submitted on: 12/12/2007	adopted on:10/09/2008	adopted on:11/03/2009
3 rd cycle	date due:01/10/2008 submitted on: 28/07/2011	adopted on:19/06/2012	adopted on:28/11/2012
4 th cycle	Date due:01/10/2011 submitted on: 08/11/2016		
5 th cycle	Date due:01/10/2014		

3. Bosnia-Herzegovina

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 2011</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2012 submitted on: 30/07/2012	adopted on:28/02/2013	adopted on:10/07/2013
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2015 submitted on: 31/08/2015	adopted on:18/03/2016	adopted on:05/10/2016
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2018		

4. Croatia

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 19/03/1999	adopted on:02/12/2000	adopted on:19/09/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 14/01/2003	adopted on:26/11/2004	adopted on:07/09/2005
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 12/10/2006	adopted on:21/09/2007	adopted on:12/03/2008
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 18/01/2010	adopted on:02/06/2010	adopted on:08/12/2010
5 th cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 17/01/2014	adopted on:24/09/2014	adopted on:15/04/2015
6 th cycle	date due:01/03/2014		

5. Cyprus

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st December 2002</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/12/2003	adopted on:24/03/2006	adopted on:27/09/2006

	submitted on: 17/01/2005		
2 nd cycle	date due:01/12/2006 submitted on: 18/01/2008	adopted on:23/04/2009	adopted on:23/09/2009
3 rd cycle	date due:01/12/2009 submitted on: 18/01/2011	adopted on:19/09/2011	adopted on:14/03/2012
4 th cycle	date due:01/12/2012 submitted on: 16/01/2014	adopted on:14/05/2014	adopted on:24/10/2014
5 th cycle	date due:01/12/2015		

6. Czech Republic

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 2007</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 30/04/2008	adopted on:23/04/2009	adopted on:09/12/2009
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 19/07/2011	adopted on:23/03/2012	adopted on:30/01/2013
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2014 submitted on: 22/09/2014	adopted on:17/06/2015	adopted on:01/12/2015
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2017		

7. Denmark

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 2001</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2002 submitted on: 03/12/2002	adopted on:21/11/2003	adopted on:19/05/2004
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2005 submitted on: 26/04/2006	adopted on:28/03/2007	adopted on:26/09/2007
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2008 submitted on: 14/04/2010	adopted on:28/09/2010	adopted on:02/03/2011
4 th cycle	date due:01/01/2011 submitted on: 11/03/2014	adopted on:14/05/2014	adopted on:24/10/2014
5 th cycle	date due:01/01/2014		

8. Finland

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 10/03/1999	adopted on:09/02/2001	adopted on:19/09/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 31/12/2002	adopted on:24/03/2004	adopted on:20/10/2004
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 13/03/2006	adopted on:30/03/2007	adopted on:21/11/2007
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 30/09/2010	adopted on:21/09/2011	adopted on:14/03/2012
5 th cycle	Date due:01/03/2011		
6 th cycle	Date due:01/03/2014		

9. Germany

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 1999</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2000 submitted on: 20/11/2000	adopted on:05/07/2002	adopted on:04/12/2002
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2003 submitted on: 02/04/2004	adopted on:16/06/2005	adopted on:01/03/2006
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2006 submitted on: 27/02/2007	adopted on:03/04/2008	adopted on:09/07/2008
4 th cycle	date due:01/01/2009 submitted on: 07/06/2010	adopted on:02/12/2010	adopted on:25/05/2011
5 th cycle	date due:01/01/2012	adopted on:14/11/2013	adopted on:28/05/2014

	submitted on: 08/04/2013		
6 th cycle	date due:01/01/2015		

10. Hungary

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 02/09/1999	adopted on:01/02/2001	adopted on:04/10/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 11/09/2002	adopted on:29/08/2003	adopted on:30/06/2004
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 21/11/2005	adopted on:01/12/2006	adopted on:20/06/2007
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 22/01/2009	adopted on:11/09/2009	adopted on:10/03/2010
5 th cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 05/03/2012	adopted on:16/11/2012	adopted on:10/07/2013
6 th cycle	date due:01/03/2014 submitted on: 10/03/2015	adopted on:18/03/2016	adopted on:14/12/2016
7 th cycle	date due:01/03/2017		

11. Liechtenstein

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 01/03/1999	adopted on:09/02/2001	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 09/03/2002	adopted on:24/03/2004	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 01/03/2005	adopted on:08/04/2005	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 05/02/2008	adopted on:12/09/2008	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
5 th cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 07/04/2011	adopted on:05/05/2011	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
6 th cycle	date due:01/03/2014 submitted on: 20/01/2014	adopted on:10/09/2014	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
7 th cycle	date due:01/03/2017		

12. Luxembourg

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st October 2005</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/10/2006 submitted on: 19/03/2007	adopted on:04/04/2008	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any

2 nd cycle	date due:01/10/2009 submitted on: 06/05/2010	adopted on:03/06/2010	recommendations The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
3 rd cycle	date due:01/10/2012 submitted on: 02/05/2013	adopted on:21/06/2013	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
4 th cycle	date due:01/10/2015 submitted on: 03/02/2015	adopted on:17/06/2015	The Committee of Ministers published the evaluation report without adopting any recommendations
5 th cycle	date due:01/10/2018		

13. Montenegro

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st June 2006</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/06/2007 submitted on: 16/07/2007	adopted on:10/09/2009	adopted on:19/09/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/06/2010 submitted on: 04/04/2011	adopted on:22/09/2011	adopted on:12/09/2012
3 rd cycle	date due:01/06/2013 submitted on: 15/05/2014	adopted on:02/12/2014	adopted on:12/05/2015
4 th cycle	date due:01/06/2016 submitted on: 05/09/2016		

14. Netherlands

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 05/03/1999	adopted on:09/02/2001	adopted on:19/09/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 26/05/2003	adopted on:17/06/2004	adopted on:15/12/2004
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 04/09/2007	adopted on:27/11/2007	adopted on:09/07/2008
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 15/09/2011	adopted on:22/03/2012	adopted on:24/10/2012
5 th cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 16/11/2015	adopted on:16/06/2016	adopted on:14/12/2015
6 th cycle	date due:01/03/2014		
7 th cycle	date due:01/03/2017		

15. Norway

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st March 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/03/1999 submitted on: 27/05/1999	adopted on:01/06/2001	adopted on:21/11/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/03/2002 submitted on: 14/03/2002	adopted on:29/08/2003	adopted on:03/09/2003
3 rd cycle	date due:01/03/2005 submitted on: 02/05/2005	adopted on:01/12/2006	adopted on:16/05/2007
4 th cycle	date due:01/03/2008 submitted on: 01/07/2008	adopted on:08/09/2009	adopted on:10/03/2010
5 th cycle	date due:01/03/2011 submitted on: 02/01/2012	adopted on:19/06/2012	adopted on:24/10/2012
6 th cycle	date due:01/03/2014 submitted on: 01/07/2014	adopted on:18/03/2015	adopted on:15/09/2015

7 th cycle	date due:01/03/2017		
-----------------------	---------------------	--	--

16. Poland

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st June 2009</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/06/2010 submitted on: 30/09/2010	adopted on:05/05/2011	adopted on:07/12/2011
2 nd cycle	date due:01/06/2013 submitted on: 16/02/2015	adopted on:19/06/2015	adopted on:01/12/2015
3 rd cycle	date due:01/06/2016		

17. Romania

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st May 2008</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/05/2009 submitted on: 26/10/2010	adopted on:30/11/2011	adopted on:13/06/2012
2 nd cycle	Date due:01/05/2012 submitted on: 02/03/2016		
3 rd cycle	Date due:01/05/2015		

18. Serbia

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st June 2006</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/06/2007 submitted on: 11/07/2007	adopted on:12/09/2008	adopted on:06/05/2009
2 nd cycle	date due:01/06/2010 submitted on: 23/09/2010	adopted on:04/05/2011	adopted on:11/06/2013
3 rd cycle	date due:01/06/2013 submitted on: 02/02/2015	adopted on:04/11/2015	adopted on:27/04/2016
4 th cycle	date due:01/06/2016		

19. Slovak Republic

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 2002</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2003 submitted on: 05/12/2003	adopted on:23/11/2005	adopted on:21/02/2007
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2006 submitted on: 30/07/2008	adopted on:24/04/2009	adopted on:18/11/2009
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2009 submitted on: 02/03/2012	adopted on:21/06/2012	adopted on:30/01/2013
4 th cycle	date due:01/01/2012 submitted on: 30/03/2015	adopted on:04/11/2015	adopted on:27/04/2016
5 th cycle	date due:01/01/2015		

20. Slovenia

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 2001</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2002 submitted on: 14/03/2002	adopted on:21/11/2003	adopted on:06/09/2004
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2005 submitted on: 13/06/2005	adopted on:15/09/2006	adopted on:20/06/2007
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2008 submitted on: 02/06/2009	adopted on:20/11/2009	adopted on:26/05/2010
4 th cycle	date due:01/01/2011 submitted on: 16/09/2013	adopted on:15/11/2013	adopted on:16/04/2014

5 th cycle	date due:01/01/2014		
-----------------------	---------------------	--	--

