
1570th meeting, 23 September 2026

4 Human rights

4.1 Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

b. 15th activity report covering the period from 1 June 2024 to 31 May 2026

¹ This document has been classified restricted until examination by the Committee of Ministers.

Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities



**15th activity report
covering the period
from 1 June 2024
to 31 May 2026**

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

**15th activity report
covering the period
from 1 June 2024
to 31 May 2026**

French edition:
*Comité consultatif de la Convention-cadre
pour la protection des minorités nationales –
Quinzième rapport d'activités couvrant
la période du 1^{er} juin 2024 au 31 mai 2026*

*The opinions expressed in this work are
the responsibility of the authors and
do not necessarily reflect the official
policy of the Council of Europe.*

The reproduction of extracts (up to 500 words) is authorised, except for commercial purposes, as long as the integrity of the text is preserved, the excerpt is not used out of context, does not provide incomplete information or does not otherwise mislead the reader as to the nature, scope or content of the text. The source text must always be acknowledged as follows: "© Council of Europe, year of the publication". All other requests concerning the reproduction/translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Publications and Visual Identity Division, Council of Europe (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex) or publishing@coe.int.

All other correspondence concerning this document should be addressed to the secretariat of the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities minorities.fcnm@coe.int
www.coe.int/minorities

Cover design and layout:
Publications and Visual Identity
Division (DPIV), Council of Europe

Photos: Council of Europe

This publication has not been copy-edited
by the DPIV Editorial Unit to correct
typographical and grammatical errors

© Council of Europe, July 2026
Printed at the Council of Europe

Contents

FOREWORD BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES	5
INTRODUCTION	9
TRENDS AND CHALLENGES FOR EFFECTIVE ACCESS TO MINORITY RIGHTS IN EUROPE	13
Hostility towards national minorities and persons affiliating with them	14
Continuing exclusion of Roma and Travellers	18
Budgetary cuts and recurring lack of reliable data	21
Conclusion	23
COUNTRY-SPECIFIC MONITORING BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	25
Periodical state reports	25
Country visits	26
Country-specific Opinions	28
Resolutions of the Committee of Ministers	29
The Advisory Committee	30
TRANSPARENCY OF THE PROCESS AND DIALOGUE	33
Publication of Opinions	33
Follow-up activities	34
Outreach and media presence	35
OTHER DEVELOPMENTS AND ACTIVITIES	37
Factsheet on environmental challenges and national minorities	37
Factsheet on challenges faced by women and girls affiliating with national minorities	37
Gender mainstreaming in the work of the Advisory Committee	38
CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES	41
Co-operation activities within the Council of Europe	41
Co-operation with national and international institutions	43
Co-operation with civil society and academic research institutions	45
APPENDIX 1	47
Signatures and ratifications of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ETS No. 157)	47
APPENDIX 2	49
Geographical scope of application of the Framework Convention	49
APPENDIX 3	50
Composition of the ACFC between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026	50
APPENDIX 4	51
Monitoring arrangements under the Framework Convention	51



Exchange of views with the Committee of Ministers, September 2024.

Foreword by the President of the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

We often hear that we live in uncertain, even unprecedented times. In fact, in the international community, nothing seems to be really certain anymore, including international law, international treaties or international institutions promoting international norms that seek to protect us as individuals and our societies. When I was elected by the Committee of Ministers as independent expert in respect of Slovenia to serve on the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities some 15 years ago, we lived in a rule-based world order and many still believed in multilateralism though early signs of its erosion may have been neglected. Back then, human rights, including minority rights, diversity and mutual respect were seen as civilisational norms. Not everywhere equally, but the institutional and legal basis was there to support their promotion, protection and further development.

Not only was this civilisational, it was also logical, for it is diversity, rather than uniformity or homogeneity, that is both present in our societies, everywhere, and a necessary pathway to progress. It challenges us to think and act having in mind difference instead of forcing the unnatural but perhaps more convenient uniformity. It requires constant and purposeful attention and mutual adaptation – i.e. diversity management. This should ensure that societal challenges are generated to building better, more inclusive societies for everyone – societies that fully embrace diversity rather than viewing it as an exception, with suspicion or even hostility.

I fear that the promises from the 1990s when the Framework Convention was drafted, and even from the early 2010s when I became more closely involved in the monitoring process of the Framework Convention, have not been fulfilled. On the contrary. Hence these growing inequalities and contemporary uncertainties we face today require a somewhat broader reflection at the end of my second term on the Advisory Committee and my third term as its president at the end of May 2026, when a further nine colleagues are also finishing their first or their second term.

Let me be clear: our collective response to the dramatic changes we are witnessing must be firm and unequivocal. We should all collectively alert – over and over again – all member states of the Council of Europe of the need for and the value of inclusive, equality oriented and fair diversity management through minority rights. This is in the interest of every member state and of all of our societies. Such an approach requires, as the Advisory Committee always stresses, constant attention, effective participation of everyone, proactive policies and self-restraint in public narratives by everyone and above all of political leadership in all states individually and in Europe as a whole. Scapegoating minorities and persons affiliating with them, seeing them as a problem, as a security threat, but also using them for promotion of foreign policy goals that often borders on interference in the internal affairs of other states as well as denying the agency to minorities and persons affiliating with them, are not the foundations that the drafters of the Framework Convention envisaged. They will not contribute to democratic security, peace and stability. So if value-based and normative arguments as the foundations of state action do not matter as much as they did decades ago, the interest in peace and democratic security should. And we know that stability and security are not a result of inequalities, violations of human and minority rights or of non-inclusive decision-making processes.

The Advisory Committee has been alerting states of the negative consequences of precisely such phenomena: of growing inequalities, lack of minority participation, not accepting minorities and persons affiliating with them as an integral and valued part of societies, but also of renewed bilateralisation of minority issues. A number of member states have been gradually shifting (further) away from what they collectively agreed in the mid-1990s: to adopt an international treaty on diversity management through minority rights, whereby minority rights are an integral part of human rights and as such, fall within the realm of common international concern. States not only agreed on this out of principle, but with a full realisation that such a new European approach to dealing with minority issues would in fact benefit everyone: individuals, minority communities, diverse societies, Europe as a whole and each and every member state of the Council of Europe. This approach was not a coincidence. The drafters knew the problems that had beset previous selective approaches to protection of minority rights for only some individuals affiliating with some minorities, living in some states.

Sadly, there has been hardly any progress towards closing the remaining gaps in this universalist approach to diversity management across Europe. No new signatures and no new ratifications of the Framework Convention. It seems almost naïve to even start discussing inequalities within the system that have not been addressed. No (regular) monitoring of the still existing zones that remain outside of the effective control of the authorities that are states parties to the Framework Convention. This does not mean there are no minorities in those areas or that minority rights do not apply and should not be effectively ensured for persons living in those areas. New such 'grey zones' have appeared in the meantime and the Advisory Committee, for its part, sees this as a problem that needs to be better addressed. Political support is needed, of course. In Europe, we continue to see individuals affiliating with national minorities who can expect their concerns, needs and interests to be at least heard by an independent body like the Advisory Committee. We continue to

see, or rather fail to see, those who have no access to this opportunity, and those who affiliate with minorities that are securitised, even weaponised, and hence face new struggles for equal access to minority rights and for their effective equality in every-day life. Such new divisions are not acceptable; they are inconsistent with how peace, democratic security and stability are to be achieved through the implementation of the Framework Convention and all the international legal norms it includes. Human rights and minority rights are universal. In law or access to them in practice should not be determined by the status of particular minority languages elsewhere, or by expectations of and requests by other states, and they are never ensured by the illegal and/or illegitimate actions of another state. Instead, access to minority rights should be viewed and ensured domestically, with the primary responsibility lying with the state where persons affiliating with minorities reside, and it should be ensured collectively, for all, as a matter of common international concern of all member states of the Council of Europe. Persons affiliating with national minorities are not some kind of 'guests' who will leave and they should not be viewed as temporary or even disturbing elements of our societies.

For this system of diversity management through minority rights to function as envisaged, everyone needs to fulfil their tasks as required. This refers to all individuals, communities and community leaders, the authorities at all levels, civil society organisations and other bodies promoting and ensuring respect for human rights, as well as international institutions. When these institutions are under attacks, when political support seems to be fading away, giving up to pressure stemming from the multipolar world in which we now live, an important layer of the essential safety-net is missing. This means that the Council of Europe secretariat will find it more difficult to provide the necessary support to any mechanism of the Council of Europe that seeks to protect our common European values and norms as well as our shared interests. Add to this the fact that some 15 years ago, I started this voluntary work for the benefit of our diverse societies as an independent expert, with my daily job as a university professor. I feel that I, together with my colleagues, am ending this service as a human rights defender, with some personal 'complaints' if not even professional attacks regarding what the Advisory Committee wrote under my presidency – not as part of our normal, open exchanges and different views in Strasbourg, but through other (diplomatic) channels. That made me realise how grateful I am also to my university and to my state for their active support to my independence and freedom in this endeavour. Not all my colleagues have been this fortunate and one should never take the independence of anyone, including any institution, for granted.

I am truly grateful to all colleagues in the Advisory Committee over the years and in the present composition, to its past presidents whose experience I could rely on when most needed, as well as to colleagues in the secretariat. I am grateful that, in increasingly difficult circumstances, we worked twice as hard to produce our assessments and recommendations and that we managed to further develop some of the principles in this rapidly changing world where new reality is often artificially generated or humanly constructed, spread and ultimately accepted faster than one can even think, let alone react. The Advisory Committee works hard to ground its assessments in facts, in data, and in information received from many sources. It does this with the intention of helping states to better address the challenges that any

form of diversity entails. We know that exclusion, new divisions, double standards, attacks on independent institutions and persons serving in them, politicisation of minority issues and even weaponisation of minority rights serves truly no one. Or do they? We must ask ourselves a broader question about what kind of Europe we want to live in, and what kind of Europe we want to leave to future generations.

