



COUNCIL OF EUROPE    CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 19 April 2006

MIN-LANG/PR (2005) 6  
Addendum 3

**EUROPEAN CHARTER FOR REGIONAL OR MINORITY LANGUAGES**

**Third Periodical Report  
presented to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe  
in accordance with Article 15 of the Charter**

**HUNGARY**

***Replies to the Comments/questions submitted to the Government of Hungary  
regarding its Third Periodical Report***

## **Responses to be given to the package of questions of the Expert Committee of the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages**

1. For the number of local minority self-governments: See Appendix 1 (Contents of the table: name of settlement, county, number of population based on Home Ministry figures, number of national minority people of the previous figure, number of those deeply attached to traditions of the previous figure, number of those declaring to have a minority language as native tongue of the previous figure, number of those using a minority language of the previous figure, ratio of minority people to whole population, ratio of those observing traditions to whole population, ratio of native speakers of a minority language to whole population, ratio of language speakers to whole population.)

2. Researchers have sent indications about the phenomenon, but as the process is slow, and today is in a rudimentary stage, there are limits to observation, no overview survey has been made in this regard yet. The Central Statistical Office has provided data regarding settlements studied by the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities (NEKH), where the minority self-governments were transformed, and where the minorities constitute a significant portion of the population. The two tables are attached (the extra contents of Appendices 2 and 3 – apart from those listed in Appendix 1 – are the number of those who had moved in from the country of the language based on the figures of the Central Statistical Office)

3. The modified minority election rules set as a condition of elections the compilation of a minority election list of names. The number of minority voters to be displayed in the list of voters compared to census figures, and the number and type of minority institutions to be found in the settlement can take us closer to a realistic assessment of minority language demands. These data can later facilitate the realisation of Recommendation no. 3 - provided the appropriate political and minority self-government support is available.

4. As our report suggested, a compulsory element of minority education is the teaching of the civilisation of the minority. This subject gives the opportunity to get to know the local dialect too. Transmitting the content of the frame curriculum requires only a part of the available time, the schools were able to prescribe learning other skills related to the given settlement, region – like the vernacular of the settlement.

5. Regarding the quantity and frequency of minority programmes, the provisions of Act I of 1996 On Radio and Television Broadcasting are the rule. They stipulate that the time available for minority programmes cannot be less than it was when the Act had come into force. In the broadcasting profile of Hungarian Radio the listed minorities raised no issues regarding either the content, or length of programme time. The former Chairman of Hungarian Television signed an agreement with the presidents of national minorities, and in this he undertook an obligation regarding the programmes. In accordance with the agreement, the parties directly concerned can discuss quantity and other demands.

6. Ukrainians, Armenians, and part of the Ruthenes continue to operate Sunday schools, unlike Bulgarians, Greeks and Poles, they did not organise supplementary minority schools as regulated in the Public Education Act. Regarding teacher training, the conditions are provided to train Polish, Greek, Bulgarian and Ukrainian teachers, whereas, as there has been no expressed demand, there are no conditions available to train schoolteachers with Armenian language specialisation. There is a Greek guest teacher from Greece teaching in the Greek supplementary minority school, and the two-semester specialised further training of teachers teaching in the Polish school in the academic year of 2004/2005 – organised by the University of Katowice - was also supported by the Ministry of Education. Pupils of this minority partly use textbooks from the motherland, but as regards Bulgarian and Greek, the development of textbooks on language and civilisation of Bulgarian and Greek is in progress. The manuscript is available of the textbook on Bulgarian and Greek popular knowledge for pupils in years (grade) 1-4, Bulgarian language for year 9, and Greek for years 3-4 and 9-12.

7. Minority education and training are regulated at the level of the National Core Curriculum in the minority directives issued with ministerial decree based on paragraph a) in Article 93 (1) (MKM decree 32 of 1997 (XI.5) on issuing educational guidelines for kindergarten education for national, ethnic minorities and on educational guidelines of teaching at schools of ethnic minorities). Annexes to this rule of law are the general requirements specified for an educational form, and the detailed

requirements issued for a minority and a form of education. The Directive provides that if the detailed requirements of a minority are not elaborated, then teaching can be organised on the basis of the local pedagogical programme elaborated on the basis of the general requirements. Out of the minorities who used to operate a Sunday school, the Greek, Bulgarian and Ruthenian requirements have been completed, the Polish minority has elaborated the pedagogical programme of its supplementary minority school. The Armenian, Ukrainian, and Ruthenian minorities have not yet used the opportunity to organise supplementary minority education as part of the public education system.

8. The Ruthenian minority has not made use of the opportunity to introduce supplementary minority education, and initiated the introduction of Ruthenian education in Komlóska - inhabited by Ruthenes - near Mucsony. The National Ruthenian Minority Self-Government – based on the direct agreement with the municipal self-government – financially also supports the maintenance of Ruthenian education and teaching. The detailed requirements of Ruthenian language and popular knowledge have been formulated, and have been issued as the annex to the decree of the Ministry of Education of 32/1997 (XI.5). Pupils partly use Ruthenian textbooks from Slovakia, partly syllabuses made by teachers. The National Ruthenian Minority Self-Government has initiated that the Ruthenian language major teacher training should be launched at the University of Nyíregyháza. The preparation of the accreditation of the major has also been financially supported by the Ministry of Education.

9. The Ministry of Education has investigated the current status of the teaching of the Roma and Beash languages. Both the local minority self-governments and surveys have indicated that the demand for the teaching of these languages at school is increasing. To create the conditions for teaching these languages, the Ministry has started to have the system of language requirements elaborated for both languages. Until it is completed, there will be an opportunity to teach Romani and Beash at school. In 2003, the Office of the Ministerial Commissioner responsible for the integration of Handicapped and Roma Children in the Ministry of Education published a call for applications to elaborate a textbook of Roma civilisation, and for a complex curriculum package (teacher's book, clasp book for children, music CD and other multimedia teaching aids, etc.) A Romani language teaching programme for PC's has also been developed.

10. With the support of the Ministry of Education, Romology has been introduced in several higher education institutions within the framework of departments, special courses, or as an independent programme. In this framework, the teaching of Romani and Beash have been introduced.

The Ministry of Education issued an invitation for applications for organisations and institutions that launch accredited further training programmes for teachers who teach Roma children and schoolchildren. Under the auspices of the programme, 4 training institutions were supported, to the amount of 7 400 000 HUF. In the framework of the four programmes, over 100 practising teachers acquired knowledge of the methodology of teaching Roma civilisation, Romani and Beash languages, and teaching Roma children.

11. The Ministry of Education supports Roma youth to become intellectuals (obtain a degree): Out of the young Roma studying in higher education - where they have to pay for their studies - the youth opting for the teaching profession received special support in an application scheme.

12. We have no information regarding the rejection of students applying for the minority programme. We wish to note here that no complaint or information has reached our ministry in the past years. It is important to note, though, that school records can only extend to participation in the minority programme, in accordance with the valid rules and regulations no records can be kept about anyone belonging to any minority.

13. The National and Ethnic Minority Research Institute is a research institute of the Hungarian Academy of Arts and Sciences. It mainly deals with research of the Hungarian minorities in the neighbouring countries. Regarding minorities in Hungary, it carries out research into history, sociology, cultural history and civilisation (ethnography). It carries out no research regarding the codification of the Ruthenian language, but – as far as we know – neither does the Hungarian Ruthenian Research Institute. The research of the Armenian language is also outside the scope of the Institute.

14. A means of co-operation in protecting the minorities in the Republic of Hungary and in the neighbouring countries is the system of bilateral joint committees. As such, it exclusively strives to

satisfy the needs of the Hungarian minorities living on the territory of the two countries (the Republic of Hungary and the partner country) and the minorities speaking the language of the partner country. As the Roma (Beash and Romani) and the Ruthenian minorities do not have a motherland, there are no bilateral joint committees regarding these languages.

15. According to a study dated 2004, there are minimum eight hundred school classes in Hungary reserved for children classified as disabled where all the pupils are Roma. Several research projects have indicated that classifying children as having special educational needs often clearly serves the purpose of segregating Roma children. However, the measures listed below are not specifically ethnic programmes, though there must be a great number of Roma among those concerned because of the above facts.

In the system of the Hungarian public education, the number of those previously defined as disabled (handicapped), now defined as having special educational needs is remarkably high. According to the opening statistical data of the 2004/2005 academic year, 6.4 % of those attending elementary schools are such. The majority of them learn on the basis of a special curriculum, in many cases segregated from the rest of the children.