21. Spain

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st August 2001</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/08/2002 submitted on: 23/09/2002	adopted on:08/04/2005	adopted on:21/09/2005
2 nd cycle	date due:01/08/2005 submitted on: 30/04/2007	adopted on:04/04/2008	adopted on:10/12/2008
3 rd cycle	date due:01/08/2008 submitted on: 30/07/2010	adopted on:02/12/2011	adopted on:24/10/2012
4 th cycle	date due:01/08/2011 submitted on: 09/05/2014	adopted on:20/03/2015	adopted on:20/01/2016
5 th cycle	date due:01/08/2014		

22. Sweden

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st June 2000</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/06/2001 submitted on: 18/06/2001	adopted on:06/12/2002	adopted on:19/06/2003
2 nd cycle	date due:01/06/2004 submitted on: 30/06/2004	adopted on:23/03/2006	adopted on:27/09/2006
3 rd cycle	date due:01/06/2007 submitted on: 18/10/2007	adopted on:26/11/2008	adopted on:06/05/2009
4 th cycle	date due:01/06/2010 submitted on: 14/10/2010	adopted on:02/05/2011	adopted on:12/10/2011
5 th cycle	date due:01/06/2013 submitted on: 10/10/2013	adopted on:16/05/2014	adopted on:14/01/2015
6 th cycle	date due:01/06/2016 submitted on: 01/06/2016	adopted on:18/11/2016	

23. Switzerland

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st April 1998</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/04/1999 submitted on: 03/11/1999	adopted on:01/06/2001	adopted on:21/11/2001
2 nd cycle	date due:01/04/2002 submitted on: 23/12/2002	adopted on:24/03/2004	adopted on:22/09/2004
3 rd cycle	date due:01/04/2005 submitted on: 24/05/2006	adopted on:19/09/2007	adopted on:12/03/2008
4 th cycle	date due:01/04/2008 submitted on: 14/12/2009	adopted on:04/06/2010	adopted on:08/12/2010
5 th cycle	date due:01/04/2011 submitted on: 18/12/2012	adopted on:28/02/2013	adopted on:10/07/2013
6 th cycle	date due:01/04/2014 submitted on: 15/12/2015	adopted on:06/06/2016	adopted on:14/12/2016
7 th cycle	date due:01/04/2017		

24. Ukraine

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st January 2006</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/01/2007 submitted on: 02/08/2007	adopted on:27/11/2008	adopted on:07/07/2010
2 nd cycle	date due:01/01/2010 submitted on: 06/01/2012	adopted on:15/11/2012	adopted on:15/01/2014
3 rd cycle	date due:01/01/2013 submitted on: 12/01/2016		
4 th cycle	date due:01/01/2006		

25. United Kingdom

Monitoring cycle	State periodical report	Committee of Experts' evaluation report	Committee of Ministers' Recommendation
<i>Entry into force of the Charter: 1st July 2001</i>			
1 st cycle	date due:01/07/2002 submitted on: 01/07/2002	adopted on:29/08/2003	adopted on:24/03/2004
2 nd cycle	date due:01/07/2005 submitted on: 01/07/2005	adopted on:14/09/2006	adopted on:13/03/2007
3 rd cycle	date due:01/07/2008 submitted on: 26/05/2009	adopted on:19/11/2009	adopted on:21/04/2010
4 th cycle	date due:01/07/2011 submitted on: 11/03/2013	adopted on:21/06/2013	adopted on:15/01/2014
5 th cycle	date due:01/07/2014		

Appendix 3: Languages protected by the Charter

LANGUAGE:**STATE PARTY:**

1. Albanian	Bosnia and Herzegovina Montenegro Romania Serbia
2. Aragonese	Spain
3. Aranese	Spain
4. Armenian	Cyprus Hungary Poland Romania
5. Assyrian/ Akkadian	Armenia
6. Asturian	Spain
7. Basque	Spain
8. Beás	Hungary
9. Belarusian	Poland Ukraine
10. Bosnian	Montenegro Serbia
11. Bulgarian	Hungary Romania Serbia Slovakia Ukraine
12. Bunjevac	Serbia
13. Catalan	Spain
14. Cornish	United Kingdom
15. Crimean Tatar	Ukraine
16. Croatian / (Croatian du Burgenland) (Croatian de Moravia)	Austria Czech Republic Hungary Montenegro Romania Serbia Slovakia Slovenia
17. Cypriot Maronite Arabic	Cyprus
18. Czech	Austria Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Poland Romania Serbia Slovakia
19. Danish	Germany
20. Finnish	Sweden
21. French	Switzerland
22. Frisian	Netherlands
23. Gagauz	Ukraine
24. Galician	Spain
25. German	Armenia Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Czech Republic Denmark Hungary Poland Romania

	Serbia Slovakia Slovenia Switzerland Ukraine
26. Greek	Armenia Hungary Romania Ukraine
27. Hungarian	Austria Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Romania Serbia Slovakia Slovenia Ukraine
28. Inari Sami	Finland
29. Irish	United Kingdom
30. Istro-Romanian	Croatia
31. Italian	Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Romania Slovenia Switzerland
32. Karaim	Poland Ukraine
33. Karelian	Finland
34. Kashub	Poland
35. Krimchak	Ukraine
36. Kurdish	Armenia
37. Kven/Finnish	Norway
38. Ladino	Bosnia and Herzegovina
39. Lemko	Poland
40. Leonese	Spain
41. Limburgish	Netherlands
42. Lithuanian	Poland
43. Low German	Germany
44. Lower Saxon	Netherlands
45. Lower Sorbian	Germany
46. Lule Sami	Norway Sweden
47. Macedonian	Bosnia and Herzegovina Romania Serbia
48. Manx Gaelic	United Kingdom
49. Meänkieli	Sweden
50. Moldovan	Ukraine
51. Montenegrin	Bosnia and Herzegovina
52. North Frisian	Germany
53. North Sami	Finland Norway Sweden
54. Polish	Bosnia and Herzegovina Czech Republic Hungary Romania Slovakia Ukraine
55. Romani (Romany, Romanes, Romani Chib, Roma language)	Austria Bosnia and Herzegovina Czech Republic

	Finland Germany Hungary Montenegro Netherlands Norway Poland Romania Serbia Slovakia Slovenia Sweden Ukraine
56. Romanian	Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Hungary Serbia Ukraine
57. Romansh	Switzerland
58. Russian	Armenia Finland Poland Romania Ukraine
59. Ruthenian	Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Hungary Romania Serbia Slovakia Ukraine
60. Sater Frisian	Germany
61. Scots	United Kingdom
62. Scottish-Gaelic	United Kingdom
63. Serbian	Croatia Hungary Romania Slovenia
64. Skolt Sami Eastern/Skolt Sami	Finland Norway
65. Slovakian	Austria Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Czech Republic Hungary Poland Romania Serbia Ukraine
66. Slovenian	Austria Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Hungary
67. South Sami	Norway Sweden
68. Swedish	Finland
69. Tatar	Finland Poland Romania
70. Turkish	Bosnia and Herzegovina Romania
71. Ukrainian	Armenia

	Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Hungary Poland Romania Serbia Slovakia
72. Ulster Scots	United Kingdom
73. Upper Sorbian	Germany
74. Valencian	Spain
75. Vlach	Serbia
76. Welsh	United Kingdom
77. Yenish	Switzerland
78. Yezidi	Armenia
79. Yiddish	Bosnia and Herzegovina Finland Netherlands Poland Romania Slovakia Sweden Ukraine

The list can be consulted on the Languages Charter website (in English and German): <http://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/languages-covered>

Appendix 4: Council of Europe member states in central and eastern Europe

1. Albania
2. Austria
3. Azerbaijan
4. Bosnia-Herzegovina
5. Bulgaria
6. Czech Republic
7. Estonia
8. Georgia
9. Croatia
10. Poland
11. Latvia
12. Lithuania
13. "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
14. Hungary
15. Republic of Moldova
16. Montenegro
17. Germany
18. Italy
19. Russian Federation
20. Armenia
21. Romania
22. Ukraine
23. Switzerland
24. Serbia
25. Slovak Republic
26. Slovenia