I was born in a country that no longer exists. That was a country where free speech was limited. Media censored. Criticism whispered. Mistrust against neighbours purposefully encouraged and instrumentalised for political goals and massive human rights violations. That country is gone, but the tools used there and in many other states during the Cold War are coming back in Europe. We are again witnessing the use of various means to control society, to question the universality of human rights and the rule of law or to abuse democracy from within, by protecting the interests of the few against our common societal interests and against the value and promise of dignity for everyone. In the Advisory Committee, we strongly believe that states in the Council of Europe and beyond must truly embrace the Framework Convention and thus not repeat some of the very costly mistakes from the past before it is too late. This is needed for the sake of all of us.

*Petra Roter,
President of the Advisory Committee
(2024-2026)*

Introduction

Nearly three decades after its entry into force on 1 February 1998, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (the Framework Convention) remains the most comprehensive legally binding multilateral treaty designed to protect and promote the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities. States parties to the Framework Convention assume a legal obligation to promote the full and effective equality of persons affiliating with national minorities in all areas of social, economic, political and cultural life. This undertaking is built on the principle that a pluralistic and genuinely democratic society must respect and protect ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity as its integral and valued part. Based on such a unique international instrument, the Council of Europe plays a crucial role in promoting common standards on managing diversity through the protection of minority rights. As underlined in the Reykjavik Declaration, which was adopted at the 4th Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe on 17 May 2023, the protection of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities is essential for building inclusive societies and preserving democratic security.

There are now 38 states parties to the Framework Convention and a special monitoring arrangement is in place for Kosovo* based on an agreement signed with the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) in 2004. Four Council of Europe member states have not signed the Framework Convention, while four member states have signed but have yet to ratify it (see Appendix 2). Following its exclusion from the Council of Europe on 16 March 2022, due to its full-scale war of aggression against Ukraine, the Russian Federation denounced the Framework Convention on 3 January 2024, with effect as of 1 August 2024.

* All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this document shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

The implementation of the Framework Convention is monitored by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, with the assistance of the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (the Advisory Committee). The expert body consists of 18 independent experts appointed by the Committee of Ministers for four years, renewable once. The members of the Advisory Committee are experts in the field of managing diversity through minority rights, serving in their individual capacity, in an independent and impartial manner. Their expertise covers a wide range of disciplines, such as (international) law, political science, international relations, history, anthropology, sociolinguistics and sociology. The Advisory Committee includes experts affiliating with national minorities. States parties to the Framework Convention nominate at least two independent experts one of whom is to be elected by the Committee of Ministers to the list of experts eligible to serve on the Advisory Committee. Although a national expert does not actively participate in the monitoring of their state and they do not vote on the respective Opinions, their national expertise and their independence is crucial for the accuracy of the Opinions. Their timely nomination by individual states parties and their election by the Committee of Ministers are therefore very important for the functioning of the Advisory Committee based on its highest standards.

Since the 2019 reform, the monitoring process has become more streamlined and efficient, based on a deeper dialogue with states parties, allowing also for predictable and faster completion of monitoring cycles. The process consists of five steps. First, the relevant authorities submit a state report; this is followed by a visit of a working group of the Advisory Committee to the state in question. Next, the Advisory Committee prepares and approves a draft Opinion, which is then finalised and adopted after a confidential dialogue between the respective state and the Advisory Committee. The Opinion is then published within four months after its adoption by the Advisory Committee, and finally, the Committee of Ministers adopts a resolution with recommendations for the state party (see the flow chart in Appendix 4). The Advisory Committee also organises follow-up activities, bringing together authorities and minority representatives to present and discuss its recommendations as part of the ongoing monitoring process. The publication of Opinions, which is automatic after four months, can occur earlier. In fact, some states parties have translated and published Opinions very shortly after their adoption by the Advisory Committee, which has been very much appreciated across the board, including by minority representatives and civil society organisations that can take the recommendations as the basis for their promotion of minority rights at the national and local levels.

During the period covered by this activity report, the full-scale war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine continued to impact the monitoring process of this state party but also more broadly. As a result, the Advisory Committee had to extend its assessment of the implementation of the Framework Convention in Ukraine to comprise two monitoring cycles (namely, the fifth and the sixth cycle). Furthermore, the Advisory Committee made significant adaptations to its usual working methods. Based on its experience during the Covid-19 pandemic, the monitoring of the implementation of the Framework Convention in Ukraine included extensive online meetings with various stakeholders, including persons affiliating with minorities who were forced to flee their places of residence due to the full-scale

war of aggression by the Russian Federation, a shortened country visit, and greater reliance on a wide range of written sources. Special efforts were made to ensure the inclusion of perspectives from displaced national minority representatives, both within Ukraine and abroad.

The 15th activity report provides an overview of developments relating to the Framework Convention and the work of the Advisory Committee between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026. It offers a welcome opportunity to reflect on major trends and challenges, while presenting some illustrative good practices from the states parties on the implementation of the Framework Convention. All documents and information relevant to the two-year period covered by this report can be found at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/advisory-committee>.



89th plenary meeting of the Advisory Committee, May 2026.

Part I

Trends and challenges for effective access to minority rights in Europe

The two years covered by this activity report have seen multilateralism come under increasing strain, undermining collective efforts to ease identity-related tensions based on the universality of human rights, including through the implementation of the Framework Convention. Coupled with democratic backsliding, the erosion of international consensus built around these issues paves the way for renewed reliance on reciprocity through bilateral arrangements, rather than collective support through joint promotion of the existing multilateral mechanisms. This tendency runs counter to the principle that the protection of persons affiliating with national minorities is part of universal human rights and must be primarily guaranteed by the states where they reside, and possibly supplemented by bilateral agreements among states, based on good neighbourly relations and respect for international law. The decline of multilateralism, which also manifests itself in increasing pressures on the functioning of international institutions, in particular international independent bodies, creates fertile ground for the polarisation, politicisation and instrumentalisation of inter-ethnic relations, thereby threatening peace and security within and between states. Minority rights have further been weaponised, which has had a number of detrimental effects on the actual ability of persons affiliating with minorities, particularly those that were the object of such a weaponisation, to enjoy minority rights in practice. All this has further undermined the joint commitment and interest in protecting minority rights as universal human rights.

This environment places increased pressures on efforts to monitor the implementation of the Framework Convention, although, in general, the Advisory Committee continues to benefit from close co-operation with states parties, with many showing their commitment to ensure access to minority rights within their borders and in Europe as a whole, also through their excellent co-operation with the Advisory Committee. However, there is a worrying trend of proposals by individual states to introduce substantial amendments to draft resolutions to be adopted by the Committee of Ministers. Those are not proposals that would address a very recent development like an adoption of a law that may effectively address a specific recommendation, but instead challenge the independent expertise and a detailed examination of the situation, the facts and the concerns of all the various actors within an individual state that then results in the advice of the Advisory Committee in the form of its carefully

drafted recommendations. Such proposals and their examination, that often open the floor for additional particularistic interests, also result in significant delays in the last stage of the monitoring process, hindering the effective and timely implementation of the Framework Convention. In this regard, the Advisory Committee recalls that it is essential that the independence and integrity of its monitoring mechanism continue to be fully respected, as this forms the foundation for the consistent and credible implementation of the European standards on diversity management through the protection of minority rights that apply to all persons affiliating with national minorities. This is how democratic stability and peace can be ensured in Europe.

This section of this activity report (2024-2026) seeks to reflect on the context and worrying trends that member states of the Council of Europe need to be alerted to. The Advisory Committee, whilst preparing a number of its Opinions, has been reflecting on trends and challenges experienced on the ground, across states parties (and other member states that are yet to ratify the Framework Convention). Some of these new and longstanding factors that the Advisory Committee has identified as hindering the progress to implement the Framework Convention are: 1) hostility towards national minorities and persons affiliating with them; 2) continuing exclusion of Roma and Travellers¹; and 3) the impact of decreasing financial resources and a lack of reliable data. Whilst reflecting on these trends, the Advisory Committee also wishes to highlight some relevant good practices and promising developments – with the hope to inspire states parties in improving the conditions for persons affiliating with national minorities to freely express the essential elements of their identities on equal grounds, to have equal access to rights despite their national or ethnic, linguistic and religious affiliations, and for everyone in the diverse European societies to benefit from interactions across differences. For societal integration and thus diversity management as such requires participation of everyone, it applies to everyone, and is based on efforts and commitment to mutual accommodation based on acceptance of diversity and minority communities as societies' integral part. Genuine, widely shared and long-term societal integration or societal cohesion will not evolve in societies that exclude, promote homogeneity in any of its forms or that fear diversity and express hostile attitudes towards individuals who affiliate with minority communities.

Hostility towards national minorities and persons affiliating with them

The Advisory Committee observes that, despite a wide range of initiatives to promote mutual understanding and respect for diversity, persons affiliating with national minorities continue to experience increasing levels of hostility throughout Europe. Tensions between states, sudden demographic changes, democratic backsliding,

1. The term "Roma and Travellers" is used at the Council of Europe to encompass the wide diversity of the groups covered by the work of the Council of Europe in this field: on the one hand a) Roma, Sinti/Manush, Calé, Kaale, Romanichals, Boyash/Rudari; b) Balkan Egyptians (Egyptians and Ashkali); c) Eastern groups (Dom, Lom and Abdal); and, on the other hand, groups such as Travellers, Yenish, and the populations designated under the administrative term "Gens du voyage", as well as persons who identify themselves as Gypsies. The present is an explanatory footnote, not a definition of Roma and/or Travellers.

and rising socio-economic inequalities have contributed to the emergence of a polarised atmosphere, which is being exploited by populist political figures and hate groups targeting national minorities and persons affiliating with them through various means. Their divisive spoken or written messages are increasingly amplified and widely disseminated through digital media platforms.