Therefore the Ministry of Education adopted a programme in 2003 to suppress classifying non-disabled children as slightly disabled, titled "From the last row of school benches". The primary objective of the programme is that the ratio of pupils in Hungary with special educational needs should converge to the average of the EU, and an aim is to lessen the overrepresentation of children at a disadvantage and Roma children in classes with a different curriculum.

Since the programme was launched, the trend – on the rise for several years – to classify children as slightly mentally handicapped stopped, and reversed. Registration data in 2005 suggested that there was a 12 % nation-wide decrease in classifying children as slightly mentally disabled.

During the implementation of the programme, in 2004 the Ministry of Education commissioned independent experts to re-examine children. They re-examined 2,100 children and found in 11% that they were not mentally handicapped, so 222 of them were transferred to classes with the usual curriculum.

The number of recommendations to put children back into ordinary classes has quadrupled in the Expert and Rehabilitation Committees Examining Learning Abilities compared to the previous academic years.

16. The 45 schools have been selected. According to statistics, in the academic year 2003/2004 in the first, fifth and ninth grades 9 935 pupils started their studies in the framework of the integration preparation. In the 2004/2005 academic year, the integration normative subsidy was claimed after 17 539 children.

The number of those making use of the new normative subsidies greatly exceeds the number of those who used to participate in the catch-up courses for Roma. This leads us to conclude that the special financing of Roma children learning in ordinary classes of the elementary schools was without any problem, so the switch-over did not result in decreasing disbursements in those schools which have been the most strongly affected.

Integration preparation – despite the relatively high number of participants – has no palpable effect on segregation. The main reason for the low efficiency level is that the segregation of children at a disadvantage – the Roma children among them – has risen to a higher level of education organisation, meaning that what we have today is not so much segregation within the school, but segregation between schools. It is difficult for a normative subsidy system – that has come into being to be an incentive in a school with a basically heterogeneous social composition – to be successful.

In 2006, the Ministry of Education – in the framework of the Human Resources Development Operative Programme (HEFOP) of the National Development Plan – wants to support the lessening of school segregation and its negative effect, and the development of teaching children with multiple disadvantages. The invitations were published in 2005.

In the framework of the NFT HEFOP 2.1.5<sup>1</sup> application programmes, we anticipate successful applications from some 100 schools, which will undertake to introduce integration preparation in their institution until the 2006/2007 academic year, and will make sure that the ratio of children with multiple disadvantages will not reach 50 %. The whole teaching staff of these schools will participate in different pedagogical-methodological further trainings serving integrated education. In addition, subsidies can be applied for to be spent on purchases and developments that will facilitate the pedagogical works of the institution. The whole amount available is 890 million HUF, a given school can win some five million HUF in subsidies. By virtue of the supported programmes, the quality of the education of ca. 30 thousand pupils – among them some 10 thousand multiply disadvantaged – will be improved

The activities planned in the second phase of the National Development Plan will have a strong focus on decreasing school segregation. Apart from comprehensive reforms in terms of organisation, subsidies and legal framework, complex development programmes are also required to improve the level of success at school of children with multiple disadvantages in the foreseeable future.

17. In line with its own strategic objectives, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage (in Hungarian: NKÖM) employs its own tools to facilitate the creation of Roma cultural values, along with their domestic and foreign display. At the same time, there is a conviction that beyond this strategy there is no need to improve the image of Roma culture as reflected by public opinion, or a related governmental, communication strategy. In the context of the recognition of the achievements of Roma artists, the acceptance of Roma cultural values, there appeared to be no issues that would prompt the development of such a strategy.

It is a basic principle of the cultural strategy of this competent ministry that a vivid and strong culture is the most prominent medium of social integration and solidarity, therefore its main purpose is to establish the framework for the coexistence of cultural diversity. Thereby it is an integral part of the governmental strategy promoting the social integration of Roma.

The Press Department of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage ensures that the representatives of the media are present at the outstanding Roma cultural events in order to present the program to the public. By virtue of their appearance in the media, the Roma artists, performers and groups, bands known nationwide make a significant contribution to the introduction and acceptance of the community.

18. The development of national minority coursebooks – including the public domain courses delivered in the native (minority) tongue – is done on the basis of a development plan designed in co-operation with the National Committee for Minorities and the national self-governments for minorities. On these grounds, the Ministry publishes an open invitation for authors to write the national minority coursebooks. In 2001, 47 proposals were received in response to the invitation issued for the publication of 106 coursebooks, whereas in 2004 48 proposals were submitted for 100 titles. Out of the 530 (479) coursebooks required for teaching the native (minority) tongue and literature (public domain courses in the native tongue) 256 (286) are missing, respectively. Dynamic development is hampered in the first place by the quite narrow authoring capacity, therefore several years will be needed to overcome the backlog even with concentrated expenditure.

19. As we have already pointed out before, as of the 2004/2005 academic year, the Bulgarian, Greek and Polish minorities initiated the creation of complementary minority schools. In all cases, the schools were invariably created as institutions of the national minority self-government concerned. The Bulgarian and the Greek schools started to operate in Budapest with 45 and 231 pupils, respectively. The Budapest-based Polish school set out to pursue its activities in 17 settlements (Békéscsaba, Budapest – 6 sites, Dunaújváros, Emőd, Érd, Gödöllő, Győr, Hajdúszoboszló, Kaposvár, Kecskemét, Miskolc, Pásztó, Pécs, Szeged, Székesfehérvár, Szolnok, Veszprém), altogether at 23 locations with a total of 218 pupils.

20. As we also signalled in our report, as from September 1, 2004 the National Self-Government of Germans in Hungary and the Hungarian Slovak Self-Government took over the operation and maintenance of 2 (Pécs, Pilisvörösvár) and 1 institution (Szarvas), respectively. The Hungarian Croatian Self-Government took over the running of the Croatian School in Hercegszántó already prior to the modification (August 1, 2000). In addition to the above, the Hungarian Slovak Self-Government

also took over the management of yet another institution, the Slovak School in Békéscsaba as from September 1, 2005.

21. The data relevant to kindergartens were disclosed on the basis of statistics compiled from the mandatory data supply of the institutions. According to our information, the number of minority kindergartens did not show a significant drop, it was only due to changes in the method of statistical data publication that certain institutions classified themselves incorrectly in the statistics.

22. Participation in minority education is voluntary, it is thus the parent or the child who selects the form of education to learn in, that is, the ratio of minority language (native tongue) or bilingual kindergartens only depends on the volition of the parents. In the case of kindergartens, there is no financial incentive like the differentiated normative financing of schools. We wish to remark, though, that in the program adopted by the Ministry of Education for the mid-term development of minority education the extension of minority language and bilingual education appears as a key task.

23. In addition to general subsidies, the operator of minority kindergartens is entitled to receive a supplementary minority support payable for the children participating in education, the amount of which was HUF 45 thousand / child in 2004. Further, in kindergartens operating in settlements with less than 1,100, between 1,101-3,000, and between 3,001-3,500 inhabitants, there is an additional HUF 50, 25 and 12,5 thousand support respectively to be had for children participating in the national minority program. As from 2006, the latter support was canceled, however, the most indigent group, that of the operators of kindergartens in settlements with less than 1,100 inhabitants can apply for supplementary support from a separate reserve provisioned for in the Budget Act.

24. As it was explained before, in compliance with the relevant article of the Minorities Act (Article 43) minority preparatory school education has to be organised provided this is requested by the parents of at least eight children. Paragraph (2) of Section II in Appendix 3 to the Public Education Act puts forward a similar provision which states that a national minority or ethnic kindergarten group needs to be set up if this is requested by the parents of at least eight children belonging to the given minority.

25. Subregional or institution managing associations sometimes are involved with institutions providing minority education. If the children are forced to commute, they mostly rely on public transport or, occasionally, school buses.

26. As we remarked above, in the program adopted by the Ministry of Education for the mid-term development of minority education the extension of minority language and bilingual education appears as a key task. Similarly to kindergartens, the participation in minority education is again voluntary, and it is thus the parent or the pupil who selects the form of education to follow. In terms of financial regulations, it represents an incentive that the operators of minority language (native tongue) and bilingual minority schools are entitled to receive stronger supplementary support for their pupils; there is no distinction made between minority language and bilingual education.