Appendix 5: Answers from members states to the questionnaire

1. As proposed in my introductory memorandum (Doc. AS/Cult (2016) 10, of 7 March 2016), and with the agreement of the Committee, I have prepared a questionnaire that was addressed to 22 member states which have not joined the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (hereafter the Charter). The questionnaire closely followed the structure of the Charter, including thematic units which cover general information (i.e. the number/proportion of people speaking regional or minority language), education, culture and media, as well as language use in public life.
2. To date, we have received answers from Iceland, Bulgaria, Andorra, Portugal, Greece and Lithuania. The authorities in Iceland stated that there are no regional or minority languages in Iceland. Bulgaria is currently undertaking consultation with the secretariat of the Charter discussing the possibility of partial accession to the Charter. A significant part of the issues falling within the scope of the Charter, are regulated by the Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities, to which Bulgaria has been a party since 1998. However, there are certain obstacles of legal nature to joining the Charter, as "regional languages" do not exist in Bulgaria.
3. In Andorra the official language is Catalan. There are no regional or minority languages according to the definition provided in the Charter (referring to historic languages); indeed, immigration flows from Spain, Portugal and France are relatively recent. Four languages are spoken in Andorra: Spanish (mother tongue of 44% of the population), Catalan (mother tongue of 40%), Portuguese (mother tongue for 18.6%) and French (mother tongue for 9.7%). A plural education system in Andorra reflects its multilingual society. There are three parallel education systems in Catalan (Andorran system), Spanish and French providing parents with a free choice between them. An agreement was signed with Portugal in 2000 to promote the Portuguese culture and language.
4. In their reply, the Portuguese authorities focused on the situation of the Mirandese language, which is spoken in a small area of north-eastern Portugal (10 000 speakers). The Portuguese Parliament granted it in 1999 co-official recognition (along with the Portuguese language) for local matters. Local institutions, both private NGOs and the local administration, are in close contact with the Asturian counterparts in Spain, as Asturian is a closely-related language, and with other European institutions concerning initiatives for the promotion and recognition of the rights of regional or minority language speakers. There are on-going concerted efforts by *Associação de la Lhéngua i Cultura Mirandesa* and the local administration to persuade Portuguese authorities to sign and ratify the Charter.
5. The reply received from Greek authorities focused only on one question concerning the training of teachers.
6. Four minority languages are traditionally spoken in Lithuania: Russian (1.9 million), Polish (260 000), Belarusian (12 000), Ukrainian (6 800). Article 28 of the Law on Education states that in local areas where a national minority traditionally constitutes a substantial part of the population, the municipality assures the possibility of learning in the language of the national minority. Article 30 states that in minority language schools, curricula shall be carried in the form of bilingual education (both the Lithuanian language and the national minority language). In practice Russian, Polish, Belarusian, Ukrainian and Yiddish are taught as a subject in schools. Russian is taught as a subject in almost all schools. Russian and Polish can be the languages of instruction from pre-school onwards to higher education. Training of teachers is available in Russian and Polish both in private and public institutions. Out of 357 500 students, 26 900 are attending school in 133 different institutions where a regional or minority language is the language of instruction. In the field of culture and media, there are different incentives and programmes to stimulate cultural institutions and media to promote different cultures and the use of regional or minority languages. For example, the Strategy of the development of the policy of National Minorities; Cultural projects of the Ministry of Culture; Lithuania's National Roma Integration Strategy (Action Plan). There are two public service radio programmes in Russian, five public service TV programmes including one in Polish, one in Ukrainian and one in Belarusian. There are several newspapers in Russian and Polish. The use of minority language in public administration is not regulated (except the right to interpretation in some cases). In places where a national minority traditionally constitutes a substantial part of the population, one can use minority language when addressing local public institutions. Minority language can be used in State or local authority meetings/events if the interpretation in the State language is assured.

Appendix 6: Answers from NGO to the questionnaire

7. I would like to thank the Federal Union of European Nationalities (FUEN), Observer to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, for their help in posting the questionnaire on their website¹ and addressing it to their member organisations (NGOs). As a result we have received answers from associations in Georgia, Greece, Albania, the Netherlands, Croatia, Italy and Germany.

8. The *Einung* association of Germans living in Georgia provided a short answer that there are Russian, Azerbaijani and Armenian schools in Georgia. There is practically no bilingual education in Georgia as in most regions with a dense residence of non-Georgian population, people do not know Georgian and its study is a serious problem. They referred to the Ombudsman report of 2012-13 which draws on specific issues with regard to education, culture and media. The Council of National Minorities under the auspices of the Public Defender of Georgia (Ombudsman) conducts annual monitoring of implementation of the National Concept and Action Plan on Tolerance and Civil Integration. The report raises the following issues. The Ministry of Education and Science decided to create “bilingual textbooks” instead of translating textbooks entirely: 70% was translated into the native languages of minorities (Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian), and 30% of the materials was provided in the official (Georgian) language. However, the majority of teachers of specific subjects do not speak the official language. The schools, as a rule, do not have a qualified Georgian language teacher who would have at the same time adequate knowledge of Armenian or Azerbaijani languages to facilitate the teaching process for the subject teachers. The teaching of a native language is carried out in line with Armenian and Azerbaijani National Curricula. In addition to the absence of the national curriculum, there is no standard for native language teachers for minorities.

9. In terms of good practice, summer schools gather ethnic Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijani children. Georgian is the only language of mutual communication in that environment, which stimulates their passive knowledge (often students only communicate in Georgian with their teachers) and is very effective. In 2013, within the programme “Teaching Georgian as a second language” 25 teachers planned and implemented an exchange programme for Armenian and Azerbaijani schools to be partners with Georgian schools in various regions. Concerning media, there are daily production and broadcasting of the news programme “Moambe” in Abkhazian, Ossetian, Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian languages; weekly news programme in Kurdish language; Parvana TV broadcasts in Armenian. For the print media: Azerbaijani newspaper “Gurjistan”, published weekly (8 pages, mainly distributed in Kvemo Kartli region, 2000 copies); Armenian newspaper “Vrastan”, published weekly; Russian newspapers “Svobodnaya Gruzia”, “Vecherni Tbilisi”, “Multinational Georgia”; and Georgian-Armenian newspaper “Samkhretis Karibche”, published weekly.

10. The association *Macedonian education and cultural movement of Edessa* from Greece answered that there are approximately 200 000 speakers of Macedonian language in northern part of Greece. The Macedonian language is almost extinct among the younger generation, while older generations avoid speaking the language in public. According to the association, there are no rights for regional or minority languages in Greece, except for the Turkish language in the minority schools in Western Thrace which are regulated by the bilateral, Treaty of Lausanne (1923) between Turkey and Greece. Macedonian language is considered a local “idiom” and not a proper language. The use of regional or minority languages is strongly discouraged. Some cultural associations have the possibility to offer non-formal education in regional or minority languages but these initiatives are strongly discouraged by state institutions. Although these private initiatives are not illegal, they get strong pressure by state authorities, with several administrative sanctions. The demand for regional or minority language instruction should be requested by the Municipal Council following a formal request by the citizens. But the law on Local self-government does not allow local governments to take decisions on language instruction in the territory of their administration, as this is in the remit of national government. As the national government does not have any policies about regional or minority language instruction, it is impossible for citizens to apply for it. The possibility, for some cultural associations in Northern Greece, to make use of the Macedonian language is limited to the singing of traditional folk, but also modern Macedonian songs, during their public cultural events. However, they cannot apply for any funding due to the negative attitude of the state towards minority languages. There aren't any television or radio broadcasts in regional or minority languages, neither print media/publications.

11. According to the answers provided by the *Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association* and the *Friendship Equality Peace Party* (Turkish minority), the Turkish language in Greece can be the language of instruction in elementary and secondary schools, following the 1923 Lausanne bilateral Treaty which grants the autonomous status of the Turkish minority. The education is bilingual. However, according to the association, the Greek state does not encourage opening of new minority private bilingual (Turkish-

¹ <https://www.fuen.org/news/single/article/council-of-europe-questionnaire-on-minority-languages/>

Greek) schools as more generally the Greek policy for the use of minority language in the formal education system is oriented to undermine this process rather than to promote it. There is no funding available to cultural associations. In terms of media, there are 4 minority radio stations (Joy FM, City FM, Cinar FM, King FM) and numerous print and online media (Azınlıkça Magazine, Birlik Newspaper, Gündem Newspaper, Millet Newspaper, Öğretmenin Sesi Magazine, Rodop Rüzgarı Magazine, Trakya'nın Sesi Newspaper, Fiyaka Magazine, Cumhuriyet Newspaper). There is neither promotion nor permission to use the Turkish language in administrative bodies, local authorities or public services.

12. According to the *Macedonian association "Ilinden"*, there are approximately 120 000 speakers of Macedonian language in Albania. There aren't any national or regional policies concerning education in minority languages, but the demand for such education is substantial among the families. There is no training of teachers available in regional or minority languages in private or public institutions. In the region of Mala Prespa, the schoolbooks for some school subjects are printed in Macedonian language. Macedonian is taught as a subject in schools and is a language of instruction in elementary and secondary schools. However, this is not the case in Golo Brdo, Gora or Vrnik. Macedonian Association "Ilinden" offers languages courses in Tirana and Golo Brdo. The association operates across Albania and organises cultural manifestations for the Macedonian Minority. There aren't any private television and radio broadcasts in regional or minority languages. Macedonian minorities living near the border watch Macedonian television and listen to Macedonian radio.

13. The *Serb National Council* (NGO) in Croatia provided a detailed breakdown of statistics for minority language speakers (mother tongue)². The laws related to the use of regional or minority languages are available online, as are annual reports of The Government Office for Human Rights and Rights of National Minorities on their implementation. According to the article 12 of The Constitutional Law on the Rights of National Minorities, the equal use of a minority language at local and regional level is possible when a minority constitutes at least a third of the total population in municipality or city in question. The Council for National Minorities was created in 2002. There are three models of education: a) all classes are taught in regional or minority language and students have the same number of hours of education in minority or regional language as they do in Croatian; b) bilingual classes: natural sciences are taught in Croatian language, but humanities and social sciences are taught in minority or regional languages; c) all classes are in Croatian, with additional school hours which are dedicated to minority or regional language and culture (geography, history, arts, etc.). There are special programmes for inclusion of Romani students in the educational system. Schools are obliged to organise classes in minority or regional languages if they are requested by parents. Teacher training is available in regional or minority languages in public institutions for the following languages: Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Macedonian, German Polish, Romani, Romanian, Russian, Slovak, Slovenian, Serbian, Italian, Turkish, Ukrainian and Hebrew. However the association identified a problem with lack of adequate textbooks and educational materials. The non-formal education for Serbian speakers is organised by the Council of Serbian national minority in Zagreb (annual workshops of Cyrillic script; the Summer school of Serbian language and culture "Sava Mrkalj"). Serbian students from Croatia travel to Hungary, to the summer linguistic camp "Vuk Karadžić". For their cultural activities, Councils of Serbian national minority in different municipalities and cities receive funding from the Council for National Minorities. Two TV programmes ("Manjinski mozaik", "Prizma") are available on Croatian public radio and television (HRT) in Croatian language, with parts in minority languages with Croatian subtitles. It is possible to watch programmes from Italy, Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Russia, Slovenia and Serbia on cable television. For the print and online publications there are: "Novosti" (weekly newspaper which combine Serbian language and Cyrillic script with texts in Croatian and Latin script); "Prosvjeta" (magazine published by the Serb Cultural Association dedicated to the Serbian culture in Croatia); Czech magazine "Jednota" (published weekly) and "Dětský koutek" (for children), once a month; "Nova Dumka" and "Vjenčić" (for children) are made by and for Ruthenian and Ukrainian speakers; Italian newspaper "La voce del popolo".