A particularly worrying tendency is also the persistence of old and emergence of new hierarchies among national minorities, favouring some communities and persons affiliating with them over others. This trend has been developing across Europe within a wide range of contexts, from the full-scale war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, to the exclusive nation-building policies, and the rise of populist and hate groups and political parties. The instrumentalisation of minority rights with hostile intentions against another state² has generated a backlash, leading to the increased securitisation of minority issues across Europe. As a result, certain minorities in many parts of Europe have been viewed with suspicion and perceived as potential risks for state sovereignty, its territorial integrity and its national security. Likewise, selective narratives about historical events or periods have often instrumentalised in successor states to justify unfavourable, sometimes discriminatory treatment of persons affiliating with national minorities associated with predecessor states. Such distinctions have restricted access of those persons to citizenship and cross-border interactions, but also to minority rights. Thus, distinctions drawn between national minority languages that are also official languages of the European Union (EU) and those that are not in relation to the EU accession process have been used as a pretext for decreasing the visibility of certain minority languages and for unequal opportunities for the use of minority languages, including the possibilities for learning them throughout public (and sometimes even private) educational institutions. Populist movements and racist hate groups that specifically target migrants, refugees, Roma, Muslims and Jews have exploited various societal and geopolitical challenges, such as drastic population movements, crime concerns including crimes against humanity and armed conflicts in the Middle East. This climate of intolerance fuels divisions within societies, reinforcing distinctions between “us” and “others”, and justifying the denial of equal protection of minority rights for all individuals affiliating with minorities based on the universality of human rights.³

Under these circumstances, recourse to reciprocity, which is not part of the present international regime for managing diversity through minority rights, through bilateral arrangements, in place of multilateral human rights mechanisms to reflect a shared international interest in protecting minority rights as part of Europe's efforts to ensure peace, democratic security and stability, has become increasingly prevalent. While the Framework Convention encourages bilateral agreements to facilitate cross-border cultural contacts, such instruments should remain complementary to multilateral

-
2. The Advisory Committee has repeatedly condemned the full-scale war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and the manipulation of minority rights as a pretext for attacks against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a member state of the Council of Europe and a state party to the Framework Convention. It underlined that that this constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of the Framework Convention and international law. See [14th activity report of the Advisory Committee \(2022-2024\)](#), p. 7; [13th activity report of the Advisory Committee \(2020-2022\)](#), p. 11.
 3. See [14th activity report of the Advisory Committee \(2022-2024\)](#), p. 5.

mechanisms. Otherwise, this approach, complemented by politicisation of minority issues in bilateral relations between states but also within the Council of Europe, may lead to several negative effects. It creates the fading lack of interest and even exclusion from minority rights efforts of persons affiliating with national minorities without a “kin-state”, such as the Roma and Travellers and others. It should be also noted that bilateral agreements and other bilateral political arrangements do not always serve the interests of persons affiliating with minorities with a “kin-state”, as they may place additional pressure on individuals both from their country of residence and from the neighbouring state with which they are ethnically or linguistically associated, raising questions about their loyalty. Such political interests from across the border further diminish the agency of persons affiliating with minorities in the state where they permanently reside. As observed before the Second World War, recourse to reciprocity and the particularisation of minority protection that applies to only some minorities in some states contributed to significant upheavals and instability in Europe. This experience has prompted the creation of contemporary international human rights mechanisms in response to the tragedies caused by the shortcomings of the old international regime primarily relied on the protection of minorities through bilateral agreements. Consequently, the revival of reciprocity undermines the established principle that the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities must be safeguarded, first and foremost, on equal grounds by the states in which they live and in compliance with universally agreed standards. When this principle is not fully respected, issues concerning minorities are likely to become more politicised, fuelling tensions within and between states, and paving the way for unilateral actions that threaten peace, stability and democratic security.

Democratic backsliding across Europe has exacerbated this climate of mistrust and exclusion, as the weakening of democratic norms and institutions leaves minority communities and persons affiliating with them increasingly vulnerable to marginalisation and discriminatory policies. They continue to face exclusionary rhetoric and hate speech propagated by politicians and senior officials, which deepen societal divisions and contribute to the normalisation of intolerance and hostility. It has become particularly worrying that the glorification of convicted war criminals and the denial of such crimes, regardless of where they were committed or who committed them, by leading politicians or even the authorities at different levels have taken place in political discourse. This has added to the already existing trend of selective memory politics that runs contrary to societal integration. Moreover, misinformation and disinformation campaigns targeting minorities and persons affiliating with them, amplified through both traditional and new media, including social media, have proliferated a distorted notion of democracy, depicting it as an absolute majority rule and blaming minorities for supposedly limiting the rights of the majority and threatening its very existence and the existence of would-be one-nation-states. In such an environment, hate crimes become more likely, while effective responses are hampered by persistent shortcomings in the criminal justice system, including gaps in data collection, police investigation, prosecution and trial processes. Furthermore, the shrinking space for civil society, especially organisations advocating for minority rights, and the erosion of safeguards for human rights defenders have stifled voices crucial for advancing and defending the rights of persons affiliating with minorities. This tendency also undermines the independence and effectiveness of equality

bodies, including ombudsperson institutions, which are essential for countering discrimination and intolerance against individuals, including persons affiliating with minorities. Under these circumstances, persons affiliating with national minorities have become increasingly reluctant to freely self-identify as such and fully participate in social, economic and political life. Even more worryingly, many decline to report incidents of discrimination and hate crime due to a lack of trust in the system itself.

Despite recent setbacks, notable progress has also been observed in several states parties, particularly in broadening the inclusion of persons affiliating with national or ethnic, linguistic, religious and other minorities within domestic frameworks for diversity management through minority rights. This more flexible and dynamic approach is being realised in a variety of ways, not only through formal recognition of minorities that is often of great symbolic value and a way of effective access to minority rights, but also by taking practical steps such as inviting representatives of new or previously unrecognised minority communities to participate in consultative bodies, or amending legislation to extend minority language rights and opportunities to express and promote minority cultures, or to be included in various decision-making processes in different walks of life. These advances reflect the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an article-by-article application of the Framework Convention, enabling more individuals to benefit from access to rights enshrined in this international treaty regardless of the status of a particular minority community. Parallel to these inclusive measures, there has been some progress in refining data collection on persons affiliating with national minorities, now also allowing for their multiple ethnic and linguistic affiliations, a significant step given the growing diversity resulting from increased population mobility within and between states. It is also noted that some states parties have broadened the offer of education in and of minority languages in schools, contributing to the preservation and appreciation of linguistic diversity and to effective access to language rights enshrined in the Framework Convention. Similarly, targeted language revitalisation initiatives make it possible for persons affiliating with numerically smaller minorities to preserve and develop their unique identities. All these developments signal an encouraging shift towards more adaptive, responsive and inclusive frameworks for the protection of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities.

Moreover, the evolving media landscape presents promising possibilities for advancing the inclusion of minority issues and of persons affiliating with national minorities, particularly when it comes to fostering media pluralism. As the media continues to play a pivotal role in shaping public attitudes and narratives, greater efforts have been made to improve access to media in minority languages, which strengthens minority visibility and societal participation for persons affiliating with minority communities. Notably, digitalisation and the rapid progress of artificial intelligence offer substantial opportunities to make minority relevant content, including in minority languages, more widely accessible and affordable, helping bridge information gaps and facilitate the expression of a plurality of voices in the public sphere. Yet, these technological advancements are not without risks: algorithmic bias, the amplification of stereotypes, and the potential for increasing existing inequalities remain significant concerns, especially as artificial intelligence becomes integral to policy choices in crucial sectors such as healthcare, education, housing and employment.

If left unchecked, these technologies could exacerbate rather than alleviate challenges faced by persons affiliating with national minorities. In this regard, vigilant and comprehensive regulation of artificial intelligence and of digital media is essential to prevent discrimination and safeguard fair minority representation and the presence of minority languages in different media outlets, particularly in the public media. By carefully harnessing the benefits of innovation while managing its risks, media and technological progress can play a vital role in building more inclusive societies and fostering positive public discourse. Such initiatives are instrumental in countering harmful foreign influence that exploits new technologies to undermine social cohesion, manipulate public opinion or target minority communities. Those initiatives and domestically produced relevant media content are thereby essential in strengthening societal resilience and safeguarding the integrity of democratic participation.

Continuing exclusion of Roma and Travellers

Despite longstanding commitments under various Council of Europe instruments, including the Framework Convention, Roma and Travellers continue to face persistent and pervasive discrimination impacting every aspect of their daily lives. The cumulative effects of generational exclusion, compounded by several new worrying trends, leave these communities and persons affiliating with them disproportionately exposed to poverty, stigmatisation and systemic barriers to societal inclusion. Moreover, a range of administrative and procedural barriers, such as difficulties in obtaining personal documentation, resolving civil registration issues and, in some cases, situations of statelessness, continue to limit access to essential services and basic human rights, thereby impeding their effective inclusion in society. Addressing this deeply rooted discrimination and marginalisation requires not only renewed political will, but also targeted and effective interventions across key sectors, particularly education, employment, housing and health. Ensuring their effective equality and thus full participation in all aspects of society on an equal basis will benefit entire societies so it is time to firmly move from policy-planning to making substantial changes on the ground.