27. Starting from the basics of the new financing system, the central budget grants supplementary support to perform the additional tasks of national minority or ethnic education. The extent of the support varies as a function of the forms of minority education, the largest amount of support is paid for the minority language and bilingual forms of education, whereas the language training form receives a lesser amount of supplementary support. In 2003, the support payable for the language training form and kindergarten education amounted to HUF 44 thousand / child or pupil, while for minority language or bilingual education 150% of this (HUF 66 thousand) was due. In 2004, the corresponding figures were HUF 45 thousand / child or pupil, and 170% of it (HUF 76,500). In 2005 and 2006, the amount of support was equal to the support of 2004.

It follows logically from the demographic characteristics of national minority population that the learning headcount of national minority, ethnic educational institutions is typically low. Due to this, the management of national minority institutions appears as a recurrent issue for the operators from time to time. The conflict between the small number of pupils and normative financing arises not only in small settlements, but – with the exception of some national minority institutions operating in major cities – in each settlement where an independent minority kindergarten or school is operated, even when the latter is responsible for national or regional tasks.

The so-called small settlement norm was introduced among others to address this problem. The amount of support was identical in 2003 and 2004 (HUF 12 thousand / child or pupil). Settlements with population between 3,001-3,500 were eligible for this support, while settlements with population between 1,101-3,000 (below 1,100 people) received the double of this sum (four times as much). Local governments managing national minority kindergartens or schools were entitled to receive twice the above amount for the children and pupils participating in the minority program. In 2005, the base amount was raised slightly (by HUF 500) to attain HUF 12,500. The support produced results at a point decisive from the perspective of the future of minorities, the subsistence of the schools of authentic small communities. In 2006, this extra national minority support was suppressed.

To overcome the issues of school operation, a targeted grant titled 'supplementary support for the operation of national minority schools' was introduced in Appendix 5 to the Budget Act. In 2003, 2004 and 2005, both HUF 340-340 mn was made available. According to its original tole, the framework was supposed to act as an incentive for operating minority language (native tongue) and bilingual schools, from the beginning the applicant operators of minority language and bilingual schools received premium support, even if the operators of kindergartens and language training schools were also eligible for support until 2003 and 2004, respectively. As of this year, the main goal is definitely to support minority language and bilingual education. The only exception was the support of national minority language training designated in bilateral agreements. As from 2006, in addition to extending this framework (the amount was increased to HUF 1.1 bn), new tasks were defined too. Besides supporting minority language and bilingual national minority schools, now support can be requested for the operation of kindergartens and schools in settlements with less than 1,100 inhabitants, for purchasing national minority coursebooks, receiving professional minority services, and performing public education tasks defined in the recommendations of mixed bilateral minority committees.

In addition to the above, from the chapter of the Ministry of Education the Ministry finances national minority tasks by means of open invitations accessible for anyone that cannot be solved within the overall general financing system. Such are research work supporting minority education and the support of the further training of minority teaching staff.

28. National minority secondary (medium) schools – with the exception of the majority of German secondary schools – typically fulfil district, regional or national roles as multifunctional institutions (providing minority education from kindergarten to secondary school) that have their own residences (dormitories) too. Pupils living within the accessible vicinity tend to commute, using public transport as a rule.

29. As it was said before, the selection of the form of education, thus the move to bilingual or minority language education is a function of the parents' decision. The opportunities of the state are restricted, and 'only' extend to the establishment of legislative and material conditions, plus the securing of financing.

30. See item 29.

31. In compliance with the provisions of the Minorities Act, through work plans and bilateral international agreements concluded with the motherlands of the domestic minorities Hungary strives to enable the young minority people to join in full or part time education or Ph.D postgradual training in the institutions of higher education of their respective motherland. For these studies, the Hungarian state disburses grants and supplementets to scholarships. Given that the agreements are bilateral, their implemetation is subject to the approval of the receiving party, so e.g. in the German relation it is not possible to participate in full time training.

32. The admission criteria are set by the receiving party, and the Hungarian side ensures a grant for the duration of the studies (or a supplement if the grant is paid by the receiving party).

33. It was said before that instead of supporting the so-called 'Sunday schools' the concerned minorities were encouraged to arrange for supplementary minority education. The advantage of the new form of education is that its initiatin is not tied to a specific number, in fact it can be organised for learners of different institutions of education, its professional, staffing and financial prerequisites are guaranteed, and the subjects are entitled for further learning.

34. According to the Minority Act and the Act on Public Education, in respect of the content of education both the national minority self-government and the National Committee for Minorities have the right of consent. In line with this, regulating the content of the civilisation course encompassing the history of minority is conducted in close co-operation with the minorities concerned.

35. Training minority teachers is a state task, and consequently the conditions for training teachers specialised in minority languages are established in domestic institutions of higher education (with the exception of the Ruthenian and Armenian minorities). We are not aware of shortage of teachers in the field of national minority education. In several relations (German, Slovak), a guest teacher program is in place building on the terms defined in bilateral interministerial agreements, but this is in no way caused by shortage of workforce.

36. The Office of Justice operating under the supervision of the Ministry of Justice plans to supplement its homepage in the near future with information on the rights of speakers of minority languages to use their native tongue. In legal disputes, speakers of minority languages are informed that they can use their minority language in the case where the court material reveals that the party belongs to a minority.

The jury is not bound and is in fact not even authorised to ascertain whether or not the participants of a procedure are members of a minority, that is, if the person concerned himself/herself does not refer to this fact and does not request the use of his/her minority language, the jury does not inform him/her to do so.

37. The Office Of Justice applies a language bonus to encourage its employees to learn minority languages, and as a consequence among the assisting supervisors 1 person has an advanced level language certificate in Lovari language, 12 persons have intermediate level and another person basic level certificates. Besides, some of the other staff members have language certificates in German, Serbian, Croatia or Romanian.

Courts aid the language training of their employees by providing financial support and reduced working time.

38. According to the information supplied by court tribunals, up to now the number of speakers of regional or minority languages did not justify an organised effort to ensure the use of regional or minority languages.

If the issues regulated in item 9 are raised at any point of the procedure, then the jury proceeds in compliance with the arguments set forth therein (exemption from costs, interpreter fees, translation fees paid by the state, gratis translation of documents submitted in minority languages, disbursement of the costs by the state, etc.).

In the course of court procedures, the statistical data regarding the use of regional or minority languages are not at the disposal of the jury.

39. So far only 3 instances were reported where the request for the use of minority languages was made by the clients of the Service of Assisting Supervisors. In these cases, it was the patron having an advanced level language certificate for the given language who took charge.

40. As our report shows, in the Republic of Hungary the legal background for the use of minority languages is guaranteed in every respect. Considering the scarcity of information regarding the practical implementation of the legislative environment, the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities, even though the realisation of minority research is not necessarily included within its scope of competence, made an attempt to use its limited means to paint an image of the practical implementation of language use. The survey mentioned was a tool for this. Settlements with transformed minority self-governments were natural subjects of the survey, while the other settlements – "the control group" – were selected upon the recommendations of Office staff members who were familiar with the particular settlements inhabited by minorities. The information so obtained was also incorporated in our report.



In what concerns the language use of the other minority self-governments, the related survey – actually due to the large number of the self-governments – is limited taking into account the resources and other opportunities.

41. The right to use minority languages was put forward in the Minorities Act and other rules of law as individual and collective right. In addition to the provision of the legislative environment, the opportunities of central government bodies – besides information supply through the media and at organised events – are fairly restricted in so far as they should encourage the individuals of minorities the use their native tongue. The organisers of local minority public life in the settlements– in terms of languages too – are the minority self-governments. The direct notification of the community members, encouraging them to use their native tongue is the function of their activity. The central support to this is given in the form of different invitations for proposals which manifested more and more focus on the use of minority languages in public life over the past years.

42. Among the invitations for proposals issued by the Public Foundation for Hungarian National and Ethnic Minorities from year to year there appear resources to support the local printed and electronic media. According to the invitations, within the framework of this application those settlements inhabited by minorities too are eligible for support that plan to develop and operate webpages in minority languages.

43. Other than the creation of the legislative environment, the opportunities of the central government are quite limited in this context. The representatives of local self-governments are informed at events organised for them about the importance of employing administrators speaking minority languages.