14. The *German minority association in Friuli-Venezia Giulia* (north-east Italy) replied that according to the Law 482/99, the Italian Republic protects the language and culture of the Albanian, Catalan, German, Greek, Slovenian and Croatian population as well as of the citizens who speak French, Franco-Provençal, Friuli, Romansh, Old Provençal and Sardinian. Specific provisions were adopted in Friuli-Venezia Giulia region for the protection of German language (LR20/2009); Friulian language (LR29/2007), and the Slovenian language (LR38/2001). However, there is no national or regional policy for the use of regional languages in the formal education system. The non-formal education encourages spread of the German culture rather than the language itself. There are 8 German cultural associations in the region. For example, *ISAL* promotes cultural interaction and exchanges between institutions, communities and associations. It does not

² Serbian 53 000; Italian 19 000; Albanian 17 100; Bosnian 16 900; Romani 14 400; Hungarian: 10 200; Slovenian 9200; Czech 6300; Slovak 3800; Macedonian 3500; German 3000; Russian 1600; Ruthenian 1500; Ukrainian 1000; Romanian 960; Montenegrin 900; Polish 700; Turkish 350; Bulgarian 300; Hebrew 30; and Vlach 14.

receive any funding. There is no television or radio broadcast in German. German is used in hospitals and healthcare, but not in public transports, police, judiciary or prisons.

15. The Sorbian minority association in Germany, *WITAJ-Sprachzentrum/Domowina e.V.*, replied that Lower Sorbian (20 000 speakers – 1000 who speak the language as a mother tongue) and Upper Sorbian (40 000 speakers – 8000 who speak the language as a mother tongue) are spoken in Lower and Upper Lusatia (Brandenburg and Saxony) and are considered as endangered languages according to the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger³. Lower and Upper Sorbian are taught as a subject in schools (2300 students in 35 institutions). They can be the languages of instruction from pre-school to higher education (2600 students in 56 institutions). Training for teachers is available in private and public institutions. Non-formal education is provided through language camps, contests, groups for theatre, sports, dancing and singing. There are two programmes promoted by the Free State of Saxony, by the Land Brandenburg and by the Foundation for the Sorbian People: *WITAJ and Konzept 2plus*. Both programmes offer the possibility for children in the Sorbian settlement area of Brandenburg and Saxony to learn Sorbian in early childhood. There are several Cultural institutions for the Sorbian minority (WITAJ Language Centre; School for Lower Sorbian Language and Culture; Sorbian Institute; German-Sorbian Folk Theatre; Sorbisches National-Ensemble; Sorbisches Museum Bautzen; Wendisches Museum Cottbus; Domowina-Verlag (Sorbian Publishing House)). They maintain contacts with other national minorities and organize collaborative projects in smaller and larger form. The most important are: the International Folklore Festival, the International Theatre Meeting, the European football championship of national minorities. Most projects are funded by the Foundation for the Sorbian People. Lower and Upper Sorbian are official languages, which can be used in all public administration in the Sorbian settlement area, but in practice there aren't enough staff who speak Lower or Upper Sorbian (e.g. Sorbian people do not use their mother tongue in court). Users of Lower and Upper Sorbian may submit oral or written requests and will receive a response in the minority language in state administration, local and regional authorities and public services. The association refers to the 2013 Publication of a "Plan of measures of the Saxon State Government to encourage and to stimulate the use of the Sorbian language". Currently the government of the Land Brandenburg is preparing a similar plan for the Lower Sorbian language.

16. The Province of Fryslân is the only province in the Netherlands that has another language in official use next to Dutch - the Frisian language. It is used in most sectors: in court, in public administration, in radio, television and in education. On 4 June 2013 the Dutch parliament voted unanimously in favour of an act on the use of the Frisian language. The act confirms the status as Frisian as second official language of the Netherlands and regulates the use of the Frisian language in public administration and in the legal system. The majority of the inhabitants of the Province speak Frisian (75%), but the Frisian literacy rate is limited, despite bilingual schooling. A special feature of the region is that it promotes multilingualism in general and provides a total package of language marketing to strengthen the Frisian language. That is especially the case with the campaigns of *Afûk*⁴, in the trilingual schools, and in campaigns to explain the advantages of multilingualism to parents of new-born babies. It should be noted that the Province is officially bilingual. A large part of the population is bilingual Frisian-Dutch, with English as a third language.

³ <http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/>

⁴ <http://afuk.frl/>

Appendix 7: Expert report

Prepared by Prof. Dr. Stefan OETER, Germany, former Vice Chair of the Independent Committee of Experts for the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML)⁵

1. Introduction

1. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages is an instrument specifically designed to protect regional or minority languages in Europe. The Charter defines the term “regional or minority languages” in its Art.1 lit.a as *“languages traditionally used within a given territory of a State by nationals of that State who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the State’s population”* and *“different from the official language(s) of that State”*. It explicitly excludes dialects of the official languages and languages of migrants from its scope of application, but allows states to extend protection also to an “official language which is less widely used on the whole or part of its territory”. The Charter thus protects only regional languages and languages of autochthonous minorities.

2. The Charter follows a so-called ‘à la carte-approach’, which means that states can select the languages deserving special protection and then may tailor the specific menu of protection according to the specific needs of each language. Result of such a differentiated approach is a huge variety in the scope of protection guaranteed by the various instruments of ratification. Some states have preferred uniform menus of protection for all the regional or minority languages on its territory, while others have made full use of the possibilities in differentiation in the degree of protection.

3. The Charter was adopted and opened for signature in 1992 and entered into force on 1 March 1998, after the necessary 8 member states had ratified the treaty. Until today, 25 member states of the Council of Europe have ratified the Charter, and a number of other new members of the Council of Europe made political pledges to ratify the Charter when acceding to the Council of Europe. Several hundreds of regional or minority languages in the 25 state parties are covered by specific part III menus of protection.

4. The Charter provides for two different avenues of protection. In part II of the Charter, a number of general objectives and principles of protection are set out that cover all the regional or minority languages traditionally used in the member states. These objectives and principles formulate a kind of minimum standard that needs to be observed with any protected language – and protected is any traditional regional or minority language present on the territory of states parties. Part III of the Charter, to the contrary, opens states parties a wide array of choices. States may choose which languages should get specific protection under its instrument of ratification, and they can select at a minimum 35 undertakings from a large list of mechanisms of protection. This list of possible undertakings covers the fields of education, official use in the judiciary, use in the administration and public services, the media, cultural activities, economic and social life as well as transfrontier exchanges.

5. The implementation of the undertakings that states have accepted when ratifying the Charter is mainly based upon a traditional state reporting procedure. States parties are obliged to submit every three years a periodical report to the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe on the state of implementation of the Charter. The treaty provides for a specific monitoring body, the Independent Committee of Experts. The ComEx looks into the periodical state reports (and additional pieces of information submitted by bodies or associations representing users of the protected languages). It regularly conducts an on-the-spot visit in the country concerned where it tries to seek clarification on open issues. As a result of the monitoring, an evaluation report is presented to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe which adopts recommendations based upon the findings of the ComEx.

6. The monitoring cycles diverge from country to country, also due to repeated delays in reporting. In some of the original members from 1998, the monitoring has entered the 6th monitoring cycle. In most cases, the monitoring is in the 3rd, 4th or 5th cycle. This means that for most state parties already a number of monitoring cycles has been concluded and the state reports, the evaluation reports of the ComEx and the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers present a rather clear-cut picture of the strengths and weaknesses of implementation in the member states of the Charter.

7. The following report will look into the current state of implementation as it may be reconstructed from the evaluation reports of the ComEx and the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers. Revisiting the state of implementation will focus on three central fields where the protection granted under the Charter is of

⁵ All opinions expressed in this text are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Council of Europe.

essential importance for the survival of endangered regional or minority languages – the fields of education, media and culture. This limitation is linked to the mandate of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media of the Parliamentary Assembly.

2. Education

8. Education is probably the most important field for measures of protection and promotion if an endangered regional or minority language shall survive in the long run. According to the experience of the ComEx, any other set of measures of protection and promotion does not make sense if a state is not willing to safeguard the transmission of the language from one generation to the other with decided mechanisms of protection and promotion in its educational institutions. The dominance of the majority languages in modern life, in the working place, in media, the schools and more and more even social life and family life, puts traditional regional or minority languages under growing pressure. There exists a strong tendency all over Europe to cease 'natural' transmission from parents to children in families. Such language shift threatens the survival of languages at its heart. But even where the regional or minority language still serves as first language in families, the dominance of majority languages leads to phenomena of functional retreat where more and more domains of language use are lost, with the minority language ending up in strongly diglossic situations where active use (in particular in a written form) tends to be extremely limited. Educational mechanisms are needed if this trend shall be stopped (or even reversed). The language needs promotion in school education, including the learning of written standards; sometimes children must even learn the language in school if it shall not perish completely in the course of two or three generations.