In particular, inclusive quality education is essential for building cohesive societies and ensuring equal opportunities for all because it enables individuals to develop their full potential and participate meaningfully in social, economic, and public life.⁴ However, this fundamental right remains out of reach for many Roma and Traveller children due to entrenched systemic barriers and discrimination. These children have often limited access to quality education, including well-resourced schools, adequately trained and culturally sensitive teachers and inclusive curricula that recognise the contributions of Roma and Travellers to diverse societies and their histories, cultures and languages. They also frequently encounter discrimination, antigypsyism and bullying within educational settings, which undermines their self-esteem and a sense of belonging but also their intercultural interactions and thus also interactions of all other children with them. Roma pupils and students still

4. See [Thematic Commentary No. 1 on Education under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities](#), adopted on 31 May 2024, revising and replacing Thematic Commentary No. 1 on Education (2006).

face segregated school environments and are disproportionately placed in schools and programmes designed for children with special educational needs. This limits their chances of advancing to higher levels of education and, consequently, their professional development and subsequent opportunities in the labour market. De facto school segregation isolates Roma pupils and students from their peers and perpetuates patterns of exclusion. Although support measures, in particular Roma classroom assistants or mediators, have been introduced in many states to tackle these obstacles, such positions are typically low-paid, insecure, and offer few prospects for long-term employment, ultimately failing to address the root causes of inequality in education. All these challenges contribute to high under-enrolment and drop-out rates among Roma children, restricting both their educational advancement and opportunities for social mobility.

Barriers to participation in economic life, such as lower levels of education and spatial segregation, continue to disadvantage Roma and Traveller communities and persons affiliating with them, restricting their access to the labour market and reinforcing cycles of exclusion, with women being particularly affected. While recognising the diverse situations in many countries across Europe, unemployment and poverty rates of Roma and Travellers are significantly higher than amongst the general population. Even when employed, many of them are often confined to poorly paid, insecure, dangerous and low-status positions with little prospect for advancement or long-term stability. Government-funded short-term initiatives, such as community clean-up or maintenance projects aimed at reducing unemployment among Roma and Travellers, often fail to address the underlying causes of such structural discrimination. These initiatives rarely offer meaningful pathways to more stable, skilled and safe employment, reinforcing a cycle of dependency on social welfare and hindering genuine economic integration. As strategies addressing the root causes of social and economic discrimination against Roma and Travellers are often designed without disaggregated data and adequate baseline studies, their implementation and impact remain weak. These challenges are deepened by structural inequalities that especially affect Roma and Traveller women and girls, who face intersecting forms of gender-based and ethnic discrimination. Instances of early and forced marriages and high rates of adolescent pregnancy, sometimes seen as “part of their culture” in certain countries, frequently limit their educational advancement, leaving them among the most economically disadvantaged groups. Despite this, strategies and national action plans for the effective inclusion of Roma and Travellers often fail to adequately address such intersecting forms of discrimination, resulting in insufficiently targeted and effective responses. Roma and Travellers are also often deprived of possibilities to participate in monitoring the implementation and outcomes of those policies and strategies.

The challenges that undermine secure and meaningful employment for Roma and Travellers are closely linked to equally persistent barriers in the area of adequate housing and accommodation. Many continue to face a heightened risk of homelessness, with insufficient access to safe and stable housing exacerbating their vulnerability. This has severe negative impact on the physical and mental health as well as the education of children. Accommodation and designated living sites for these communities are too often situated in environmentally hazardous or isolated areas,

such as electricity pylons and dumps, exposing residents to health and safety risks while reinforcing their social exclusion. Far too many live in areas distant from political and economic centres of activity, placing them in a disadvantageous social and economic situation. Difficulties in accessing social services are further compounded by bureaucratic obstacles, such as the lack of official documentation or housing certificates, which may result in forced evictions. Basic utilities like drinking water, electricity and sanitation are frequently absent or unreliable, undermining the quality of daily life and well-being. For many, housing options remain substandard, lacking in comfort and safety, while forced nomadism and relocations prevent the development of any sense of personal and community stability. Furthermore, a lack of culturally appropriate housing continues to limit the ability of Roma and Travellers to maintain their traditions and ways of life. In some cases, residential segregation is even reinforced as a deliberate policy or practice, perpetuating isolation from mainstream society and deepening patterns of marginalisation.

The precarious living conditions faced by Roma and Travellers directly contribute to deep inequalities in health and wellbeing. Individuals from these communities often experience heightened risks of suicide and mental health problems, exacerbated by both the stress of unstable housing and persistent social marginalisation. Access to healthcare remains severely limited, with many struggling to obtain necessary documentation to benefit from free or affordable services, accompanied by practical barriers such as lack of information, transportation or administrative support, further widening the existing health disparities. Within health systems, discrimination is an all-too-common experience, particularly for Roma and Traveller women seeking maternity care, who frequently encounter biased treatment and lack of cultural sensitivity. Essential measures to confront and redress the legacy of forced sterilisation remain inadequate, leaving lasting trauma and mistrust. The efforts to promote health literacy often lack targeted strategies, including the provision of information in the respective minority language. As a result, the overall health in Roma and Traveller communities lags well behind that of the general population, reflecting the profound intersection of socio-economic factors and structural exclusion.

Consequently, interlinked barriers in education, employment, housing and health create a deeply entrenched and self-perpetuating cycle of discrimination against Roma and Traveller communities and persons affiliating with them, sustaining inequality across generations and limiting meaningful social mobility. While some positive developments have occurred, including improved health insurance coverage, increased access to education and targeted programmes supporting inclusive schooling, these remain exceptions rather than the rule. This highlights the need for guaranteeing social, economic and cultural rights to all on an equal basis, including Roma and Travellers, who continue to face systemic obstacles in accessing them. It also requires efforts to empower Roma and Travellers to effectively participate in decision-making processes, particularly on those issues that affect them. Recognising antigypsyism as a distinct form of racism is essential when implementing national strategies against discrimination. Efforts to promote the cultures and histories of Roma and Travellers, such as the recognition of the Roma Holocaust and teaching in and of the Romani and other minority languages, are important steps toward ensuring dignity, remembrance and inclusion. EU-supported funding for strategies

concerning Roma and Travellers has also enabled progress in raising awareness, countering stereotypes and combating discrimination, yet concerns remain regarding the sustainability of these initiatives and their capacity to achieve long-term systemic change. Much more must be done to dismantle structural discrimination and ensure that Roma and Travellers can participate fully and equally in all aspects of our diverse societies.

Budgetary cuts and recurring lack of reliable data

Addressing the complex and frequently intersectional challenges faced by persons affiliating with national minorities, including Roma and Travellers, requires sustained and sufficient funding, yet securing such resources is becoming significantly difficult. The increasing international instability and ongoing wars, both within and beyond Europe, have triggered a notable reallocation of public funds towards defence, security and emergency responses. Coupled with persistent global economic pressures, including inflation, supply chain disruptions and energy insecurity, this trend has led to widespread budgetary freezes and substantial cuts to social policies, including those aimed at promoting societal inclusion and respect for diversity. As a result, several programmes designed to support national minorities and effective access to minority rights, have not been fully implemented, with many unable to commence or continue due to insufficient funding. This situation disproportionately affects minorities and persons affiliating with them, as numerous initiatives addressing their specific needs and interests rely on project-based funds, further heightening their vulnerability during periods of economic hardship.

Austerity measures have been acutely felt across Europe, especially in community inclusion programmes and initiatives promoting minority languages and cultures. Under these circumstances, many states have experienced increasing difficulty maintaining an appropriate and fair balance between fiscal discipline and the protection of social and economic rights in critical areas such as education, housing, employment and healthcare. Marginalised minorities, including Roma and Travellers, often reliant on informal or precarious employment and residing in underdeveloped regions, have been particularly affected, resulting in a deepening of structural exclusion. Similarly, the implementation of national strategies and action plans to support and promote intercultural understanding and minority cultures has become increasingly challenging due to insufficient funding. Many community centres, minority media outlets and minority language schools, which play a vital role in preserving and developing essential elements of minority cultures and identities, have terminated or significantly reduced their activities. This trend has had a lasting impact on marginalised communities, especially the numerically smaller ones. While the Advisory Committee acknowledges the need for financial measures in times of economic hardship, it emphasises that such policies should be informed by robust impact assessments of their effects on persons affiliating with national minorities, who must be part of these processes, ensuring their voices are heard and their needs and interests are addressed.

In parallel to widespread budgetary freezes and reductions in public funding, there remains a persistent tendency across Europe to rely predominantly on project-based

funding for initiatives advancing access to minority rights. This pattern is especially pronounced regarding the inclusion of Roma and Travellers, where external resources, mainly provided by the EU and other international donors, have served as the principal means of support for social, educational and cultural interventions. However, due to the cessation of grants or shifts in donor priorities, many promising efforts have been abruptly discontinued or scaled back, jeopardising the progress made towards inclusion. Such discontinuations have eroded institutional memory in addressing the existing challenges and obstacles in access to minority rights. The Advisory Committee observes that while project-based funding has facilitated the launch of numerous valuable initiatives, the reliance on external, short-term project-driven resources has undermined the institutionalisation and sustainability of national mechanisms to promote inclusion and mutual understanding. Therefore, these efforts should move beyond short-term, project-based interventions and adopt long-term, inclusive policies anchored in sustainable public investment, taking fully into account the needs and interests of persons affiliating with national minorities.