44. It was mentioned in our report, that pursuant to the Act on the General Rules of Authority Public Administration Procedures and Services, the assembly of the local minority self-government may declare within its competence that in addition to Hungarian, the minority language is also official in the authority procedures. Until November 1, 2005 (the date when the Act entered into force) this authorisation given by law was used in nine settlements (in Somogy County: Gadács; in Vas County: Apátistvánfalva, Felsőcsatár, Kétvölgy, Narda, Orfalu; in Veszprém County: Borzavár, Csetény, Porva).

The register of minority language settlements and settlements using other geographical names is attached (Appendix 4). To date no complex survey has been made concerning the language of other geographical names, so it is only the Y2004 survey of the NEKH Office that suggests that in the greater part of the settlements, names in minority languages are also used occasionally in addition to the name of the settlement and its streets for other purposes. At the same time, the reorganised minority self-governments usually use two languages – Hungarian and the language of the given minority – to identify the contents of their forms.

45. On January 30, 2006 the Parliament amended the relevant Act, which now makes it possible that minority radio programmes can be broadcast on the previous frequencies for yet another year, until January 31, 2007. Given that the amendment of the Act only provides a temporary solution for the future of the frequency - and therefore the minority programmes -, the vice chairmen of the Hungarian Radio proposed that the Hungarian Radio, the national minority self-governments, the National Radio and Television Commission (ORTT) and Antenna Hungaria Rt. should without delay start the co-ordination work to allow the broadcasting of the minority programmes in a stand-alone network even before the expiry of the 1-year grace period guaranteed by law.

46. The invitations for proposals for radio frequencies receivable in the territory of Budapest prefer the applicants representing national and ethnic minorities. In the spirit of the invitation, in addition to the general evaluation 20 extra score points are automatically credited to an applicant who undertakes to make programmes for a specific target audience (national and ethnic minorities) to cover 50% of the definitive part of its programme plan.

47. In view of improving the reception zone of the Slovene minority radio programme, the National Radio and Television Commission initiated a co-ordination session with the competent officials of the Ministry of Information Technology and Telecommunications and the National Communications Authority of Hungary (NHH). Considering that the official seat of Radio Monoster is located in a special

area – in the immediate proximity of the Austrian and Slovene borders), the authorities of these neighbouring states also have to be consulted. The Austrian Directorate allowed the use of the 97.7 MHz frequency, but this is not sufficient for achieving the goal, as there is a large number of USW FM emitter stations operating in the region, making the jamming level (noise) quite high. There seems to be no realistic chance for the co-ordination of another frequency according to the control noise calculations.

48. Radio Monoster is a non-profit-oriented programme service operated by Slovene Radio Servicing Co. and the Hungarian Slovene Self-Government. Its support comprises mainly domestic budget resources. Over the past 3 years, its annual support increased from HUF 13.5 mn to HUF 16.2 mn. This amount of support suffices for the operating costs of the institution, but potential developments will require additional resources.

A possible way for obtaining additional resources would be to submit applications in response to the invitations (promoting technical development too) published by ORTT for non-profit-oriented programme providers.

49. See Appendix 5. The table shows the name and language of the channel broadcasting in the given language, and the number of connected households.)

50. The accessibility of the programmes broadcast by the national public service programme providers and intended for ethnic or other minorities is regulated by the so-called "must carry" rule. According to this rule, the programme distributor must distribute all programmes of the public service programme providers provided their reception zone covers the headend. The distribution is free of charge for every public service programme provider, and in turn the public service programme provider is not allowed to charge a fee for the distribution of its programmes.

51. In relation to the frequency (of occurrence) of the television programme made for the Slovene minority in Hungary, the Hungarian Slovene Self-Government previously consulted the management of Hungarian Television (MTV). The current amount of broadcasting is a result of this co-ordination. So far the Hungarian Slovene Self-Government did not signal its request in relation to weekly broadcasting.

52. The institution of the equal opportunities ombudsman of Hungarian Television is a new initiative, only a very short period of time has passed since its creation. Due to this, there are no clear cut information as to its operation. We think that the site visit of the Expert committee may provide an opportunity for the appointed ombudsman to give a personal account of his/her activities related to minorities.

53. In September 2004, Hungarian Television one-sidedly terminated the co-operation agreement concluded with the national minority self-governments in April 2000, then in October 2004 changed the broadcasting scheme of national minority magazines.

Due to the new programme structure, minority programmes became inaccessible for the majority of the members of minority communities. In the opinion of minority leaders, the programme ranges ensured by the public television do not make it possible for all interested parties to have access to the programmes, as it is only pensioners staying at home during the day who may actually watch them.

In the summer of 2004, the Chairman of Hungarian Television promoted a new head to manage the chief editorial office responsible for minority programmes without prior consultation with the minority self-governments.

The public television channel plans to launch the so-called Democracy Channel. According to the management of MTV, national minority programmes could be broadcast through the community cable channel during more favourable showtimes.

54. Unfortunately, the Media Act in effect does not define provisions with regard to unlimited access using minority languages. ORTT – with the involvement of an expert committee – has worked

on the modification of the Media Act for a year now, and this process may provide an opportunity to solve this problem.

55. It becomes more and more natural for municipal governments and local minority self-governments to build their international relations autonomously. The twin city relations of settlements inhabited by national minorities are well-developed, and these provide a broad space for co-operation between civil organisations, cultural associations and schools. On the level of the central government, information on these is not readily obtained. The Government primarily uses the invitations for proposals of the Public Foundation for Hungarian National and Ethnic Minorities to offer support for the establishment and sustainment of twin city relations.

Sorszám:	Település	Nemzetiség	Megye	Lakosság száma a 2001. évi népszámlálás	Ebből: nemzetiséghez tartozók száma	Ebből: hagyományhoz kötődést vállalók száma	Ebből: anyanyelvet vállalók száma	Ebből: nyelvet családi, baráti körben	Nemzetiséghez kötődők és a teljes népesség	Hagyományokhoz kötődők és a teljes népesség	Anyanyelvek és teljes népesség	Nyelvet családi, baráti körben használók és
1.	BÖLY	német	Baranya	3911	647	928	268	659	16,54%	23,73%	6,85%	16,85%
2.	DRAVAKER	horvát	Baranya	161	78	104	43	62	48,45%	64,60%	26,71%	38,51%
3.	DRAVASZT	horvát	Baranya	477	277	287	281	283	58,07%	60,17%	58,91%	59,33%
4.	ERDŐSMEC	német	Baranya	425	90	89	93	76	21,18%	20,94%	21,88%	17,88%
5.	FELSŐSZEN	horvát	Baranya	1050	728	756	770	772	69,33%	72,00%	73,33%	73,52%
6.	GÖRCSONY	német	Baranya	443	117	251	204	225	26,41%	56,66%	46,05%	50,79%
7.	MECSEKNA	német	Baranya	1664	648	875	656	573	38,94%	52,58%	39,42%	34,44%
8.	NAGYPALL	német	Baranya	443	12	113	11	75	2,71%	25,51%	2,48%	16,93%
9.	ÓFALU	német	Baranya	367	304	327	286	321	82,83%	89,10%	77,93%	87,47%
10.	PÉCSDEVE	német	Baranya	115	26	27	34	27	22,61%	23,48%	29,57%	23,48%
11.	PÓCSA	német	Baranya	186	25	33	4	2	13,44%	17,74%	2,15%	1,08%
12.	SZEMELY	horvát	Baranya	433	150	165	82	100	34,64%	38,11%	18,94%	23,09%
13.	TÖTTÖS	német	Baranya	639	41	101	57	118	6,42%	15,81%	8,92%	18,47%
14.	UDVAR	német	Baranya	196	82	103	1	38	41,84%	52,55%	0,51%	19,39%
15.	CSASZART	német	Bács-Kiskü	2700	514	598	124	130	19,04%	22,15%	4,59%	4,81%
16.	DUNAEGYH	szlovák	Bács-Kiskü	1483	122	282	18	125	8,23%	19,02%	1,21%	8,43%
17.	HAJÓS	német	Bács-Kiskü	3544	975	1004	0	829	27,51%	28,33%	0,00%	23,39%
18.	NEMESNÁD	német	Bács-Kiskü	2062	523	634	567	479	25,36%	30,75%	27,50%	23,23%
19.	MEHKEREK	román	Békés	2315	1385	1412	1572	1563	59,83%	60,99%	67,90%	67,52%
20.	ALSOREGM	szlovák	Borsod-Ab	222	9	20	4	7	4,05%	9,01%	1,80%	3,15%
21.	HERCEGKÜ	német	B-A-Z	733	348	385	0	2	47,48%	52,52%	0,00%	0,27%
22.	NAGYHUTA	szlovák	B-A-Z	86	0	6	0	0	0,00%	6,98%	0,00%	0,00%
23.	RÁTKA	német	B-A-Z	1089	236	450	10	97	21,67%	41,32%	0,92%	8,91%
24.	RÉPÁSHUT	szlovák	B-A-Z	551	268	286	142	175	48,64%	51,91%	25,77%	31,76%
25.	SZAR	német	Fejér	1689	123	352	33	62	7,28%	20,84%	1,95%	3,67%
26.	VEKERD	román	Hajdú-Bih	167	25	25	0	0	14,97%	14,97%	0,00%	0,00%