9. Accordingly, practically all member states have selected a number of undertakings from Article 8 of the Charter, the article on education. The core undertakings cover kindergarden and pre-school education, primary education, secondary education and higher or university education, supplemented by undertakings devoted to professional education and adult education. For each of these sectors, the Charter provides for at least three different levels of protection. Education may be provided in the regional or minority language, as medium of instruction. It may also be taught as a regular subject, whereas the major part of education is given in the majority language. As an intermediate form, the Charter also provides for the option of bilingual education, where some subjects are taught in the regional or minority language, some others in the majority language. The choice of these options depends very much on the socio-linguistic situation of each language. If the regional or minority language is still the first language of a large segment of population and serves as a local or regional 'lingua franca', bilingual forms of education make sense – the children need alphabetisation in their first language, but should also develop sufficient skills in the majority language (and official language of the state). If the socio-linguistic position of a regional or minority language is feeble and it is highly endangered, immersion models in kindergarden and pre-school and further use of the language as dominant means of instruction makes sense to reach some kind of functional bilingualism. With most small and scattered linguistic minorities, the weakest option of teaching the minority language as a regular subject will often be the only option that is viable in practice.

10. Educational systems show a strong path-dependency and often follow a historical pattern established decades ago. Such patterns do not always make sense over time if the situation has changed significantly. The established models of teaching in the regional or minority language (as medium of instruction) may hamper societal integration and may damage the chances of children to achieve qualified positions in society at a later stage. Shifts to bilingual models of education might make sense in such situations. On the other hand, the traditional models of teaching the minority language as an additional course are often too weak in its position in the educational structure, too marginal in the curriculum (optional course) and will often offer too few hours of teaching to reach a sustainable effect for language acquisition. In these cases, a decided strengthening of the model will be needed. In general, there exist too limited offers of bilingual education. States either tend to lock children in a kind of educational ghetto where only the regional or minority language is used, or they work with marginal offers of an additional course too limited to achieve anything sensible. The mechanisms really needed in most cases would fall somewhere in between these two poles.

11. The structure of the offers at different levels of education and in different places and educational establishments is often haphazard, leaving it in practice to municipal authorities, school directors or individual teachers to decide whether they are willing to offer courses in regional or minority languages. This leads to severe structural problems of continuity throughout educational careers. An immersion model at pre-school level does not produce sustainable results if there is no follow-up at primary school level – and the same is true for efforts in primary school if secondary schools lack credible offers in minority languages. Promoting language acquisition and the strengthening of linguistic capabilities in cases of endangered languages needs a concerted effort throughout all the levels of education. Such a concerted effort must secure continuity of certain educational models from pre-school over primary to secondary education. This requires a structured policy and a certain degree of educational planning.

12. Accordingly, the Committee of Experts is often calling for the introduction of a structural policy with activating policies and a set of coordinated positive measures as well as dedicated financial incentives. States parties should in an anticipatory way make sustainable efforts for preserving the continuity of offers in education in all age groups. At the same time, the Committee of Experts quite regularly calls for creating a transparent legal framework which sets out clear entitlements for parents to demand certain educational offers.

13. Existing legal frameworks for minority education often place a heavy burden on parents. There is a problem with the common requirement for families of speakers to express their demand, in particular if the legal framework lacks transparency and clarity. Parents often lack awareness of their rights in these situations and feel a certain pressure not to be perceived as “trouble makers”. Some evaluation reports mention that the authorities should raise awareness of the right to mother tongue instruction (and of the advantages of multilingualism more in general). In some cases the determination of a minimum number of students to constitute sufficient demand may be problematic, since these numbers tend to be often too high for the concrete situation on the ground. A certain degree of flexibility may be needed in such cases – a flexibility states parties show in a growing number of cases. The problem is aggravated by the fact that in many cases speakers of linguistic minorities live in impoverished and peripheral areas from which large scale emigration has taken place. This brings with it depopulation and closures of schools due to insufficient demand. At the same time, there are very few offers of minority language education in the metropolitan areas where large numbers of the migrated minority populations live. States must strengthen their efforts to develop credible offers for minority language groups in metropolitan areas.

14. Educational reforms tend to hamper minority language education disproportionately. This is often due to demographic problems in the minority areas and to the remoteness and the small size of traditional minority schools. Cost-cutting policies in education may often result in the closure of schools teaching in regional or minority languages. A sensible design of rationalization programs in school structure and of educational reforms in general should take care of the danger of excessive damage to minority language education – a danger often overlooked because minority language education in many cases constitutes a marginal issue not in the minds of mainstream school bureaucrats. Outsourcing minority education to specific institutions with a strong participation of the minority groups themselves may help to overcome these problems. In various states the teaching of minority languages falls outside the public system and relies on private schools run by the speakers themselves or by institutions linked to them. This is perfect if these alternate educational systems are adequately funded. In some cases they even constitute model cases of best practice, as in the case of the Danish schools in the German Land of Schleswig-Holstein. In general, one might say, the internal political and institutional structure of the member states should not be used to justify the failure to honor the commitments of the Charter. If there is a political will, the commitments of the Charter can be well implemented under each type of internal organisation and institutional structure.

15. There is sometimes a tendency to limit the use of regional or minority languages to matters deemed to be of lesser importance for the education system or linked exclusively to historical and cultural aspects. Such a tendency can reinforce prejudices about regional or minority languages in the majority population. The educational system should be designed in a way that regional or minority languages are seen as appropriate for all types of uses and contexts relating to modern life – and in particular to domains linked to economically competitive sectors, covering subjects such as mathematics, science and technical subjects. In general it is problematic if the education system reinforces prejudices towards regional or minority languages rather than promoting their social prestige. The Committee of Experts in a number of cases has drawn attention to the need of promoting multilingualism as a positive value in itself. Multilingualism is to be seen as an added value in modern societies and should be portrayed as such when it comes to the teaching of regional or minority languages.

16. In addition to the need of teaching regional or minority languages, the Charter contains also the commitment to teaching the history and culture which is reflected by the language. This is extremely important in order to fight prejudice in the majority society and to promote the self-esteem of minority groups that is needed if the loss of speakers shall be countered over time. The usual problem in implementing this undertaking is the absence of a systematic and comprehensive approach to the teaching of culture and history different from the dominant narrative of ‘national history’. The challenge lies in the development of adequate curricular structures and the provision of appropriate teaching material and teachers having received the necessary training.

17. Teacher training is in general a pressing problem. The national systems of teacher training usually give only a very limited scope to the training of teachers qualified for minority language teaching. This is less problematic with the training of teachers prepared to teach the language as a subject. Such training fits

relatively well into the structure of second language teaching – although teaching children with the minority language as first language may need different skills than traditional foreign language teaching. In most member states, there exist problems with the training of teachers qualified for teaching different subjects in the minority language (as medium of instruction). Often there is no structured offer that enables teachers to give that type of teaching; their subject-matter teaching usually is trained in the majority language and they have to rely on their linguistic skills as native speakers of the regional or minority language in order to develop the necessary teaching skills. This might create quality problems, since even teachers that are native speakers of minority languages might lack the professional vocabulary in the subjects of teaching. Relying mainly on native speakers also limits severely the numbers of adequately qualified teachers – a limitation which often severely hampers efforts to strengthen and expand the offer of minority language education.

18. Another deficiency that regularly hampers minority language education is linked to the lack of appropriate teaching material for regional or minority languages. As far as small languages are concerned, this lack of appropriate teaching material regularly affects the teaching of the language. Without adequate teaching material, teachers must improvise and must create their own material, which costs a lot of time and energy and wastes resources. But even in the case of regional or minority languages with a relatively strong position in the educational system, a lack of adequate teaching material is to be observed. Subjects that are provided to be taught in regional or minority languages in the framework of bilingual education models or even models with teaching in the minority language often lack adequate teaching materials. States do not invest enough resources to produce and print these materials in minority languages, and existing materials for these subjects from kin-states may not be used due to huge differences in the curricula. More efforts are needed in this field.

19. The Committee of Experts has noted strong inconsistencies in the instruments of ratification either as a result of a lack of precision concerning the level of undertaking or the fact that the undertakings are inappropriate to the actual situation of the language concerned. In a number of cases states have selected by far too low levels of protection – in particular in the cases of uniform menus for part III languages covering a broad range of languages with different situations and problems. But also too high levels of protection might create problems, since they do not always make sense. Sometimes ratifying states also misunderstood the systematic construction of different options and ratified false undertakings that do not fit to their educational systems. There exist also strong inconsistencies between the instruments of ratification and the organisation of the education system in practical terms, not living up to the level of ratification. This is particularly acute in the case of Romani, where no functioning model exists how to integrate the teaching of Romani in a future education model taking adequate care of the needs of Roma children.