The availability of reliable, disaggregated data is essential for conducting robust impact assessments of policies affecting persons affiliating with national minorities and for formulating evidence-based strategies to address their specific needs, particularly in periods of economic hardship. Yet, as traditional censuses become increasingly rare and are largely replaced by register-based ones, there continues to be a significant lack of accurate and comprehensive data on ethnic, linguistic and religious affiliations, including of multiple affiliations. While some states have begun to supplement register-based censuses with qualitative and quantitative surveys and other types of data collection, challenges persist: data collection systems often lack clear methodologies, nuanced response options for ethnic and linguistic affiliation, and open-ended questions that would capture the complexity of living experiences of individuals. Understanding of intra-minority dynamics over time, including of diversity within national minorities, is essential to design and implement evidence-based policies and strategies corresponding to the evolving needs and interests of persons affiliating with these communities. Moreover, the rigid use of census data to determine thresholds for access to minority rights can limit full enjoyment of those rights, especially where threshold criteria remain high or are applied retroactively to pre-existing entitlements or continue to be based on proportions of populations which remain beyond reach for minorities living in bigger urban areas. The absence of publicly accessible, disaggregated data, especially regarding socio-economic status, employment, education, gender and discrimination, seriously compromises the ability to assess intersectional forms of exclusion. Discrepancies between official statistics and data gathered by minority representatives further erode trust and complicate efforts to accurately evaluate the situation of persons affiliating with national minorities. Overall, without a clear and systematic approach to the collection of reliable, comprehensive and disaggregated data, persons affiliating with national minorities risk continued underrepresentation, inadequate policy responses and unaddressed inequalities. The Advisory Committee therefore welcomes the preparation by the Council of Europe's Steering Committee on Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Inclusion (CDADI) of a study containing practical guidance on data collection in relation to the rights of persons belonging to national minorities and the use of regional or minority languages including through population censuses.

Conclusion

The period covered by this activity report has marked an era of mounting challenges for the management of diversity through minority rights in Europe. Escalating geopolitical tensions, increasing recourse to selective approaches and heightened democratic backsliding have seriously tested the coherence and effectiveness of multilateral human rights frameworks such as the Framework Convention. The persistence of exclusionary narratives, the instrumentalisation of minority rights, and deepening social and economic disparities and inequality risk entrenching cycles of mistrust, marginalisation and exclusion. Particularly concerning is the emergence of preferential treatment for certain minorities based on reciprocity and often asymmetrical power relations, rather than on the protection of all persons affiliating with all national minorities as enshrined in the universality of human rights. This trend risks normalising hostility towards ethnic, linguistic and religious groups not benefiting from such arrangements and further deepening divisions within society.

Against this backdrop, the erosion of democratic institutions and safeguards, the shrinking space for civil society and the justification of exclusionary rhetoric contribute to an environment in which minority rights are increasingly contested, securitised or deprioritised. Attempts to define democracy by the will of the majority alone, or to depict the protection of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities as privileges against the interest of the majority fundamentally weaken the democratic fabric of society and render societal cohesion more vulnerable to polarisation and conflict. The rise of populist political figures, racist organisations and the so-called radical influencers promoting illiberal policies in the social media, are both the result of the deterioration of inclusive democracy and the driving forces behind the stigmatisation and dehumanisation of certain segments of the society based on ethnicity, language or religion. Such an atmosphere limits opportunities for effective participation in decision-making at all levels, undermining the pluralistic nature of democracy across Europe.

Ensuring the effective diversity management through minority rights in this challenging landscape requires a renewed and sustained commitment to the full implementation of the Framework Convention. The protection of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities remains an essential component of democratic security and social cohesion, and should be regarded as a key element and a key interest of broader efforts to strengthen democracy in Europe, including within the framework of the Council of Europe's New Democracy Pact for Europe initiative. Such efforts must be supported by the allocation of adequate, stable and predictable financial resources, moving beyond short-term and project-based approaches towards long-term, structural solutions to counter discrimination and ensure effective equality for everyone. At the same time, the development of effective policies requires the availability of reliable, disaggregated data, collected in full respect of the principles of self-identification and data protection, in order to accurately assess the situation of persons affiliating with national minorities and address their specific needs and interests, through inclusive and effective consultation processes.

The Advisory Committee reiterates that only a proactive comprehensive approach, rooted in a spirit of dialogue, openness and partnership between persons affiliating

with minorities and with majorities, civil society organisations, independent human rights institutions and state authorities, can ensure that Europe's societies are robust enough to withstand attacks on multilateralism and pluralistic democracy and diversity more broadly. The monitoring process under the Framework Convention remains a cornerstone for fostering such dialogue, facilitating exchange and guiding states towards the full and effective implementation of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities within the scope of universal human rights principles. The Advisory Committee continues to stand ready to support states parties in advancing these goals, by providing independent expertise and examples of inspiring good practices across Europe, in order to ensure that all individuals, regardless of their affiliations, can contribute to, and benefit from strong, democratic societies built on respect for diversity.



Advisory Committee's 6th monitoring visit to Croatia, June 2025.

Part II

Country-specific monitoring by the Advisory Committee

Between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026, the Advisory Committee received nine state reports. Its members carried out 14 country visits, and in turn, during the eight plenaries it held, it adopted 14 Opinions. Over the reporting period, the Committee of Ministers adopted 16 related resolutions, and the Advisory Committee took part in three follow-up dialogues.

Periodical state reports

The Advisory Committee received nine state reports as part of the 6th monitoring cycle between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026, reaching already halfway through the 6th monitoring cycle.

6th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Malta, received on 3 June 2024;
- ▶ Estonia, received on 5 June 2024;
- ▶ Austria, received on 12 August 2024 (with its annex, received on 21 January 2025);
- ▶ Armenia, received on 16 September 2024;
- ▶ Ukraine, received on 10 January 2025;
- ▶ Romania, received on 18 March 2025;
- ▶ Republic of Moldova, received on 1 April 2025;
- ▶ Norway, received on 1 July 2025;
- ▶ North Macedonia, received on 28 October 2025.

The Advisory Committee welcomes the fact that state reports are generally thorough and informative, providing relevant disaggregated data and details on legislation, policies, and other activities and developments. They also include assessments of the actual implementation of the recommendations made by both the Advisory Committee and the Committee of Ministers.

Moreover, civil society stakeholders, such as national minority organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and national independent experts contribute more to state reports, are often included in the drafting process, and are able to provide their own assessments and open issues. Including such views of civil society actors and in particular persons affiliating with national minorities in state reports is of added value and a sign of efficient co-operation among different stakeholders at the national level when it comes to the implementation of the Framework Convention.

However, the Advisory Committee urges states parties to submit their reports in a timely manner, as nearly half of the state reports are overdue. Timely submission is important, not only in order to comply with obligations under the treaty but also to allow the Advisory Committee to better plan its work. This, in turn, eases the workload of the state party concerned before and during the monitoring visit. The Advisory Committee also recalls that, in accordance with the outline for the 6th cycle state report approved by the Committee of Ministers in July 2022, reporting should cover the period from the adoption of the fifth cycle Opinion until the transmission of the state report. Additional information may be shared by the respective state party as well as asked by the Advisory Committee until the adoption of the Opinion.

Country visits

During the reporting period, Advisory Committee delegations carried out 14 country visits.

6th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Czechia, from 24 to 28 June 2024;
- ▶ Cyprus, from 4 to 8 November 2024;
- ▶ Spain, from 12 to 15 November 2024;
- ▶ Hungary, from 2 to 6 December 2024;
- ▶ Italy, from 7 to 11 April 2025;
- ▶ Croatia, from 9 to 13 June 2025;
- ▶ Ukraine (5th and 6th monitoring cycles), from 18 to 19 September 2025, preceded by online meetings on 20, 21, 27 and 28 May 2025 and 17 June 2025;
- ▶ Slovak Republic, from 20 to 24 October 2025;
- ▶ Germany, from 19 to 23 January 2026;
- ▶ Slovenia, from 2 to 6 March 2026;
- ▶ Romania, from 20 to 24 April 2026.

5th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Serbia, from 24 to 28 June 2024;
- ▶ Portugal, from 24 to 28 March 2025;
- ▶ Poland, from 29 September to 3 October 2025.

Country visits are an important part of the monitoring process, enabling the Advisory Committee to gain a better insight into the situation of national minorities on the ground, and an understanding of their needs and interests, as well as that of other stakeholders. This is made possible through encounters with persons affiliating with national minorities, including representatives reflecting a diversity within these minorities (i.e. related to gender, age and other aspects of one's identity). Moreover, during country visits, the Advisory Committee meets with authorities at the central, regional and local levels, representatives of parliaments and other relevant institutions, including ombudspersons and equality bodies, as well as civil society organisations and independent experts. Country visits usually span over five days, and include several destinations in the state party concerned – not only the capital city, but also remote areas where persons affiliating with national minorities reside.



Advisory Committee's 6th monitoring visit to Slovenia, March 2026.



Advisory Committee's 6th monitoring visit to the Slovak Republic, October 2025.

Country-specific Opinions

In the course of this reporting cycle, the Advisory Committee adopted a total of 14 Opinions. It also approved two Opinions (to be adopted after the confidential dialogue with the respective states parties).