27.	<b>CSOLNOK</b>	német	Komárom	3406	1041	1290	671	858	30,56%	37,87%	19,70%	25,19%
28.	<b>VARGESZ</b>	német	Komárom	487	149	237	67	137	30,60%	48,67%	13,76%	28,13%
29.	<b>VÉRTESS</b>	német	Komárom	1298	379	556	45	306	29,20%	42,84%	3,47%	23,57%
30.	<b>VÉRTESTI</b>	német	Komárom	532	114	118	26	128	21,43%	22,18%	4,89%	24,06%
31.	<b>ERDŐKÚF</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	611	185	247	88	125	30,28%	40,43%	14,40%	20,46%
32.	<b>FELSŐPE</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	776	274	284	50	136	35,31%	36,60%	6,44%	17,53%
33.	<b>LUCFALV</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	615	163	167	43	157	26,50%	27,15%	6,99%	25,53%
34.	<b>ÓSAGAR</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	353	84	121	79	102	23,80%	34,28%	22,38%	28,90%
35.	<b>DUNABOG</b>	német	Pest	2934	525	646	120	240	17,89%	22,02%	4,09%	8,18%
36.	<b>VALLAJ</b>	német	Szabolcs-S	1002	380	332	2	2	37,92%	33,13%	0,20%	0,20%
37.	<b>LAKÓCSA</b>	horvát	Somogy	580	105	106	99	133	18,10%	18,28%	17,07%	22,93%
38.	<b>PÁLMAJO</b>	cigány	Somogy	320	20	16	7	8	6,25%	5,00%	2,19%	2,50%
39.	<b>POTONY</b>	horvát	Somogy	289	105	106	109	110	36,33%	36,68%	37,72%	38,06%
40.	<b>SZENTBO</b>	horvát	Somogy	135	53	77	38	68	39,26%	57,04%	28,15%	50,37%
41.	<b>TÓTÚJFA</b>	horvát	Somogy	265	106	109	127	139	40,00%	41,13%	47,92%	52,45%
42.	<b>APÁTISTV</b>	szlovén	Vas	404	271	297	253	269	<b>67,08%</b>	<b>73,51%</b>	<b>62,62%</b>	<b>66,58%</b>
43.	<b>FELSŐCS</b>	horvát	Vas	466	108	192	93	122	23,18%	41,20%	19,96%	26,18%
44.	<b>HORVÁTL</b>	horvát	Vas	195	29	59	62	64	14,87%	30,26%	31,79%	32,82%
45.	<b>HORVÁTZ</b>	horvát	Vas	856	315	326	326	309	36,80%	38,08%	38,08%	36,10%
46.	<b>KISZSIDA</b>	német	Vas	102	7	7	6	6	6,86%	6,86%	5,88%	5,88%
47.	<b>NARDA</b>	horvát	Vas	509	341	372	314	293	<b>66,99%</b>	<b>73,08%</b>	<b>61,69%</b>	<b>57,56%</b>
48.	<b>ÓLMOD</b>	horvát	Vas	88	23	23	27	22	26,14%	26,14%	30,68%	25,00%
49.	<b>ORFALU</b>	szlovén	Vas	55	51	52	50	49	<b>92,73%</b>	<b>94,55%</b>	<b>90,91%</b>	<b>89,09%</b>
50.	<b>PERESZN</b>	horvát	Vas	615	204	212	232	202	33,17%	34,47%	37,72%	32,85%
51.	<b>PORNOAF</b>	német	Vas	393	132	144	137	183	33,59%	36,64%	34,86%	46,56%
52.	<b>VASKERE</b>	német	Vas	342	117	186	168	186	34,21%	<b>54,39%</b>	49,12%	54,39%
53.	<b>BALATON</b>	német	Veszprém	172	3	25	3	1	1,74%	14,53%	1,74%	0,58%
54.	<b>CSEHBAN</b>	német	Veszprém	290	6	6	5	5	2,07%	2,07%	1,72%	1,72%
55.	<b>SZENTJAK</b>	német	Veszprém	133	12	16	0	2	9,02%	12,03%	0,00%	1,50%
56.	<b>VÖRÖSTŐ</b>	német	Veszprém	107	0	0	0	4	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,74%
57.	<b>FITYEHAZ</b>	horvát	Zala	721	337	359	32	248	46,74%	49,79%	4,44%	34,40%
58.	<b>MOLNARI</b>	horvát	Zala	798	530	493	493	407	<b>66,42%</b>	<b>61,78%</b>	<b>61,78%</b>	<b>51,00%</b>
59.	<b>SEMJENH</b>	horvát	Zala	687	220	120	84	239	32,02%	17,47%	12,23%	34,79%
60.	<b>PETRIVEN</b>	horvát	Zala	413	32	29	19	103	7,75%	7,02%	4,60%	24,94%
61.	<b>TÖTSZEN</b>	horvát	Zala	930	409	449	461	372	43,98%	48,28%	49,57%	40,00%
62.	<b>TÖTSZER</b>	horvát	Zala	1329	757	756	828	728	<b>56,96%</b>	<b>56,88%</b>	<b>62,30%</b>	<b>54,78%</b>

Sorszám:	Település	Nemzetiség	Megye	Lakosság száma a 2001. évi népszámlálás	Ebből: nemzetiséghez tartozók száma	Ebből: hagyományhoz kötődést vállalók száma	Ebből: anyanyelvet vállalók száma	Ebből: nyelvet családi, baráti körben	Nemzetiséghez kötődők és a teljes népesség	Hagyományokhoz kötődők és a teljes népesség	Anyanyelvük és teljes aránya	Nyelvet családi, baráti körben használok és a nyelvhasználat	Nyelvszabályokról bekezdések száma
1.	BOLY	német	Baranya	3911	647	928	268	659	16,54%	23,73%	6,85%	16,85%	5
2.	DRÁVAKERÉK	horvát	Baranya	161	78	104	43	62	48,45%	64,60%	26,71%	38,51%	0
3.	DRÁVASZTA	horvát	Baranya	477	277	287	281	283	58,07%	60,17%	58,91%	59,33%	1
4.	ERDŐSMECS	német	Baranya	425	90	89	93	76	21,18%	20,94%	21,88%	17,88%	0
5.	FELSŐSZENT	horvát	Baranya	1050	728	756	770	772	69,33%	72,00%	73,33%	73,52%	3
6.	GÖRCSONYI	német	Baranya	443	117	251	204	225	26,41%	56,66%	46,05%	50,79%	0
7.	MECSEKNÁD	német	Baranya	1664	648	875	656	573	38,94%	52,58%	39,42%	34,44%	2
8.	NAGYPALL	német	Baranya	443	12	113	11	75	2,71%	25,51%	2,48%	16,93%	0
9.	ÓFALU	német	Baranya	367	304	327	286	321	82,83%	89,10%	77,93%	87,47%	0
10.	PÉCSDEVEC	német	Baranya	115	26	27	34	27	22,61%	23,48%	29,57%	23,48%	0
11.	PÓCSA	német	Baranya	186	25	33	4	2	13,44%	17,74%	2,15%	1,08%	1
12.	SZEMELY	horvát	Baranya	433	150	165	82	100	34,64%	38,11%	18,94%	23,09%	1
13.	TÓTTÓS	német	Baranya	639	41	101	57	118	6,42%	15,81%	8,92%	18,47%	3
14.	UDVAR	német	Baranya	196	82	103	1	38	41,84%	52,55%	0,51%	19,39%	1
15.	CSASZARTÓ	német	Bács-Kiskü	2700	514	598	124	130	19,04%	22,15%	4,59%	4,81%	1
16.	DUNAEGYHÁZ	szlovák	Bács-Kiskü	1483	122	282	18	125	8,23%	19,02%	1,21%	8,43%	3
17.	HAJOS	német	Bács-Kiskü	3544	975	1004	0	829	27,51%	28,33%	0,00%	23,39%	2
18.	NEMESNÁD	német	Bács-Kiskü	2062	523	634	567	479	25,36%	30,75%	27,50%	23,23%	0
19.	MEHKERÉK	román	Békés	2315	1385	1412	1572	1563	59,83%	60,99%	67,90%	67,52%	92
20.	ALSÓREGMESE	szlovák	Borsod-Ab	222	9	20	4	7	4,05%	9,01%	1,80%	3,15%	2
21.	HERCEGKÜT	német	B-A-Z	733	348	385	0	2	47,48%	52,52%	0,00%	0,27%	0
22.	NAGYHUTA	szlovák	B-A-Z	86	0	6	0	0	0,00%	6,98%	0,00%	0,00%	0
23.	RÁTKA	német	B-A-Z	1089	236	450	10	97	21,67%	41,32%	0,92%	8,91%	1
24.	RÉPÁSHUTA	szlovák	B-A-Z	551	268	286	142	175	48,64%	51,91%	25,77%	31,76%	3
25.	SZÁR	német	Fejér	1689	123	352	33	62	7,28%	20,84%	1,95%	3,67%	3
26.	VEKERD	román	Hajdú-Bih	167	25	25	0	0	14,97%	14,97%	0,00%	0,00%	0