20. In general, however, one must say that states parties take the challenge of education in minority languages quite seriously and invest a lot of efforts in improving the situation of minority languages in the educational system. In a number of cases, new institutional arrangements have been developed in education in order to live up to the commitments of the Charter. In some cases, languages which had no place in the educational system were successfully incorporated into the educational structures, creating for the first time suitable offers to learn the regional or minority language or to be taught in the language (as a medium of instruction). The Committee of Experts also has found, in the course of its monitoring practice, a number of ‘best practice’ cases that offer exemplary models of how to cope with the challenges of protecting and promoting regional or minority languages. In a geographical perspective, there is no East-West divide or North-South divide. Due to historical legacies, there are a number of best practice cases in Eastern countries such as Hungary, Romania, Serbia, but also in Spain as well as in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. At the same time, and in the same country, there also exist problematic cases and serious challenges.

3. Media

21. The media, in particular radio and television, but also the internet and the new social media, are of utmost importance to secure an adequate place for regional or minority languages in communicative patterns of minority groups. If there is no offer – or insufficient offer – of programs in regional or minority languages, there is a danger that these languages will perish as an element of daily life in modern societies. Even most minority language speakers live in industrialised societies where a lot of communication does not happen directly, in small local communities, but mediated over media platforms like radio and television. Radio and television programs in regional or minority languages keep the language alive as a vital element of daily communication and strengthen at least the passive skills in regional or minority languages. The new media offer even further opportunities to use actively regional or minority languages in electronic communication. If absent in these media, regional or minority languages drastically lose functionality in daily life and shrink to peripheral domains.

22. Accordingly states have, when ratifying the Charter, tended to include ambitious commitments concerning the electronic media. The number of over-ambitious levels of ratification where the level of commitments does not fit to the operational realities of the media system is particularly high in the media sector. Such mistakes are not easy to correct. Ex post-changes of the level of commitment are nearly impossible. Upgradings of the position of minority languages in the media system are also quite difficult, because that might cost enormous amounts of resources, requires skilled personnel that is not easily available and might run counter to deeply entrenched arrangements of freedom of the media. This problem is particularly acute with public broadcasting systems where the public broadcasters enjoy a constitutionally entrenched guaranty of autonomy, making it more of less impossible for politics to demand a better offer of minority language programs. The more public broadcasters are directly dependent on the government, the less such excuses enjoy credibility.

23. The problem of huge discrepancies between levels of commitment and operational realities is particularly serious in the realm of television. If states have opted for the commitment of either Art. 11 (1) (a) (ii) or (c) (i) to “encourage and/or facilitate the creation of at least one television channel in the regional or minority languages”, the fulfilment of this undertaking is extremely costly if states do not have such a channel already. An entire TV channel broadcasting in a regional or minority language needs huge resources – and quite a number of skilled personnel. Since resources usually are severely limited, even in the media field, it may result to a ‘mission impossible’ to find the necessary resources for such an endeavor. Even the weaker option to “encourage and/or facilitate the broadcasting of television programs in the regional or minority languages on a regular basis” may put some strain on existing resources, because the element “on a regular basis” will require a certain regularity – and not half an hour every six months. Producing a TV program regularly once a month or even once a week will require a production team capable to work in a minority language and thus needs specific arrangements that will cost. The rate of non-fulfilment is particularly high in these television commitments – and there is not much hope of improvement in most cases, an observation true even in the case of wealthy states such as Germany. This is to a certain degree shameful because the complete denial of a suitable offer of at least some program once a month indicates a strong disdain for the role and importance of regional or minority languages – and severely hampers their position in a modern communicative environment.

24. In the case of radio the problem is less severe. The running of an entire radio channel is still rather costly, at least if done on a high level of professional quality (as Switzerland has experienced with its 24 hours radio channel for Romansh). The production of radio programs, however, is much less costly than that of TV programs and can be handled even by civil society enthusiasts. They need some additional training, but must not be necessarily trained professional journalists. A lot of member states have arranged, with some limited amount of additional resources, a basic service of regular radio programs in regional or minority languages. Accordingly, the commitments for radio under the Charter are fulfilled in most countries (and for the majority of languages) – and if not, it is usually a symptom of lack of political interest, since fulfilment can usually be achieved with a limited amount of additional resources and some activating political coordination (finding channels that offer time-slots on their frequencies). There still exist a lot of quality problems in the offer of radio programs – limited availability of such programs in terms of quantity, quality, scheduling and technical transmission; these quality problems might even put into doubt overall fulfilment. What counts at the end is real access of users of regional or minority languages to the programs. Technical changes, such as the shift to digital radio, should not hamper accessibility.

25. There is a growing importance of the commitments under Art. 11 (1) (d) of the Charter, the undertaking to “encourage and/or facilitate the production and distribution of audio and audiovisual works in the regional or minority languages”. In most member States (and concerning most languages) this undertaking is fulfilled, at least at a minimal level. Fulfilment requires states to pay some production and/or distribution subsidies for works in regional or minority languages. The amount of these subsidies usually is quite limited – but it regularly suffices to fulfil the undertaking. With the rise of the new media, the distribution costs tend to sink drastically – but the question of content (and its production) remains a serious bottleneck in the case of most minority languages. The numbers of speakers (and thus the potential audience) often is so small that the production of works in minority languages is not viable in purely commercial terms. Production aids help to safeguard a minimum amount of content in regional or minority languages available for media, be they old (linear) media, be they new (digital) media.

26. The role of the new media in the implementation of the Charter is still an unclear issue. The new media, in particular the social media, offer new opportunities for regional or minority languages (and its users). It allows speakers to activate their language skills and to use their language actively in communication with large groups of other users of the language. In some cases, like Romani, this has led to entirely new forms of written use for languages traditionally used only in oral form. There are, however, also

dangers. Internet TV and radio, but also internet-based newsletters threaten to cannibalise the traditional media. In the case of regional or minority language media, the danger is particularly acute since minority media tend to operate at the brink of commercial viability anyway. There are chances to expand the use of regional or minority languages in the media with new formats, but the secure place of regional or minority languages in the old, linear media may get lost. It is still open whether the shift to new media will be, in an overall perspective, more positive or negative for regional or minority languages. Still open is also the role that new media can play in future in fulfilling the commitments under the Charter.

27. This question is particularly acute with a view to minority language newspapers. There is a high degree of non-fulfilment concerning the undertakings of Art. 11 (1) (e) of the Charter, the encouragement of the creation and/or maintenance of a newspaper in the regional or minority language, or at least the regular publication of articles in the regional or minority language in newspapers. In particular the more ambitious undertaking of a minority language newspaper poses problems. In cases of small language groups, such a newspaper will never be viable in commercial terms and needs a considerable amount of subsidies in order to operate sustainably. States are often not willing or pretend – due to legal constraints – not being able to subsidise the written press. Internet-based newspapers might alleviate the problem to a certain degree, but they still must fulfill certain qualitative requirements – regular publication of a new version at least once a week and content of a certain journalistic quality – in order to be qualified as ‘newspapers’ under the Charter.

28. Commitments that also raise problems are to be found in Art. 11 (1) (g) and 11 (3) of the Charter. The first one concerns support for the training of journalists and other staff for minority language media – an important provision if one bears in mind the wide-spread quality problems of minority media. Too many member states that ratified this undertaking have no structured mechanism to deal with that problem. The other undertaking that often raises problems – Art. 11 (3) – concerns representation of minority language users within bodies supervising the media, with the responsibility for guaranteeing the freedom and pluralism of the media. There are best practice examples where the minority organisations are represented in an impressive way in such bodies. These bodies, however, are often very politicised and diverge enormously in size – factors that sometimes make it quite difficult to organize representation of minority language users.

4. Culture

29. Cultural activities in the regional or minority language or expressing the culture linked to such languages are of vital importance for the preservation of regional or minority languages. Due to the (small) size of most minority communities, the organisations representing minority language users often lack adequate resources. A basic offer of cultural activities thus will in most cases depend on assistance and support granted by the state.

30. Practically all the states parties to the Charter have support schemes that assist the minorities in organising cultural activities. The amount of the resources distributed with these schemes varies enormously, as does the organisation of the support schemes – does the state hand out lump-sum subsidies to minority organizations which then plan and operate the cultural activities, or are state authorities involved in the micro-management of such activities by handing out small-scale project subsidies with tight controls of the use of such aids. This might make a huge difference for the chances of success, as well as for the scope of autonomy minority communities possess in the organisation of its cultural activities. In general, however, notwithstanding all the differences, the state of implementation of the commitments entered into under Art. 12 of the Charter is quite good. Article 12 commitments rarely show up as significant problem areas in 4th or 5th monitoring cycles.

31. The fundamental commitment under Art.12 (1) (a), namely “to encourage types of expression and initiative specific to regional or minority languages”, is practically fulfilled in all states that ratified the Charter. The Committee of Experts has shown particular interest under Article 12 (1) (a) in the allocation of funding. This is often linked to concerns expressed by minority-language representatives about the amount of funding allocated by the state and about the ways and means of distribution (and sometimes also the delays in distribution). These observations usually serve to qualify the fulfilment statement, but rarely lead to non-fulfilment. The same is true for a number of subsequent undertakings under Art. 12 (1). In most cases they are fulfilled because states parties have an interest to support cultural activities of minorities. One might sometimes doubt about the orientation of such activities – they are often too much of a folkloristic nature and do not cover enough “modern cultural initiatives” suited to improve a language’s image as a “living language”, in particular among younger generations.

32. Some problems are visible with regard to the undertakings of Art. 12 (1) lit. (b) and (c) – to foster access to works in minority languages by aiding and developing translation, dubbing, post-synchronisation

and sub-titling (and vice versa). Implementation of these undertakings in a number of cases does not work because states often have no dedicated mechanisms to provide incentives for such activities – and by itself these activities do not happen in most cases. Problems also arise under Art. 12 (1) (g) – the obligation to facilitate the creation of a body to systematically archive minority language materials. With written materials this usually works fine – there is usually a deposit library systematically collecting written materials. The archiving of audio, audiovisual and digital materials is much more deficient – in a number of states nobody takes care of such archiving.

33. The Committee of Experts has found a number of best practice cases in countries such as Switzerland, Finland, but also Slovenia and Hungary, as far as part III commitments are concerned. The Hungarian model of minority self-government deserves particular mention in this regard, since it secures an utmost degree of autonomy of minority language communities in deciding themselves on how to organise cultural activities.

5. Conclusion

34. There still exist strong structural impediments hindering a complete implementation of the commitments under the Charter in most states. The legacy of the traditional 'nation state' model, with its simplistic 'national' narrative of history and its culture of monolingualism, creates severe problems for a sustainable implementation of all the Charter undertakings. At the same time, European states have coped with the challenge and are trying to improve the situation, creating a more friendly environment for regional or minority languages. The creation of the Language Charter, its ratification, but also the improving state of implementation prove this point. There is still a lot to do, but the Charter tells us at least with some clarity what is to be done in order to protect and promote regional or minority languages.

Appendix 8: Fact-finding visit to Latvia

1. In preparation of my report I have made a fact-finding visit to Latvia on 28-29 June 2016. I wish to thank here Ms Libna-Egnere, head of the Latvian parliamentary delegation and Ms Laizane member of the Latvian delegation from the region of Latgale, who hosted me during my visit.

2. The fact-finding visit to Latvia was indeed an opportunity for me to hold very fruitful and positive exchanges with colleagues in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Culture. I have also appreciated meeting with several MPs and the two mayors in the Latgale region. I wish to also thank researches and linguists from the Rezekne University and the two school Directors for their very warm welcome, for the information they have provided me with and for their professional commitment to promoting regional or minority languages.

1. Language situation in Latvia

3. The official language in Latvia is Latvian. The State Language Law of 1999 defines the use of the Latvian language without regulating the use of minority or foreign languages, with the exception of the extinct Livonian language. As a result Russian, Polish and Lithuanian languages for example correspond to both minority and foreign language criteria⁶. Since 1998, the official status of the Latvian language has been written into the Constitution. In 1995 Latvia signed and in 2005 ratified the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. However, to date Latvia has not signed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, as the language situation in Latvia represents a very sensitive and politicised issue.

4. Latvia is a small country with approximately 2 million inhabitants. It is a multi-ethnic society. Russian population forms the largest ethnic minority in Latvia (26%), followed by Belorussian (3.4%), Ukrainian (2.3%), Polish (2.1%), Lithuanian (1.2%), Jewish (0.3%), Roma (0.3%), German (0.1%) and Estonian (0.1%). There is a very small ethnic community of Livs (177 people), while Latgalian speakers do not ethnically distinguish themselves from Latvians in the census.

5. Whereas a small Russian-speaking population has inhabited the area of present day Latvia throughout several centuries, the vast majority of Russophones had moved to Latvia in the period between 1944 and 1991. Since the independence of Latvia in 1991, Latvian state has deployed efforts to reverse the language shift from the dominance of Russian during the Soviet times to re-establish Latvian as the main language of society and the language of interethnic communication.

6. According to the census in 2000, Russian was the first language of 37.5% and the second language of 43.7% of population in Latvia. 50% of the population in the capital Riga had Russian as the first language. The referendum which took place in February 2012 was an attempt to change the Latvian constitution in order to establish Russian as a second official state language alongside Latvian. The results of the referendum had shown that a vote was cast largely along ethnic Latvian-Russian divide: 24.9% of all votes were in favour of Russian as a second state language, 74.8% votes rejected the proposal. The high turnout at the Referendum (71%) indicated how important and sensitive this language issue is in Latvian society. As a language of interethnic communication in Latvia, Russian is still of high importance among the population who grew up in Soviet times, while among younger generation communication seems balanced between Latvian and Russian.

2. State language policy and education reform for national minorities

7. The objective of the Official Language Law which came into force in 2000, was to “*ensure preservation, protection and development of the Latvian language, preservation of the cultural and historical heritage of the Latvian people, inclusion of national minorities in the community of Latvia, by taking into account their right to use mother tongue or other languages, and also to ensure increase of the Latvian language influence in the culture environment of Latvia, by promoting the faster integration of the community*”.⁷

8. The three main areas of the state language policy are: a) judicial area to consolidate the status of the official state language in laws; b) pedagogical area to teach Latvian to Latvians and to minorities living in Latvia; and c) linguistic area to undertake scientific research, standardising Latvian language and publishing

⁶ Chapter 1 Language policy in Latvia, Publication “*Language situation in Latvia 2004-2010*”, Latvian Language Agency, 2012

⁷ page 8, Guidelines of the State Language Policy for 2015-2020, adopted by the Latvian Government in 2014

of reference documents as sources for language norms. In 2005, the government adopted Guidelines of the State Language Policy for 2005-2014 which were in 2014 extended for 2015-2020 period⁸.

9. Two education laws (adopted in 1998 and 1999 respectively) have formed the basis for the elaboration of a minority education program. The primary school reform included the elaboration of four models that required a gradual introduction of Latvian or bilingual classes in Russian language schools, while retaining a significant amount of teaching time in Russian. The secondary school reform implemented in September 2004, included 60-40% ratio to guarantee progressive teaching in Latvian and a requirement to pass the final exam (Baccalaureate) in Latvian. In practice a large number of Russian language schools made a transition to bilingual education and a small number of other minority schools, practice a mix of methods, but include the language of the minority as well as the state language as languages of instruction.

10. According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Latvian state finances teaching programs in minority languages for seven languages: Russian, Polish, Hebrew, Ukrainian, Estonian, Lithuanian and Byelorussian. In the 2015/2016 academic year, 59 418 pupils were enrolled in national minority education programmes, accounting for 26% of the total number of students. National minority education programmes are implemented and financed in 104 schools: education programmes in the Russian language and bilingually are carried out in 94 schools, in Polish and bilingually in 4 schools, in Ukrainian and bilingually in one, in Belarusian and bilingually in one, Hebrew in two, in Latvian and Lithuanian in one, in Latvian and Estonian in one school.

11. I wish to highlight that even during the period of economic crisis in 2007-2010 and downsizing of the overall public budget, the state investment in bilingual and minority education remained a priority. Notwithstanding the very positive results of the education reform and a gradual and peaceful transition towards a greater use of Latvian, in my view Latvian-Russian divide has taken up most attention in political and language debates in society to the detriment of initiatives towards other languages (Latgalian and Livonian for example).

3. Latgalian

12. The Latvian state officially recognises the Latgalian language as a "historical variant of Latvian". It can be considered a regional language, predominantly spoken in the region of Latgale in eastern Latvia. Researchers at the Rezekne University report that the status of Latgalian is a matter of some debate. Whereas many speakers of Latgalian consider it to be a language in its own right, the attitude of many Latvian philologists and state institutions is that it is a dialect of Latvian. Because of its border location, the Latgale region not only has the highest level of multilingualism in Latvia (Latvian, Latgalian, Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, Yiddish, etc.) but it also had a high influx of speakers of Russian during the Soviet era, which has reduced the importance of Latgalian (and Latvian) in the region. UNESCO classifies Latgalian as "vulnerable" since the community is small, scattered and completely bilingual (or trilingual) due to a relatively low level of perceived interethnic distance between Latvians and Latgalians.

13. Latgale continues to be economically the weakest region of Latvia with high emigration rates. In June 2012, a few months after the referendum on the status of the Russian language and as part of the state integration policy, the Latvian government approved a plan prepared by the Ministry of Regional Affairs on regional development of Latgale. The plan aimed to stimulate better living conditions, education and economic opportunities in the region. The plan also envisaged to develop better media coverage of Latgale and of Latgalian issues on national TV. This political change also brought a more explicit language policy for Latgalian. A pilot project introducing "Regional studies" in schools in Latgale started in 2013 as an initiative of the Rezekne University College and has been financially supported by Rezekne municipality. It offered an opportunity for pupils to learn about Latgalian language, culture and literature. This optional course in school was very popular beyond the core circles of Latgalian community. However, problems persist with written language since Latgalian was traditionally an oral language, with many dialects⁹. Standardisation of the written language is underway. Another challenge for teachers is lack of any fixed curriculum and adequate teaching materials. The question also remains, whether Latgalian could be institutionalised and taught as a subject (optional) outside the Latgale region. This is a sensitive political issue and there is no consensus between political parties in Latvia.

⁸ http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/Citi/Official_Language_Policy_Guidelines_for_2015x2020.pdf

⁹ After a short period of official support during the first times of Latvian independence after 1918 with elements of education system in Latgalian and rights to self-determination concerning aspects of language, religion, church, school and economy, the use of Latgalian was discouraged since 1934 and publically forbidden since 1940. As a result the Latgalian language has survived essentially as an oral language in private domains and in the Catholic Church.

14. Young activists of the student society for Latgalian “*Latgolys Studentu centrs*” launched a very interesting initiative to promote Latgalian among young people, not only in Latgale region but also at Universities in Riga. The initiative started with the use of Latgalian in rock music, using therefore “modern” culture to promote the language, as opposed to a more traditional (folklore) perception of Latgalian.