6th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Finland, adopted on 24 February 2025;
- ▶ Cyprus, adopted on 1 July 2025;
- ▶ Malta, adopted on 1 July 2025;
- ▶ Czechia, adopted on 2 July 2025;
- ▶ Spain, adopted on 2 July 2025;
- ▶ Hungary, adopted on 15 October 2025;
- ▶ Italy, adopted on 11 February 2026;
- ▶ Slovakia, adopted on 20 May 2026;
- ▶ Croatia, adopted on 20 May 2026;
- ▶ Ukraine (also including the 5th monitoring cycle), adopted on 21 May 2026;
- ▶ Slovenia, approved on 21 May 2026.

5th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Lithuania, adopted on 15 October 2024;
- ▶ Ireland, adopted on 16 October 2024;
- ▶ Serbia, adopted on 26 February 2025;
- ▶ Portugal, adopted on 15 October 2025;
- ▶ Poland, approved on 22 May 2026.

Committee of Ministers' Resolution CM/Res(2019)49 on the revised monitoring arrangements under Articles 24 to 26 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities has established a confidential dialogue between the state party concerned and the Advisory Committee, which takes place before an Opinion is adopted. Accordingly, once the Advisory Committee approves the first draft of an Opinion, the state has two months to present factual observations and clarifications in the framework of the confidential dialogue phase. During the following plenary meeting, the Advisory Committee carries out a second reading of the Opinion, taking into account inputs from the state party concerned, and in turn adopts the final Opinion.

Overall, the Advisory Committee considers that including a confidential dialogue within the monitoring process has strengthened and enhanced its co-operation with states parties. Still, it encourages states parties to strictly limit their observations to inaccuracies of a factual nature or elements requiring clarification, and refrain from making comments of a substantial nature at this stage of the procedure. States parties are encouraged to send any additional information before, during and after the country visit, particularly during the phase of the drafting of the respective Opinion.

While in the past, the Advisory Committee formulated “recommendations for immediate action” and “further recommendations” in its Opinions, a significant change was implemented in the 6th monitoring cycle. Since June 2024, the Advisory Committee selects 10 priority recommendations – in other words, recommendations that it considers that states parties should focus on as a matter of priority in order to achieve the Framework Convention’s objectives at national level. This does not mean all other recommendations become less relevant.

Resolutions of the Committee of Ministers

The Committee of Ministers adopted a total of 16 resolutions between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026.

6th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Denmark, adopted on 25 September 2024;
- ▶ Finland, adopted on 9 July 2025;
- ▶ Czechia, adopted on 21 January 2026;
- ▶ Malta, adopted on 21 January 2026;
- ▶ Spain, adopted on 21 January 2026;
- ▶ Hungary, adopted on 8 April 2026;
- ▶ Cyprus, adopted on 6 May 2026;
- ▶ Portugal, adopted on 6 May 2026.

5th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Bosnia and Herzegovina, adopted on 23 October 2024;
- ▶ Lithuania, adopted on 12 March 2025;
- ▶ Ireland, adopted on 2 April 2025;
- ▶ Serbia, adopted on 7 November 2025;
- ▶ Bulgaria, adopted on 4 March 2026.

4th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Georgia, adopted on 19 November 2024;
- ▶ Montenegro, adopted on 11 December 2024;
- ▶ Latvia, adopted on 2 April 2025.

A given monitoring cycle is formally completed with the adoption of a resolution by the Committee of Ministers. Those resolutions should be read in conjunction with the relevant Opinion of the Advisory Committee, because they are adopted based on its priority recommendations. However, the Advisory Committee recalls that states parties are expected to take into account and implement all the recommendations contained in the Opinion.

The Advisory Committee and the Committee of Ministers hold a sustained and fruitful dialogue, in particular through the Committee of Ministers’ Rapporteur Group on

Human Rights (GR-H). The Advisory Committee’s President presents country-specific Opinions to the GR-H, providing an opportunity to exchange information on issues relating to the Framework Convention and its monitoring mechanism. This practice also illustrates the monitoring mechanism’s multilateral dimension, which transcends the scope of bilateral or inter-state relations.



Advisory Committee’s monitoring visit to Ukraine, September 2025.

The Advisory Committee

On 1 June 2024, new members of the Advisory Committee begun their mandate, namely: Evis Alimehmeti (Albania), Besarion Bokhashvili (Georgia), Detlev Rein (Germany), Elisabeth Sándor-Szalay (Hungary), Šarūnas Liekis (Lithuania), Vladimir Djurić (Serbia), Yuliia Fysun (Ukraine). Following the resignation of a previous member elected in respect of the Netherlands, Ingeborg Birnie-Havenga joined the Advisory Committee on 25 September 2024.

During its 84th plenary meeting in October 2024, the Advisory Committee elected a new bureau for a two-year term of office. Petra Roter (Slovenia) was elected President of the Advisory Committee; Besarion Bokhashvili (Georgia), First Vice-President; David Smith (United Kingdom), Second Vice-President.

A number of members saw their mandates end on 31 May 2026: Pedro Aguilera Cortés (Spain), Laura-Maria Crăciunean-Tatu (Romania), Tomáš Hrustič (Slovak Republic), Tove H. Malloy (Denmark), Egly Pantelakis (Cyprus), Klaus Poier (Austria), Petra Roter (Slovenia), Roksana Rudeviča (Latvia), David Smith (United Kingdom), Judith Wyttenbach (Switzerland).

On 15 April 2026, the Committee of Ministers appointed as ordinary members of the Advisory Committee nine experts. Their term of office begun in early June 2026: Siniša Bjeković (Montenegro), Ian Feldman (Republic of Moldova), Marie Hagsgård (Sweden), Emma Lantschner (Italy), Thomas McCann (Ireland), Emil Ordukhanyan (Armenia), Aleksandra Oszmiańska-Pagett (Poland), Harald Scheu (Czechia), Dejan Valentinčič (Slovenia) and Petter Wille (Norway).

Gender balance is an important consideration in the composition of the Advisory Committee. Between September 2024 and May 2026, it was composed of 10 female and eight male experts, electing a female President and two male Vice-Presidents.



Advisory Committee's monitoring visit to Ukraine, September 2025.

Part III

Transparency of the process and dialogue

Publication of Opinions

During the reporting period, a total of 17 Advisory Committee Opinions were made public, in accordance with Resolution CM/Res(2029)49.

6th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Czechia, published on 19 November 2025;
- ▶ Malta, published on 20 November 2025;
- ▶ Cyprus, published on 21 November 2025;
- ▶ Spain, published on 27 November 2025;
- ▶ Hungary, published on 3 March 2026;
- ▶ Italy, published on 29 May 2026.

5th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Denmark, published on 19 June 2024;
- ▶ Bosnia and Herzegovina, published on 24 June 2024;
- ▶ Bulgaria, published on 10 October 2024;
- ▶ Azerbaijan, published on 15 November 2024;
- ▶ Lithuania, published on 27 January 2025;
- ▶ Ireland, published on 27 February 2025;
- ▶ Serbia, published on 5 May 2025;
- ▶ Finland, published on 16 June 2025;
- ▶ Portugal, published on 26 February 2026.

4th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Georgia, published on 26 June 2024;
- ▶ Montenegro, published on 10 October 2024.

An Opinion can be published immediately following its adoption by the Advisory Committee if the state concerned has no further comments or if it agrees to publish it as soon as possible after its adoption. The Opinion is otherwise made public once the state submits its comments on the evaluation, or at the latest, four months after the state receives the Opinion. The comments are a means for the country concerned to answer some of the Advisory Committee's findings, point out to factual changes, which may have occurred since the country visit, and address any other relevant issues.

As over 12 months elapse between the country visit and the adoption of an Opinion, following such schedule to publish the Opinion and comments ensures that the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations are still up to date when they are made available publicly. This is why the Advisory Committee encourages states parties to publish the respective Opinion as soon as possible.

Along with the Opinion and the state's potential comments, the Committee of Ministers' recommendations are also made public once adopted.

The Advisory Committee compiles its Opinion's main findings into summaries, which are translated into the official languages of the state concerned. This practice enables the public at large to access and understand the outcomes of the monitoring process. It constitutes a means of promoting dialogue between those with vested interest at national level, and thus foster the implementation of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. The Advisory Committee encourages states parties to translate the Opinions into all of their official and minorities languages in order to contribute to the awareness-raising of the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities, enshrined in the Framework Convention.

Follow-up activities

Three follow-up activities took place during the reporting period.

5th monitoring cycle

- ▶ Republic of Moldova, on 13 December 2024;
- ▶ Switzerland, on 17 March 2025;
- ▶ Ireland, on 6 November 2025.

Follow-up activities, which are usually conducted halfway through the monitoring cycle, are crucial in establishing a constructive dialogue between the states parties and the Advisory Committee. This process provides an opportunity to take stock on the progress made in implementing recommendations, identify the most efficient ways of putting them in practice and sharing examples of good practices, while addressing implementation gaps. Follow-up activities can also, where necessary, be a means for the Advisory Committee to clarify its assessment and recommendations. Finally, they can serve to raise awareness about the Framework Convention's principles, provisions and the functioning of its monitoring mechanism, including the possibility for non-governmental actors to submit alternative reports or share relevant pieces of information. The Advisory Committee, therefore, encourages all states parties to more proactively support the organisation of such additional fora of exchange between authorities, persons affiliating with national minorities and other stakeholders on a regular basis.



5th monitoring cycle's follow-up dialogue, Republic of Moldova, December 2024.

Outreach and media presence

With the Secretariat's support, the Advisory Committee communicates about its activities through the Framework Convention's website. They notably published 25 news items during the second half of 2024, 36 in 2025, and 11 in the first half of 2026.

The Advisory Committee's work is also promoted through the Council of Europe's @Antidiscr X account, announcing country visits, the publication of Opinions, as well as other activities and events.