27.	<b>CSOLNOK</b>	német	Komárom	3406	1041	1290	671	858	30,56%	37,87%	19,70%	25,19%	5
28.	<b>VARGESZ</b>	német	Komárom	487	149	237	67	137	30,60%	48,67%	13,76%	28,13%	2
29.	<b>VÉRTESS</b>	német	Komárom	1298	379	556	45	306	29,20%	42,84%	3,47%	23,57%	2
30.	<b>VÉRTESTI</b>	német	Komárom	532	114	118	26	128	21,43%	22,18%	4,89%	24,06%	0
31.	<b>ERDŐKÚF</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	611	185	247	88	125	30,28%	40,43%	14,40%	20,46%	0
32.	<b>FELSŐPE</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	776	274	284	50	136	35,31%	36,60%	6,44%	17,53%	3
33.	<b>LUCFALV</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	615	163	167	43	157	26,50%	27,15%	6,99%	25,53%	0
34.	<b>ÓSAGAR</b>	szlovák	Nógrád	353	84	121	79	102	23,80%	34,28%	22,38%	28,90%	0
35.	<b>DUNABO</b>	német	Pest	2934	525	646	120	240	17,89%	22,02%	4,09%	8,18%	12
36.	<b>VALLAJ</b>	német	Szabolcs-S	1002	380	332	2	2	37,92%	33,13%	0,20%	0,20%	0
37.	<b>LAKÓCSA</b>	horvát	Somogy	580	105	106	99	133	18,10%	18,28%	17,07%	22,93%	3
38.	<b>PÁLMAJO</b>	cigány	Somogy	320	20	16	7	8	6,25%	5,00%	2,19%	2,50%	
39.	<b>POTONY</b>	horvát	Somogy	289	105	106	109	110	36,33%	36,68%	37,72%	38,06%	3
40.	<b>SZENTBO</b>	horvát	Somogy	135	53	77	38	68	39,26%	57,04%	28,15%	50,37%	1
41.	<b>TÓTÚJFA</b>	horvát	Somogy	265	106	109	127	139	40,00%	41,13%	47,92%	52,45%	1
42.	<b>APÁTISTV</b>	szlovén	Vas	404	271	297	253	269	<b>67,08%</b>	<b>73,51%</b>	<b>62,62%</b>	<b>66,58%</b>	0
43.	<b>FELSŐCS</b>	horvát	Vas	466	108	192	93	122	23,18%	41,20%	19,96%	26,18%	0
44.	<b>HORVÁTIL</b>	horvát	Vas	195	29	59	62	64	14,87%	30,26%	31,79%	32,82%	0
45.	<b>HORVÁTZ</b>	horvát	Vas	856	315	326	326	309	36,80%	38,08%	38,08%	36,10%	0
46.	<b>KISZSIDA</b>	német	Vas	102	7	7	6	6	6,86%	6,86%	5,88%	5,88%	2
47.	<b>NARDA</b>	horvát	Vas	509	341	372	314	293	<b>66,99%</b>	<b>73,08%</b>	<b>61,69%</b>	<b>57,56%</b>	0
48.	<b>ÓLMOD</b>	horvát	Vas	88	23	23	27	22	26,14%	26,14%	30,68%	25,00%	0
49.	<b>ORFALU</b>	szlovén	Vas	55	51	52	50	49	<b>92,73%</b>	<b>94,55%</b>	<b>90,91%</b>	<b>89,09%</b>	0
50.	<b>PERESZN</b>	horvát	Vas	615	204	212	232	202	33,17%	34,47%	37,72%	32,85%	0
51.	<b>PORNOAF</b>	német	Vas	393	132	144	137	183	33,59%	36,64%	34,86%	46,56%	0
52.	<b>VASKERE</b>	német	Vas	342	117	186	168	186	34,21%	<b>54,39%</b>	49,12%	54,39%	2
53.	<b>BALATON</b>	német	Veszprém	172	3	25	3	1	1,74%	14,53%	1,74%	0,58%	0
54.	<b>CSEHBAN</b>	német	Veszprém	290	6	6	5	5	2,07%	2,07%	1,72%	1,72%	2
55.	<b>SZENTJAK</b>	német	Veszprém	133	12	16	0	2	9,02%	12,03%	0,00%	1,50%	0
56.	<b>VÖRÖSTÓ</b>	német	Veszprém	107	0	0	0	4	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	3,74%	0
57.	<b>FITYEHAZ</b>	horvát	Zala	721	337	359	32	248	46,74%	49,79%	4,44%	34,40%	2
58.	<b>MOLNARI</b>	horvát	Zala	798	530	493	493	407	<b>66,42%</b>	<b>61,78%</b>	<b>61,78%</b>	<b>51,00%</b>	3
59.	<b>SEMJENH</b>	horvát	Zala	687	220	120	84	239	32,02%	17,47%	12,23%	34,79%	1
60.	<b>PETRIVEN</b>	horvát	Zala	413	32	29	19	103	7,75%	7,02%	4,60%	24,94%	0
61.	<b>TÓTSZEN</b>	horvát	Zala	930	409	449	461	372	43,98%	48,28%	49,57%	40,00%	0
62.	<b>TÓTSZER</b>	horvát	Zala	1329	757	756	828	728	<b>56,96%</b>	<b>56,88%</b>	<b>62,30%</b>	<b>54,78%</b>	1

Sorszám	Település	Nemzetiség	Lakos	Ebből: nemzetiséghez tartozók száma	Ebből: hagyományhoz kötődők száma	Ebből: anyanyelvet vallalók száma	Ebből: nyelvet családi, baráti körben használók száma	Nemzetiséghez kötődők és a teljes aránya	Hagyományokhoz kötődők és a teljes népesség aránya	Anyanyelvük és a teljes népesség aránya	Nyelvet családi, baráti körben használók és a teljes népesség aránya	Nyelvországból beköltöztek száma
1	Pilisszent	szlovák	2170	1185	1493	922	973	54,61	68,80	42,49	44,84	3
2	Lórév	szerb	307	180	202	175	175	58,63	65,80	57,00	57,00	3
3	Felsőszőlő	szlovén	682	448	497	467	468	65,69	72,87	68,48	68,62	1
4	Szakonyfő	szlovén	366	100	119	86	79	27,32	32,51	23,50	21,58	1
5	Kópháza	horvát	1882	865	1026	877	885	45,96	54,52	46,60	47,02	0
6	Bezenye	horvát	1695	123	288	247	240	7,26	16,99	14,57	14,16	0
7	Gilvánfa	cigány	375	265	265	267	266	70,67	70,67	71,20	70,93	
8	Kétsoprony	szlovák	1559	413	373	108	294	26,49	23,93	6,93	18,86	13
9	Kétvölgy	szlovén	140	110	109	100	110	78,57	77,86	71,43	78,57	2
10	Kimle	horvát	2842	292	413	288	284	10,27	14,53	10,13	9,99	0
11	Kimle	német	2842	101	320	29	274	3,55	11,26	1,02	9,64	12
12	Beloianis	görög	1185	273	273	259	268	23,04	23,04	21,86	22,62	110
13	Dusnok	horvát	3304	358	681	131	449	10,84	20,61	3,96	13,59	2
14	Hercegszék	horvát	2329	283	318	295	341	12,15	13,65	12,67	14,64	10
15	Hercegszék	szerb	2329	88	102	72	97	3,78	4,38	3,09	4,16	64
16	Múcsony	ruszin	3495	4	9	1	7	0,11	0,26	0,03	0,20	8
17	Komlóskai	ruszin	330	60	97	51	95	18,18	29,39	15,45	28,79	0
18	Kétegyházi	román	4354	660	757	1075	857	15,16	17,39	24,69	19,68	168
19	Körösszalk	román	911	148	87	27	12	16,25	9,55	2,96	1,32	23
20	Körösszeg	román	984	125	144	55	57	12,70	14,63	5,59	5,79	30
21	Magyarcsanak	román	1646	142	141	159	189	8,63	8,57	9,66	11,48	86
22	Szentpéteri	horvát	1076	702	748	630	685	65,24	69,52	58,55	63,66	3
23	Dabas	szlovák	15841	299	346	163	820	1,89	2,18	1,03	5,18	19
24	Pilisszántó	szlovák	2120	416	580	287	480	19,62	27,36	13,54	22,64	15



25	Piliscsév	szlovák	2314	1059	1250	311	637	45,76	54,02	13,44	27,53	5
26	Tardos	szlovák	1629	255	448	90	282	15,65	27,50	5,52	17,31	9
27	Terény	szlovák	428	53	81	27	19	12,38	18,93	6,31	4,44	0
28	Csátalja	német	1691	67	85	63	61	3,96	5,03	3,73	3,61	0
29	Kunbajja	német	1756	41	46	16	15	2,33	2,62	0,91	0,85	0
30	Babarc	német	791	158	299	107	132	19,97	37,80	13,53	16,69	1
31	Borjád	német	450	61	49	26	31	13,56	10,89	5,78	6,89	0
32	Dunaszek	német	2224	101	105	71	39	4,54	4,72	3,19	1,75	1
33	Himesház	német	1220	520	660	571	604	42,62	54,10	46,80	49,51	5
34	Majs	német	1106	50	74	38	45	4,52	6,69	3,44	4,07	0
35	Nagynyárá	német	871	386	358	139	282	44,32	41,10	15,96	32,38	7
36	Palotaboz	német	1085	376	428	368	366	34,65	39,45	33,92	33,73	2
37	Somberek	német	1601	463	596	519	461	28,92	37,23	32,42	28,79	4
38	Szajk	német	797	160	260	152	182	20,08	32,62	19,07	22,84	1
39	Szederkér	német	1869	460	546	329	387	24,61	29,21	17,60	20,71	1
40	Szűr	német	318	113	113	115	136	35,53	35,53	36,16	42,77	1
41	Véménd	német	1702	376	470	363	397	22,09	27,61	21,33	23,33	1
42	Villány	német	2753	186	312	89	97	6,76	11,33	3,23	3,52	2
43	Dunaszen	német	411	107	141	29	91	26,03	34,31	7,06	22,14	2
44	Szendeh	német	1461	462	485	92	199	31,62	33,20	6,30	13,62	1
45	Tarján	német	2812	607	652	332	505	21,59	23,19	11,81	17,96	4
46	Budaörs	német	24282	359	510	165	260	1,48	2,10	0,68	1,07	94
47	Pilisvörös	német	12514	2167	2584	748	1216	17,32	20,65	5,98	9,72	32
48	Solymár	német	8912	747	1019	110	354	8,38	11,43	1,23	3,97	42
49	Szigetsze	német	1796	117	259	47	41	6,51	14,42	2,62	2,28	6
50	Szigetújf	német	2051	125	237	34	68	6,09	11,56	1,66	3,32	3
51	Taksony	német	5869	587	819	125	300	10,00	13,95	2,13	5,11	8
52	Gyönk	német	2240	274	463	181	177	12,23	20,67	8,08	7,90	0
53	Györköny	német	925	202	345	177	179	21,84	37,30	19,14	19,35	0
54	Berkenye	német	583	141	222	6	36	24,19	38,08	1,03	6,17	0
55	Kismányo	német	392	52	52	52	48	13,27	13,27	13,27	12,24	1
56	Nagymány	német	2501	317	477	104	246	12,67	19,07	4,16	9,84	6
57	Németkér	német	1873	214	305	60	181	11,43	16,28	3,20	9,66	3
58	Szakadát	német	334	75	131	90	128	22,46	39,22	26,95	38,32	6

59	Németbán	német	81	27	26	1	28	33,33	32,10	1,23	34,57	0
60	Nagytevel	német	516	65	82	48	60	12,60	15,89	9,30	11,63	0
61	Bedő	román	317	145	117	56	78	45,74	36,91	17,67	24,61	8
62	Magyarcsanak	szerb	1646	30	35	32	31	1,8226	2,126367	1,944107	1,883354	6
63	Katymár	horvát	2359	136	167	140	113	5,765155	7,079271	5,934718	4,790165	4
64	Katymár	német	2359	37	54	46	28	1,568461	2,289106	1,949979	1,186944	3
65	Rakaca	cigány	890	530	17	0	0	59,55056	1,910112	0	0	0
66	Alsószentgyörgy	cigány	1092	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
67	Mátraszentkereszt	szlovák	557	48	100	84	113	8,617594	17,95332	15,08079	20,28725	1
68	Sámsonháza	szlovák	308	122	145	68	131	39,61039	47,07792	22,07792	42,53247	0

## A nemzetiségi nevet helységnévtáblán feltüntető helységek jegyzéke megyénként, 2005. január 1-jén

Megye, helység megnevezése	A helységnévtáblán feltüntetett nemzetiségi név (nevek)
<b>BÁCS-KISKUN MEGYE</b>	
Bácsalmás	Aljmaš Almasch
Bácsbokod	Bikić Wikitsch
Bátya	Baćin
Császártöltés	Tschasartet
Csátalja	Tschatali
Csikéria	Čikerija Tschikri
Dusnok	Dušnok
Harta	Hartau
Hercegszántó	Santovo Саптово
Katymár	Kačmar Katschmar
Kunbaja	Kumbaj Kunbaja
Nemesnádudvar	Nadwar
Vaskút	Waschkut
<b>BARANYA MEGYE</b>	
Almamellék	Homeli
Áta	Ata
Babarc	Bawarz
Bár	Baar
Beremend	Behrend
Bóly	Bohl
Borjád	Burjad
Csebény	Tschewing
Drávakeresztúr	Križevci
Drávasztára	Starin
Dunaszekcső	Seetschke
Erdősmecke	Metschge
Fazekasboda	Boden
Felsőszentmárton	Martinci
Geresdlak	Gereschlak
Görcsönydoboka	Ketsching
Gyód	Jood
Hásságy	Haschad
Hetvehely	Hetfehell
Himesháza	Nimmersch
Ivánbattyán	Ivan
Kásád	Kašad
Kátoly	Katolj
Kisbudmér	Kleinbudmer
Kisjakabfalva	Jackfall
Kisnyárad	Kischnaarad
Kökény	Kukinj
Lánycsók	Lantschuk
Lippó	Lippwar
Liptód	Liptowr

Lovászhetény  
Magyarsarlós

Majs  
Máriakéménd  
Márok  
Mecseknádasd  
Mohács

Monyoród  
Nagybudmér  
Nagynyárad  
Nagypall  
Óbánya  
Ófalu  
Olasz

Palkonya  
Palotabozsok  
Pécsdevecser  
Pécsvárad  
Pócsa  
Pogány  
Sárok  
Somberek  
Szajk  
Szalánta  
Szalatnak  
Szederkény  
Székelyszabar  
Szemely  
Szentlászló  
Szókérd  
Szúr  
Teklafalu  
Töttös  
Véménd  
Versend

Villány  
Villánykövesd  
Vokány

Battonya

Békéscsaba  
Kétegyháza  
Méhkerék  
Örménykút  
Pusztatltaka  
Szarvas  
Tótkomlós

Laßhetting  
Šaroš  
Schoarasch  
Maisch  
Mariakemend  
Marok  
Nadasch  
Mohač  
Mohatsch  
Minjorod  
Großbudmer  
Großnaarad  
Pahl  
Altglashütte  
Ohwala  
Olas  
Ahlaß  
Palkan  
Boschok  
Dewetsch  
Petschwar  
Bootsch  
Pogan  
Schareck  
Schomburg  
Seik  
Salanta  
Salack  
Surgetin  
Sawar  
Semelj  
Senglasl  
Sukid  
Sier  
Tekladorf  
Tiedisch  
Weimend  
Vršenda  
Werschend  
Wieland  
Gowisch  
Wakan

Bätania  
Batanja  
Békésska Čaba  
Chitighaz  
Micherechi  
Irminčok  
Otlaca-Pustä  
Sarvaš  
Slovenský Komlóš

## BÉKÉS MEGYE

## BORSOD-ABAÚJ-ZEMPLÉN MEGYE

Hercegkút  
Kishuta  
Nagyhuta  
Répáshuta

Trautsondorf  
Malá Huta  
Vel'ká Huta  
Répášká Huta

## CSONGRÁD MEGYE

Deszk  
Magyarcsanak

Деска  
Чанад  
Cenadul Unguresc

## FEJÉR MEGYE

Bakonycsernye  
Beloianisz  
Etyek  
Isztimér  
Mány  
Mór  
Pusztavám  
Szár  
Újbarok  
Vértesacsa

Čerňa  
Μπελογιάννης  
Edeck  
Ißzimmer  
Maan  
Moor  
Pußtawam  
Saar  
Neudörf  
Atscha

## GYŐR-MOSON-SOPRON MEGYE

Ágfalva  
Bezenye  
Fertőboz  
Fertőrákos  
Hegyeshalom  
Hidegség  
Jánossomorja  
  
Kimle  
  
Kópháza  
Levél  
Máriakálnok  
Mosonmagyaróvár  
Mosonszolnok  
Rajka  
Sopron  
Und

Agendorf  
Bizonja  
Holling  
Kroisbach  
Straß-Sommerein  
Vedešin  
Sanktjohann  
Sanktpeter  
Kemlja  
Kimling  
Koljnof  
Kaltenstein  
Gahling  
Wieselburg-Ungarisch Altenburg  
Zanegg  
Ragendorf  
Ödenburg  
Unda

## HAJDÚ-BIHAR MEGYE

Bedő  
Körösszakál  
Körösszegapáti  
Vekerd

Bedeu  
Săcal  
Apateu  
Veherd

## HEVES MEGYE

Mátraszentimre

Alkár

## KOMÁROM-ESZTERGOM MEGYE

Baj  
Csolnok  
Dunaszentmiklós  
Kecskéd  
Kesztlőc  
Leányvár  
Máriaalom  
Piliscsév  
Tarján  
Tát

Woj  
Tscholnok  
Niklo  
Kätschka  
Kestúc  
Leinwar  
Kirwa  
Čív  
Tarian  
Taath

## NÓGRÁD MEGYE

Várgesztes  
Vértessomló  
Vértestolna

Gestic  
Schemling  
Tolnau

Alsópetény  
Berkenye  
Erdőkürt  
Felsőpetény  
Lucfalva  
Nézsza  
Nógrád  
Sámsonháza  
Szendehegy  
Szügy  
Terény  
Vanyarc

Dolné Peťany  
Berkina  
Kirt'  
Horné Peťany  
Lucina  
Níža  
Novohrad  
Šamšon  
Sende  
Sudice  
Terany  
Veňarec

## PEST MEGYE

Budakeszi  
Budaörs  
Diósd  
Halásztelek  
Lórév  
Nagybörzsöny  
Pilisborosjenő  
Pilisszántó  
Pilisszentiván  
Pilisszentkereszt  
Pilisszentlászló  
Pilisvörösvár  
Solymár  
Szigetbecse  
Szigetcsép

Wudigess  
Wudersch  
Orasch  
Халастелек  
Ловра  
Deutschpilsen  
Weindorf  
Santov  
Sankt-Iwan  
Mlynky  
Senváclav  
Werischwar  
Schaumar  
Wetsch  
Tschip  
Чун  
Sankt-Martin  
Inselneudorf  
Taks  
Tukulja  
Großturwall  
Wetschesch  
Schambeck

Szigetszentmárton  
Szigetújfalu  
Taksony  
Tököl  
Törökbálint  
Vecsés  
Zsámbék

## SOMOGY MEGYE

Ecseny  
Kercseliget  
Lakócsa  
Potony  
Szentborbás  
Tótújfalu

Etsching  
Gerstleck  
Lukovišće  
Potonja  
Brlobaš  
Novo Selo

## TOLNA MEGYE

Bátaapáti  
Bonyhád  
Gyöngy  
Györköny  
Kakasd  
Kisdorog  
Kismányok  
Medina  
Mórággy

Apati  
Bonnhard  
Jink  
Jerking  
Kockrsch  
Kleindorog  
Kleinmanok  
Медина  
Maratz

## VAS MEGYE

Nagymányok  
Németkér  
Szakadát

Großmanok  
Kier  
Sagetal

Alsószőlnök

Dolnji Senik  
Unterzemming

Apátistvánfalva

Števanovci

Felsőcsatár

Gornji Četar

Felsőszőlnök

Gornji Senik

Horvátlövő

Hrvatske Šice

Horvátzsidány

Hrvatski Židan

Kétvölgy

Verica-Ritkarovci

Kiszsidány

Roggendorf

Narda

Narda

Ólmod

Plajgor

Orfalu

Andovci

Peresznye

Prisika

Pornóapáti

Pernau

Rönök

Radling

Szakonyfalva

Sakalovci

Szentgotthárd

Monošter

Szentpéterfa

Petrovo Selo

Vaskeresztes

Großdorf

## VESZPRÉM MEGYE

Bakonyjákó  
Bakonypölöske  
Bakonyzentiván  
Béb  
Döbrönte  
Farkasgyepű  
Ganna  
Hárskút  
Kislőd  
Lókút  
Németbánya  
Városlőd

Jaka  
Peretschke  
Sankt-Iwan  
Wieb  
Dewrenten  
Wirtshäuzl  
Ganna  
Lindenbrunn  
Kisludt  
Rosbrunn  
Deutschhütten  
Waschludt

## ZALA MEGYE

Fityeház  
Molnári  
Murakeresztúr  
Petriente  
Semjénháza  
Tótszentmárton  
Tótszerdahely

Fícéhaz  
Mlinarci  
Kerestur  
Petriba  
Pustara  
Sumarton  
Serdahelj

<b>Műsorszolgáltatás megnevezése</b>	<b>Nyelv</b>	<b>Csatlakoztatott háztartásszám</b>
SAT 3	Német	676 764
SAT 1	Német	1 811 427
ARD 1	Német	322 639
ARD 1 PLUS	Német	217
DEUTSCHE WELLE	Német	495 278
DSF	Német	1 604
ORF 1 (osztrák)	Német	346 431
ORF 2 (osztrák)	Német	320 823
PRO 7	Német	1 590 210
RTL 1	Német	1 647 145
RTL 2	Német	867 869
RTL +	Német	440
RTL 4	Német	365
ZDF	Német	267 476
RTL 1	Német	1 647 145
4 POL	Lengyel	672
TV POLONIA	Lengyel	109 417
POLSAT 1	Lengyel	4 176
ERT	Görög	231 367(UP MTC fejállomás)
Ukrán TV	Ukrán	859
Román TV 1	Román	27 831
Belgrád (Beograd) 1	Szerb	3 577
Belgrád (Beograd) 2	Szerb	4 874
Újvidék TV (Novisad TV)	Szerb	4 655 + 8 884
Horvát TV 1 (HRT 1)	Horvát	216 502
Horvát TV 2 (HRT 2)	Horvát	21 864
Horvát TV 3 (HRT 3)	Horvát	7 687
TV Zagreb 1	Horvát	3 996
Ljubljana 1	Szlovén	220
Ljubljana 2	Szlovén	7 407
Nova TV	Szlovén	726
Szlovén TV 1	Szlovén	3 687
Szlovén TV 2	Szlovén	16 951
Szlovák TV 1 (STV 1)	Szlovák	12 631
Szlovák TV 2 (STV 2)	Szlovák	534
TA3	Szlovák	27 554