4. Livonian language

15. The Livonian language is the language of Latvian indigenous (autochthonous) people, one of the smallest European languages recorded in the UNESCO Red Book of Endangered Languages¹⁰. Genealogically it belongs to the Finno-Ugric subgroup and Baltic-Finnish group of the Uralic languages¹¹. It is part of the linguistic heritage of a very small community of Livs (177) in the north of the Kurzeme peninsula in Latvia. The rights of the Livonian language are guaranteed by the Official Language Law, adopted in 1999, stipulating in section 4 that the State shall ensure the maintenance, protection and development of the Livonian language as the language of the indigenous (autochthonous) population. However according to Dr Valts Ernštreits research fellow at the University of Tartu, there is lack of support mechanisms for safeguarding the status of the Livonian language (for example, a government action plan).

16. The Livonian community association (Livonian Culture Centre) in cooperation with the *Livonian Friends' Association* have organised the International Year of Livonian Language and Culture in 2011, which has given a special impetus to raise awareness and value the language and stimulate research. Numerous exhibitions, concerts, readings and other events were organised in Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Lithuania, France and Russia that year. Livonian language was incorporated in the Song and Dance Festival of Latvia. Since 2012, the annual Livonian Studies conference has occurred as part of the Livonian Culture Days. Along with Livonian community organisations, the Latvian Language Agency has also contributed to raise awareness and popularise the Livonian language. The Agency has regularly included several events in its program for the European Day of Languages. The web portal *Livones*¹² has been expanded with posts in Latvian, English, Livonian, Estonian and Finnish. One of the areas where coordination and government support would be important is the social setting in which Livonian language occurs, especially for tourism, in order to promote Livonian language and culture more widely.

5. Future prospects: Multilingualism

17. Today 95% of people speak at least 2 languages in Latvia. Researchers at Rezekne University in cooperation with researchers from other universities abroad are exploring ways of nurturing multilingual approach to teach several languages in parallel at school. This is of particular interest in Latgale region where most pupils are trilingual (Latvian, Latgalian and Russian). However, problem persists with teacher training and certification for teaching in all three languages.

¹⁰ now part of the UNESCO Atlas of Endangered Languages <http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/index.php>

¹¹ Apart of the Livonian language this group comprises also the Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Veps, Izhor and Vote languages.

¹² <http://www.livones.net/?lang=en>

Appendix 9: Fact finding visit to Italy (Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol region)

1. In the preparation of my report I made a fact-finding visit to the Trentino-Alto Adige (Südtirol) region in Italy on 6-7 October 2016. I wish to thank here Mr Nicoletti, head of the Italian parliamentary delegation, who was most helpful in facilitating the preparation of my visit.

2. The fact finding visit was an opportunity for me to hold very fruitful exchanges with Mr Ugo Rossi, President of the Autonomous Province of Trento, Mr Bruno Dorigatti, President of the Provincial Council of Trento, Mr Riccardo Dello Sbarba, member of the Green Group in the Provincial Council of Bolzano, and with Mr Francesco Palermo, member of the Italian Senate. I wish to thank the researchers and experts, namely Mr Jens Woelk, Professor of Constitutional law at the University of Trento, Mr Giuseppe Detomas, Regional Assessor for linguistic minorities, and Mr David Lardschneider, Journalist and member of the Union Generela di Ladins dla Dolomites, for their valuable contribution and insights. During my visit, I was also able to have a very lively exchange with the pupils of a secondary school in Bolzano (using predominantly the German language) and of a trilingual school in Ortisei in Val Gardena.

1. Protection of minority languages in Italy

3. In the application of the Constitution, Italian Framework Law 482/99 recognises twelve minority languages. To enjoy concrete language rights, minorities must be recognised through a formal decision on the municipal level, after certain thresholds have been met. In addition, special statutes concern the German, French and Slovenian speakers in, respectively, Alto Adige/Südtirol, Valle d'Aosta/Vallée d'Aoste and Friuli Venezia Giulia. The Italian protection regime is multi-leveled, since it aims to strike a balance between, on the one hand, issues of national cohesion and unity and, on the other hand, protection of minorities and territorialism, involving also the local (municipal) level.

2. Ladin language

4. Ladin people are a specific ethnic group living in the valleys of Badia and Gardëina (both in South Tyrol), Fassa (Trentino), Livinallongo (known as Buchenstein or Fodom) and in Ampezzo (both in the Province of Belluno). Their native language is Ladin, a Rhaeto-Romance language related to the Swiss Romansh and Friulian languages. They are part of Tyrol, with which they share culture, history, traditions, environment and architecture. During the protestant reform period, many Ladins took over the German language.

3. German language

5. At the end of the First World War in 1918 (London Pact), the so-called "terre irredente" ("unredeemed lands", i.e. Bolzano, Trento and Trieste regions) which were formerly part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire were given to Italy. The agreement stipulated the respect of language (German), people and traditions which was later challenged by the rise of Mussolini's Fascism movement in 1922. During this period, German was forbidden, names of places (toponyms) and people had to be changed and schools were converted to the Italian language. Having been germanised during the Austrian period, "Tirolesi" (Tyrolians) were again assimilated to become Italian. There was resistance to this assimilation process with clandestine schools, particularly in the remote Alpine regions outside cities. As a result of the 1939 Hitler-Mussolini agreement, the local population was asked to choose between German and Italian citizenship. Consequently, the region was "colonised" by Italians from other parts of Italy, while among people who opted to become German, 70 000 were later transferred to Poland to germanise it during the Nazi Germany period. Following the end of the Second World War, the "Gruber-de Gasperi" bilateral agreement was signed between Austria and Italy (Paris, September 1946), which granted the German speaking population of the current Alto Adige (Südtirol) region to preserve their cultural identity and customs through autonomy and the recognition of German in the local area as an official language equivalent to the Italian language¹³. The decisions of this accord were later incorporated into the Italian Constitution.

4. Issues discussed

6. During my visit we discussed the main issues related to the protection and promotion of regional or minority languages which arise today in the Trentino-Alto Adige region. The fact that the Gruber-de Gasperi agreement sought to establish equal status between the German and Italian languages has in practice led to a separation of communities (cohabitation) due to a system of clearly separate schools and separate policies which have been reinforced by linguistic division among political parties in the region. The question arises

¹³ See historic document from 1946, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1946v04/d297>.

now how to evolve from this co-habitation towards plurilingualism and pluriculturalism (“living together”). Article 19 of the Statute of the Autonomy¹⁴ establishes a clear division in governing schools and does not encourage bilingualism. Ladin schools are an exception as they practice trilingualism, with German and Italian being taught alongside Ladin which is considered a “weak” language for employment purposes. However, the communities are small (14 000 people) and dispersed in remote alpine valley areas. When I visited the German secondary school in Bolzano, young people themselves were very much in favour of plurilingualism (most mastered German as a mother tongue and had a proficient level of Italian, English and in some cases Spanish as a fourth language which they could learn at school). They considered that multilingualism gave them the opportunity to become more open to other cultures and to be a lot more at ease to learn new languages. However, only one pupil in the class had Italian as his mother tongue. It was an economic choice of his parents who considered that German schooling would give their son better job opportunities later in life to work in Austria or Germany.

7. The Trentino-Alto Adige (Südtirol) region comprises two rather distinct Provinces: Bolzano and Trento, which hold a considerable autonomy. The Bolzano Province has a dominant German speaking population (60%) with latent movements of nostalgia of Austrian times and a longing for “separation”. In the Trentino Province dispersed communities of Ladins are generally bilingual or trilingual and tend to speak Italian perfectly (95% of the population of the Trentino Province speak Italian). We have therefore discussed with the provincial and regional authorities how to avoid tensions and how to best work towards “linguistic peace” in the region. One of the possibilities evoked was the concept of a cross border Euroregion including Tirol in Austria, Bolzano and the Trentino Provinces. Also, the training of teachers and administrative staff ought to be shared between the two languages to achieve more openness and a bilingual certification. The University of Bolzano, for example, uses both the German and Italian languages. Cultural centres in remote areas (disposing of TV and internet) were considered a good model to preserve other (smaller) languages in the Region. It was considered important to distinguish the rights of minorities (protection of people) from linguistic rights (protection of regional or minority languages) and to carefully consider the socio-economic situation of linguistic minorities. Thanks to tourism in Alpine areas, the Ladins for example are today doing well economically with less young people who want to emigrate from the region. In the past, these remote areas used to be extremely poor, which represented a threat to Ladin communities and their capacity to preserve the language.

5. Conclusion

8. In general, we agreed that minority and linguistic issues often tend to be conflictual and politicised issues across Europe. Political parties hold a special responsibility as many insist on separation. It would therefore seem necessary to agree on common basic values that would be the foundation to overcome such conflicts. Moreover, my interlocutors considered that greater autonomy and decentralisation with a higher citizen participation would also provide a better framework to find good solutions. We also discussed institutional mechanisms which exist but do not necessarily function well in Europe. Many institutions seek to preserve a status quo (ghettoes with guaranteed rights) instead of inducing a different dynamic towards inter-cultural cooperation (discussing and seeking benefits for all linguistic communities). Finally with Senator Francesco Palermo we raised the sensitive issue of the measures and political circumstances which would be needed for Italy to ratify the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

¹⁴ See http://www.buergernetz.bz.it/en/downloads/autonomy_statute_eng.pdf.