Among other communications means, the Advisory Committee also distributes a newsletter entitled "Minority rights in Europe" – three of such newsletters were published between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026.

The leaflet "Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities: Questions & Answers", a short publication aimed at raising awareness about the treaty among the general public, was translated into three additional languages: Polish, Slovak and Slovenian. The leaflet is now available in 26 languages.



Advisory Committee's 6th monitoring visit to Slovenia, March 2026.

Part IV

Other developments and activities

Factsheet on environmental challenges and national minorities

In May 2025, the Secretariat of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (the Secretariat) released a factsheet highlighting the environmental challenges which persons affiliating with national minorities face, including indigenous communities such as the Sami, and outlining key actions to address them. It contributes to the Reykjavík Declaration, which reaffirmed the Council of Europe's dedication to advancing the human rights dimensions of environmental protection, and led to the adoption of the Council of Europe's first-ever Strategy on the Environment and accompanying Action Plan.

The publication draws on the Advisory Committee's findings, as since its first monitoring cycle, it has consistently addressed environmental issues. Indeed, in its Opinions, it regularly points out the disproportionate impact of climate change on minority communities and persons affiliating with them, affecting their health, livelihoods and cultural heritage. In this context, the factsheet, which presents key concerns and recommended actions, aims to support states parties in ensuring that environmental policies respect and promote the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities, in line with the Framework Convention.

Factsheet on challenges faced by women and girls affiliating with national minorities

In October 2025, the Secretariat published a factsheet on the challenges which women and girls affiliating with national minorities face. The factsheet concentrates on the relevant recommendations of the Advisory Committee in four areas: gender disaggregated data collection; violence against women and domestic violence; equal access to education, to the labour market, to healthcare and to justice; as well as participation in political and public life.

This document stresses that Advisory Committee seeks to foster the notions of intersectionality and multiple discrimination in its work, pursuing a gender sensitive and gender responsive approach to the rights of persons affiliating with national minorities. It seeks to raise awareness of structural discrimination that minority women and girls are subjected to in all spheres of social, economic and political life. The factsheet also provides information on how the Advisory Committee mainstreams gender equality throughout all phases of monitoring process.



Gender mainstreaming in the work of the Advisory Committee

During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee mainstreamed gender in all its activities in a systematic and consistent manner. As Gender Equality Rapporteur, Judith Wyttenbach, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Switzerland, has continued supporting this in integrating gender equality perspective into every step of the monitoring process concerning the implementation of the Framework Convention. In addition, the Advisory Committee took note of an information document prepared by the Secretariat, which, based on the relevant jurisprudence, aims at addressing the challenges that minority women and girls face in line with the [Council of Europe Gender Equality Strategy \(2024-2029\)](#).

In the beginning of a monitoring process, the Advisory Committee prepares questions, taking account the updated gender equality checklist prepared in 2021. In the same vein, while assessing state reports through a gender lens, the Advisory Committee requests gender segregated data and information on policies in questionnaires for the authorities. They also consult the documents specifically addressing the rights of women and girls affiliating with national minorities. In the course of monitoring visits, the Advisory Committee meet with women representatives, and once it gathers relevant information through these various means, it makes recommendations

addressing intersectional discrimination of women and girls, thereby promoting gender balance across all fields of participation and representation and access to minority rights.

The Advisory Committee has identified several recurring issues concerning the experiences of discrimination by women and girls affiliating with national minorities, in particular those from Roma and Travellers communities. It has underlined that minority women face biased and exclusionary attitudes rooted at the intersection of gender, ethnicity, age and religion. Other pressing issues that the Advisory Committee has identified include violence, which prevents women from participating fully, and gender stereotypes, which pose serious obstacles to participation. Moreover, social inequalities and lack of resources, such as networks, support, financial means, time and care load, limit the opportunities for realising their full potentials. Minority women tend to be excluded from (often male-dominated) minority leadership structures, as well as from mainstream women's movements and organisations. The Advisory Committee reiterates that stereotypes against women cannot be justified based on some interpretations of perceived minority cultures in order to close eyes to gender-based discrimination or to normalise structural inequalities affecting women and girls affiliating with national minorities.

The Advisory Committee has also identified a number of good practices promoting gender equality, including: the collection of regular data on the socio-economic situation, notably disaggregated by gender, language and age; the targeted support for the economic development of minority women; the appointment of special commissioners on gender equality where specific problems arise (e.g. health, housing); the participation of minority women in designing minority policies, as well as their inclusion in general national action plans to combat discrimination; efforts supporting the political participation and representation of minority women in state bodies, institutions and structures, such as through advisory bodies and councils. However, those still often remain an exception, rather than a common practice. More needs to be done to prevent and counter discrimination against women and girls affiliating with national minorities.

Moreover, the Advisory Committee contributed to events on national minorities, delivering presentations on the challenges that minority women and girls face in relation to their full and effective participation in social, economic, cultural and political life.



Geneva Peace Week's side-event, October 2025.

Part V

Co-operation with other bodies

The Advisory Committee greatly benefits from co-operation with other bodies of the Council of Europe, as well as other international organisations, civil society, academia and other stakeholders in the field of diversity management through minority rights.

Co-operation activities within the Council of Europe

On 25 September 2024, Petra Roter, President of the Advisory Committee, presented the Advisory Committee's 14th activity report covering the period from 1 June 2022 to 31 May 2024 to the Committee of Ministers and exchanged with the Permanent Representatives on current trends and challenges in the field of minority protection.

On 17 October 2024, the Advisory Committee launched its Thematic Commentary on Education during an event held in Strasbourg, on the sides of its 84th plenary meeting. The Secretary General of the Council of Europe participated at this launch, together with representatives of other bodies of the organisation, as well as member states. The United Nations' Special Rapporteur on Minority Issues and various experts in minority rights also took part in discussing the importance of education in diversity management.

On 3 and 4 December 2024, the Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities participated in the 18th Dialogue Meeting of the Council of Europe with Roma and Traveller civil society. The event focused on how findings from Council of Europe's monitoring bodies could be integrated into the organisation's Strategy on Roma and Traveller Inclusion for 2026-2030.



Exchange of views with Marko Bošnjak, former President of the European Court of Human Rights – 85th plenary meeting of the Advisory Committee, February 2025.

During its 85th plenary meeting, between 24 and 28 February 2025, the Advisory Committee held an exchange of views with Marko Bošnjak, then President of the European Court of Human Rights.

On 12 May 2025, Tove H. Malloy, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Denmark, took part in a hearing on discrimination against minority women and girls, which was organised by the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE). In her intervention, Tove H. Malloy talked about the topic of gender mainstreaming in the Advisory Committee's work, and presented some of its findings.

On 14 May 2025, Petra Roter, President of the Advisory Committee, participated in the 7th meeting of the Committee of Experts on Intercultural Inclusion of the Council of Europe (ADI-INT). Presenting the Advisory Committee's revised Thematic Commentary on Education, she emphasised that education is a powerful tool for promoting societal inclusion and the recognition of minority identities as an integral part of society, as well as fostering respect for diversity.

On 30 June 2025, Petra Roter, President of the Advisory Committee, held consultations with the Chair of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), Bertil Cottier, on issues of common interest.

On 16 September 2025, Petra Roter, President of the Advisory Committee, met with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and other Chairs of monitoring bodies. Topics on the agenda of were, inter alia, the role of monitoring bodies in a changing geopolitical context, their inputs to the New Democratic Pact for Europe, and possible collaborative efforts with other regional and global mechanisms.

On 16 October 2025, during its 87th plenary meeting, the Advisory Committee held an exchange of views with Ambassador Berta Mrak, President of the Committee of Ministers' Rapporteur Group on Human Rights (GR-H) and Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the Council of Europe, which was followed by a second discussion with Hallvard Gorseth, Council of Europe's Director of Equal Rights and Dignity.

David Smith, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of the United Kingdom and Second Vice-President, regularly participated in working groups of the Steering Committee on Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Inclusion (CDADI), a body mandated to steer the Council of Europe's intergovernmental work to promote equality for all and build more inclusive societies. He was notably involved in devising the "Study on certain aspects of regional or minority language protection and identification of good practices in member States" (CM(2025)180-add5final), which the Committee of Ministers took note of on 4 March 2026.

Co-operation with national and international institutions

Over the two years covered in this report, the Advisory Committee continued to regularly engage with other international institutions focusing on the protection of minority rights. This was in particular the case for the Office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), as well as with the United Nations' Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Nicolas Levrat – a former member and Second Vice-President of the Advisory Committee.

On 28 and 29 November 2024, David Smith, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of the United Kingdom and Second Vice-President, and the Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention attended the 17th United Nations' Forum on Minority Issues in Geneva. The annual event was organised for two working days allocated to thematic discussions, and this session was notably devoted to minority representation in four areas: (i) public spaces; (ii) education; (iii) the media, including social media; (iv) art and culture.

On 11 December 2024, the Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention participated in a conference entitled "Challenges and prospects for national minority protection in Europe". The event, organised by the Hungarian Presidency of the Council of the European Union in Brussels, Belgium, was an occasion to present the Framework Convention, as well as the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML), their impact over the past decades, as well as challenges and opportunities in the field of diversity management.

On 15 October 2025, Judith Wytenbach, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Switzerland, contributed to the Geneva Peace Week 2025 in her capacity as Advisory Committee's Gender Equality Rapporteur. The panel in which she took part was co-organised by the OSCE, the Council of Europe and Legal Action Worldwide (LAW).

During its 87th plenary meeting, the Advisory Committee invited Christophe Kamp, OSCE HCNM, to hold an exchange of views. The discussion, which took place on 17 October 2025, notably revolved around the HCNM's priorities and recent activities, as well as issues of mutual interest with the Advisory Committee, including the evolving challenges in the field of minority protection.

On 23 October 2025, a member of the Secretariat attended an event organised by the Swedish Equality Ombudsperson to mark the 25th anniversary of Sweden's ratification of the Framework Convention. As suggested by its title, "Conversation on 25 Years



18th session of the United Nations' Forum on Minority Issues, November 2025.

of National Minority Rights in Sweden – and the Way Forward!”, the event was an opportunity to ponder over Sweden’s achievements relating to the five recognised national minorities (Sami, Jews, Roma, Sweden Finns and Tornedalians), as well as to discuss opportunities for the future in the field of minority protection.

On 27 and 28 November 2025, the Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention participated in the 18th United Nations’ Forum on Minority Issues, which was entitled “The contribution of minorities to diverse, resilient, and peaceful societies”.

On 4 December 2025, David Smith, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of the United Kingdom and Second Vice-Chair, took part in a discussion organised by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. The event focused on the recommendations in the Advisory Committee’s Sixth Opinion on Finland, the corresponding Resolution of the Committee of Ministers, as well as the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)’s findings in its latest report on Finland.

During its 88th plenary meeting, the Advisory Committee convened with the Council of Europe’s Commissioner for Human Rights, Michael O’Flaherty. During the exchange of views, which took place on 10 February 2026, the Commissioner outlined the priorities for his mandate.



Exchange of views with Michael O'Flaherty, Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights – 88th plenary meeting of the Advisory Committee, February 2026.

Co-operation with civil society and academic research institutions

On 4 December 2024, Evis Alimehmeti, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Albania, took part in the 1st Balkan Egyptians International Forum on “Visions and perspective of Balkan Egyptians in Western Balkans related with EU negotiation processes”, which was held in Berat, Albania.

During its 85th plenary meeting, held between 24 and 28 February 2025, the Advisory Committee received representatives of the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) to discuss their study on “From Recommendation to Action: Assessing the Quality of Monitoring Dialogue and State Responses to Advisory Committee Recommendation”.

On 2 December 2025, Tove H. Malloy, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Denmark, attended the third thematic meeting of the Federal Union of European Minorities (FUEN)'s project on “Women of Minorities”, which was held in Budapest, Hungary. She delivered a keynote speech, focusing on core dimensions of political participation of minority women.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE



Meyeti PAYET
ECMI Consultant



Ljubica DJORDJEVIC
ECMI Senior Researcher



Vello PETTAI
Director of the European
Centre for Minority Issues



Petra RÖTER
President of the Advisory
Committee

*Presentation by the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) –
85th plenary meeting of the Advisory Committee, February 2025.*

Appendix 1

Signatures and ratifications of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ETS No. 157)

Treaty open for signature by Council of Europe member states and up until the date of entry into force by any other state so invited by the Committee of Ministers.

Opening for signature

Place: Strasbourg, France

Date: 1/2/1995

Entry into force

Conditions: 12 ratifications

Date: 1/2/1998

Status as of 29 May 2026

Member states of the Council of Europe

	Signature	Ratification	Entry into force	Denunciation	Denunciation – Entry into force	Notes	R.	D.	A.	T.	C.	O.
Albania	29/6/1995	28/9/1999	1/1/2000									
Andorra												
Armenia	25/7/1997	20/7/1998	1/11/1998									
Austria	1/2/1995	31/3/1998	1/7/1998					X				
Azerbaijan		26/6/2000 a	1/10/2000					X				
Belgium	31/7/2001						X					
Bosnia and Herzegovina		24/2/2000 a	1/6/2000									
Bulgaria	9/10/1997	7/5/1999	1/9/1999					X				
Croatia	6/11/1996	11/10/1997	1/2/1998									
Cyprus	1/2/1995	4/6/1996	1/2/1998									
Czech Republic	28/4/1995	18/12/1997	1/4/1998									
Denmark	1/2/1995	22/9/1997	1/2/1998					X				
Estonia	2/2/1995	6/1/1997	1/2/1998					X				
Finland	1/2/1995	3/10/1997	1/2/1998									
France												
Georgia	21/1/2000	22/12/2005	1/4/2006									
Germany	11/5/1995	10/9/1997	1/2/1998					X				
Greece	22/9/1997											
Hungary	1/2/1995	25/9/1995	1/2/1998									
Iceland	1/2/1995											
Ireland	1/2/1995	7/5/1999	1/9/1999									
Italy	1/2/1995	3/11/1997	1/3/1998									
Latvia	11/5/1995	6/6/2005	1/10/2005					X				

	Signature	Ratification	Entry into force	Denunci- ation	Denunci- ation – Entry into force	Notes	R.	D.	A.	T.	C.	O.
Liechtenstein	1/2/1995	18/11/1997	1/3/1998					X				
Lithuania	1/2/1995	23/3/2000	1/7/2000									
Luxembourg	20/7/1995							X				
Malta	11/5/1995	10/2/1998	1/6/1998				X	X				
Republic of Moldova	13/7/1995	20/11/1996	1/2/1998									
Monaco												
Montenegro		11/5/2001 a	6/6/2006			*						
Netherlands	1/2/1995	16/2/2005	1/6/2005					X		X		
North Macedonia	25/7/1996	10/4/1997	1/2/1998					X				
Norway	1/2/1995	17/3/1999	1/7/1999									
Poland	1/2/1995	20/12/2000	1/4/2001					X				
Portugal	1/2/1995	7/5/2002	1/9/2002									
Romania	1/2/1995	11/5/1995	1/2/1998									
San Marino	11/5/1995	5/12/1996	1/2/1998									
Serbia		11/5/2001 a	1/9/2001			*						
Slovak Republic	1/2/1995	14/9/1995	1/2/1998									
Slovenia	1/2/1995	25/3/1998	1/7/1998					X				
Spain	1/2/1995	1/9/1995	1/2/1998								X	
Sweden	1/2/1995	9/2/2000	1/6/2000					X				
Switzerland	1/2/1995	21/10/1998	1/2/1999					X				
Türkiye												
Ukraine	15/9/1995	26/1/1998	1/5/1998									
United Kingdom	1/2/1995	15/1/1998	1/5/1998									
Non-Members of the Council of Europe												
Russian Federation	28/2/1996	21/8/1998	1/12/1998	3/1/2024	1/8/2024			X				

Total number of signatures not followed by ratifications: 4

Total number of ratifications/accessions: 38

Notes:

* Date of accession by the state union of Serbia and Montenegro.

a: accession; s: signature without reservation as to ratification; su: succession;
r: signature “ad referendum”. R.: reservations; D.: declarations; A.: authorities;
T.: territorial application; C.: communication; O.: objection

Source: Treaty Office on www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/home.

Kosovo* is subject to a specific monitoring arrangement in conformity with the 2004 Agreement between the UNMIK and the Council of Europe.

Appendix 2

Geographical scope of application of the Framework Convention

States parties to the Framework Convention

Albania	Estonia	Malta	Serbia
Armenia	Finland	Republic of Moldova	Slovak Republic
Austria	Georgia	Montenegro	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	Germany	Netherlands	Spain
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Hungary	North Macedonia	Sweden
Bulgaria	Ireland	Norway	Switzerland
Croatia	Italy	Poland	Ukraine
Cyprus	Latvia	Portugal	United Kingdom
Czechia	Liechtenstein	Romania	
Denmark	Lithuania	San Marino	

States having signed but not ratified the Framework Convention

Belgium	Greece	Iceland	Luxembourg
---------	--------	---------	------------

States having neither signed nor ratified the Framework Convention

Andorra	France	Monaco	Türkiye
---------	--------	--------	---------

Kosovo* is subject to a specific monitoring arrangement in conformity with the 2004 Agreement between the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the Council of Europe.

Appendix 3

Composition of the ACFC between 1 June 2024 and 31 May 2026

Petra ROTER (Slovenia) – *President*

Besarion BOKHASHVILI (Georgia) – *First Vice-President*

David SMITH (United Kingdom) – *Second Vice-President*

Pedro AGUILERA CORTÉS (Spain)

Evis ALIMEHMETI (Albania)

Ingeborg BIRNIE-HAVENGA (Netherlands) who replaced Bob DEEN as from September 2024

Laura-Maria CRACIUNEAN-TATU (Romania)

Vladimir DJURIĆ (Serbia)

Yuliia FYSUN (Ukraine)

Tomáš HRUSTIČ (Slovak Republic)

Šarūnas LIEKIS (Lithuania)

Tove H. MALLOY (Denmark) who replaced Jørgen MØLLEKÆR as from March 2024

Egly PANTELAKIS (Cyprus)

Klaus POIER (Austria)

Detlev REIN (Germany)

Roksana RUDEVIČA (Latvia) who replaced Mārtiņš PAPARINSKIS as from September 2024

Elisabeth SÁNDOR-SZALAY (Hungary)

Judith WYTTEBACH (Switzerland) who replaced Nicolas LEVRAT as from June 2024

Appendix 4

Monitoring arrangements under the Framework Convention



The protection of national minorities is a core issue for the Council of Europe, and one of the major achievements in this field is the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The entry into force of the Framework Convention on 1 February 1998 was indeed an event of universal stature, for it is the first ever legally binding multilateral instrument devoted to the protection of national minorities in general.



www.coe.int

The Council of Europe is the continent's leading human rights organisation. It comprises 46 member states, including all members of the European Union. All Council of Europe member states have signed up to the European Convention on Human Rights, a treaty designed to protect human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The European Court of Human Rights oversees the implementation of the Convention in the member states.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE