

ECMI
ISSUE BRIEF



EUROPEAN CENTRE
FOR
MINORITY ISSUES

National Minorities and Socio- Economic Equality: Still Work in Progress

Andreea Cârstocea

ECMI Brief #41
December 2018



The European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) is a non-partisan institution founded in 1996 by the Governments of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the German State of Schleswig-Holstein. ECMI was established in Flensburg, at the heart of the Danish-German border region, in order to draw from the encouraging example of peaceful coexistence between minorities and majorities achieved here. ECMI's aim is to promote interdisciplinary research on issues related to minorities and majorities in a European perspective and to contribute to the improvement of interethnic relations in those parts of Western and Eastern Europe where ethnopolitical tension and conflict prevail.

ECMI Briefs are written either by the staff of ECMI or by outside authors commissioned by the Centre. As ECMI does not propagate opinions of its own, the views expressed in any of its publications are the sole responsibility of the author concerned.

ECMI Issue Brief # 41
European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)
Director: Prof. Dr. Tove H. Malloy
© ECMI 2018



National Minorities and Socio-Economic Equality: Still Work in Progress

National minorities often find themselves at a socio-economic disadvantage, whether in their access to employment, adequate housing, social services or healthcare. The Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the main legal instrument safeguarding the rights of national minorities, includes the right to equality before the law and of equal protection by the law, and the right to effective participation in social and economic life. This Issue brief will focus on the monitoring process of this legal instrument, analysing the extent to which the right to socio-economic participation is monitored by the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The conclusion of the Issue brief will point towards a rather inconsistent and unstructured approach towards the monitoring of this topic and will argue that the socio-economic objectives already developed under the Framework Convention should be followed through in the monitoring of the socio-economic situation of all national minorities, alongside renewed requests for improved data collection by governments.

Andreea Cârstocea, December 2018

ECMI Issue Brief # 41

I. INTRODUCTION

The Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (henceforth FCNM) represents a comprehensive, detailed instrument for the protection of the rights of national minorities across Europe. The set of rights included in this instrument range from political to cultural and socio-economic rights, whose fulfilment by countries that have ratified the FCNM (called ‘State Parties’ in all FCNM-related documents) are closely monitored by an Advisory Committee (ACFC).

National minorities are more likely to be underemployed, and when employed, they are more likely to earn less; housing conditions tend to be poorer, with a below-average standard of living and social services.¹ Starting from the assumption that socio-economic inequalities hinder social cohesion, and that equal socio-economic opportunities for members of national and ethnic minorities in Europe is important not only for general prosperity, but also for the security of the European continent,² this Issue brief will focus on the issue of socio-economic equality of national minorities, as reflected in the monitoring process of the FCNM.



More specifically, this Issue brief will examine the standards set out by the FCNM in the area of socio-economic equality, by reviewing the text of the Convention in conjunction with the FCNM Explanatory Report and the relevant Thematic Commentaries and will analyze the ACFC Opinions in the fourth cycle monitoring in light of these standards.

The conclusion of this Issue brief will point towards an inconsistent, unstructured approach towards the monitoring of socio-economic rights of national minorities. As will be shown in the following, the monitoring reports tend to either disregard altogether this aspect of participation, or simply focus on just one issue – be it employment, access to healthcare, or infrastructure. An important exception to this rule is the analysis of the socio-economic situation of Roma communities, which appears to be much better structured, consistent throughout the Opinions, and usually based on hard data. This Issue brief will argue for the need of taking a similar approach in the analysis of the socio-economic participation of all other national minorities in the future monitoring exercises.

II. The standards: FCNM objectives concerning the realisation of socio-economic rights

As noted above, the two articles of the Framework Convention which are

particularly relevant in considering the promotion of socio-economic equality of national minorities are Art. 4, focusing on equality, and Art. 15, focusing on participation.

Equality. The provisions regarding equality included in the text of the Convention (Art.4), read in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs in the Explanatory Report and Thematic Commentaries Nos. 2 and 4, indicate broadly the approach agreed to by the State Parties. As such, Art. 4 FCNM guarantees the ‘right of equality before the law and of equal protection of the law’ to persons belonging to national minorities and introduces the prohibition of discrimination. Particularly relevant to the present Issue brief is Paragraph 2, which specifies the areas in which State Parties are required to adopt ‘where necessary, adequate measures in order to promote, in all areas of economic, social, political and cultural life, full and effective equality between persons belonging to a national minority and those belonging to the majority’.³

As always in discussions concerning equality, a fundamental question is related to *what kind of equality* is envisaged by the Convention. The text of the FCNM does not *directly* specify whether its vision of equality is oriented towards equality of opportunity or rather towards a (projected) equality of outcomes. However, the inclusion in Art.4 Para.2 of references to ‘adequate measures’ that State Parties have to institute in order to promote full and effective equality points towards an



understanding of equality as equality of opportunities. Indeed, the Explanatory Report spells out the *types of measures* that are envisaged: these should conform to the proportionality principle; and should be limited in time or in scope up to the point when full and effective equality has been achieved.⁴ Moreover, the Explanatory Report makes a point of stating that the reason why there is no provision in the Convention concerning the principle of equal opportunities is that Para.2 Art. 4, through its references to ‘adequate measures’ implies this specific view of equality.⁵

The problem of *data collection* concerning equality is addressed in the *Thematic Commentary No. 4: The scope of application of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* of the ACFC, which points towards the necessity that countries that have ratified the FCNM base their policies for promoting equality on comprehensive data; special mention is made of the importance of regularly collecting reliable data concerning those segments of society which are ‘disempowered economically, socially or geographically, due to their size or because of past experiences of conflict’.⁶

Participation in socio-economic life. While Art.4 focuses on equality and non-discrimination, Art.15 sets out the standards concerning the participation of persons belonging to national minorities in public life. The text of Art.15 is concise and refers simply to the obligation of State Parties to

‘create the conditions necessary for the effective participation of persons belonging to national minorities in cultural, social and economic life and in public affairs, in particular those affecting them’.⁷ The Explanatory Report emphasizes that the purpose of Art.15 is that of encouraging ‘real equality between persons belonging to national minorities and those forming part of the majority’⁸, where ‘real equality’ should likely be understood as the full realization of the principle of equality of opportunity – confirming the understanding of equality as ‘equality of opportunities’ emerging from Art.4.

The Explanatory Report also contains several types of measures that State Parties can employ for creating the necessary conditions for participation by persons belonging to national minorities, e.g. consultation with these persons; involving these persons in the preparation, implementation and assessment of national and regional development plans and programmes likely to affect them directly; undertaking studies, in conjunction with these persons, to assess the possible impact on them of projected development activities; involving persons belonging to national minorities in the decision-making processes and elected bodies both at national and local levels; decentralised or local forms of government.⁹

The second Thematic Commentary of the ACFC, entitled ‘*Commentary on the Effective Participation of Persons Belonging to National Minorities in Cultural, Social*



and Economic Life and in Public Affairs includes a detailed analysis of the conditions which are necessary for the socio-economic participation of such persons. As in the case of the provisions promoting equality, the importance of *anti-discrimination legislation* (in areas such as to employment, housing, health care and social protection) is particularly emphasized, as is the importance of accurate *data collection* on the socio-economic situation of persons belonging to national minorities in order to compare it with the situation of the majority population.¹⁰ The document also recognizes the *administrative obstacles* that national minorities may face and recommends that State Parties should develop adequate training programmes for public service staff; in the same context, it recommends that information on public services and welfare institutions should be easily accessible and possibly available in the languages of national minorities. Importantly, it recommends that public institutions should promote *the recruitment and retention* of persons belonging to national minorities.¹¹ The Commentary also recognizes that sometimes national minorities live in *economically depressed regions* (whether rural, isolated, border, war-damaged, or de-industrialized areas), and therefore should benefit from specific programmes enabling their socio-economic participation.¹²

As for the policy areas in which State Parties are expected to institute special measures promoting the socio-economic participation of persons belonging to national minorities, the Commentary mentions a wide range:

privatization processes; land rights and land usage; access to the labour market, basic social benefits and public services; housing and access to infrastructure; and healthcare.¹³ Finally, the Commentary emphasizes that certain social and economic measures may be required for persons belonging to disadvantaged minority groups to ensure their effective equality, quoting the case of the Roma and Travellers, where it recommends the setting up of comprehensive and long-term strategies.¹⁴

III. Evidence from the monitoring process

As shown in the previous section, the standards set out in the Framework Convention concerning the socio-economic participation and equality of persons belonging to national minorities are wide ranging and – should they find their practical realization – would likely achieve the stated purpose of full and effective equality between such persons and persons belonging to majorities.

Given the range of areas of intervention and types of policies mentioned in the FCNM Explanatory Report and Thematic Commentaries, a closer look at how the ACFC monitors developments on this specific topic of socio-economic equality may be indicative of the relative weight and importance attached to this topic by both the ACFC and State parties. For the purposes of this Issue brief, the fourth cycle monitoring has been used, as providing the most up to date information on the subject.¹⁵



Monitoring of developments concerning equality from a socio-economic perspective (Art. 4 FCNM)

As a general observation, with two exceptions, the fourth cycle monitoring of the developments concerning equality and non-discrimination includes minimal (if any) references to socio-economic aspects of equality.

Despite the general absence of references to socio-economic disparities, there are however aspects related to the promotion of socio-economic equality which are mentioned in a few cases. For instance, in the case of Armenia, the introduction of legislation tackling extreme poverty is commended; while not targeted specifically at minority communities, they also benefit from it.¹⁶ Hungary is requested to ascertain the impact of its policies on the socio-economic position of national minorities,¹⁷ while a Norway 2009 Action Plan for Equality and Prevention of Ethnic Discrimination, covering aspects related to working life, education, housing, public services, culture and the media, is criticized for focusing mainly on immigrants.¹⁸ In all cases mentioned above, there is little acknowledgement as to the actual socio-economic situation of national minorities (whether indicated by statistical data or qualitative indicators), and also few (if any) recommended measures for improving their situation. A somewhat different approach emerges in the Opinion on the United Kingdom, perhaps the most detailed and comprehensive monitoring exercise in the

fourth monitoring cycle, where the analysis is carried out structured along regions and includes several relevant socio-economic aspects (mostly employment, but also education and healthcare).¹⁹

As mentioned above, there are two exceptions to this general lack of emphasis on the socio-economic aspects of equality. The two exceptions refer to the situation of the Roma minority, and respectively to post-conflict societies. In the case of the Roma, a structured and usually detailed monitoring exercise can be discerned across countries; most often, the observations related to socio-economic inequalities refer to housing, education, health and employment. The ACFC Opinions usually include observations related to the current situation, as well as recommended measures to improve it. In the cases of Croatia²⁰ and FYROM,²¹ there are a set of comprehensive observations concerning socio-economic aspects of equality in post-conflict societies, covering both the Roma community and other national minorities.

One important aspect that should be noted is the fact that data collection is flagged as a recurring and persistent problem throughout. Indeed, the lack of quality, segregated data may be a very important reason why a more structured and consistent approach to monitoring socio-economic inequalities affecting persons belonging to national minorities is missing. Indeed, scholars have noted that the absence of data makes assessments of the effective and equal access to rights very difficult; furthermore, it



considerably complicates the drafting of policies in this respect.²²

Monitoring concerning the socio-economic participation of persons belonging to national minorities (Art. 15 FCNM)

As noted in the second section of this Issue brief, the standards put forth by the Framework Convention (read in conjunction with the Explanatory Report and Thematic Commentaries) point towards several areas of concern, in which State Parties are required to take action to ensure the socio-economic participation of persons belonging to national minorities (access to the labour market, basic social benefits and public services; housing and access to infrastructure; healthcare; privatization processes; land rights and land usage).

These are all important – and obviously the list is not exhaustive – objectives that this Issue brief has attempted to follow, in its reading of the monitoring reports pertaining to the Fourth cycle of the monitoring process of the FCNM. As in the case of the monitoring of the developments under Art.4, the picture that emerges is that of an incomplete and inconsistent monitoring exercise. For some countries (i.e. Armenia,²³ Denmark,²⁴ Germany,²⁵ Norway,²⁶ Italy,²⁷ and Czechia²⁸) the only aspect monitored under Art.15 (for national minorities other than the Roma) is that of representation of national minorities in elected bodies, with no mention of socio-economic participation. In most other cases, socio-economic participation is addressed as a standalone section, but instead of following a set of

aspects related to socio-economic participation, reports usually focus on just one such topic. For instance, the Opinion on Austria²⁹ highlights the rising unemployment in areas inhabited by minorities and contains no other reference to other issues; similarly, in the cases of the UK³⁰ and Estonia³¹ access to employment is the only issue emphasized, while the report on Finland³² highlights briefly the difficulties in the access to social and health services by the Sami.

In several cases (Cyprus,³³ Hungary,³⁴ the Slovak Republic³⁵) the monitoring reports briefly mention that the socio-economic situation of national minorities does not diverge from that of the majority population. While indeed that can be the case for some minorities, such a blanket statement is problematic; as noted by Marc Weller, justifications by governments that economic divergences may be due to lagging regional development, rather than national, ethnic, religious, or linguistic factors, are not likely to persuade in this respect; instead, governments should endeavor to develop measures for counteracting the effects of such structural differences.³⁶

As in the case of Art.4, the only national minority whose situation is analyzed comprehensively along a clearer structure is that of the Roma. For most countries with a Roma population, the socio-economic aspects of participation of the Roma minority are structured along four main sectors – access to healthcare, employment, housing and education (this last aspect is



usually only tangentially dealt with, as Art. 12 of the FCNM is concerned exclusively with education). Again, as in the case of Art.4, in the cases of Croatia³⁷ and FYROM,³⁸ the monitoring is a lot more detailed and follows through several aspects related to socio-economic participation of national minorities (alongside several aspects which affect specifically the Roma minority): underdevelopment of infrastructure, access to healthcare and utilities, and underemployment.

IV. Conclusions

This Issue brief has attempted to analyse the monitoring by the ACFC of the socio-economic participation of persons belonging to national minorities, in light of the standards set out in the FCNM and its accompanying documents.

As outlined above, the picture that emerges is one of inconsistency and lack of structured monitoring. Although the FCNM provides a set of objectives, they are not followed through by the monitoring; what is more, in the case of some countries the monitoring of socio-economic participation appears almost absent, while for others there are only certain aspects that are highlighted.

The only minority whose right to socio-economic participation appears to be

consistently monitored, using a similarly structured approach across the board is the Roma; aspects related to employment, access to healthcare and housing are present throughout the Opinions. As noted in the introduction, national minorities are generally more likely to find themselves at a socio-economic disadvantage, it follows therefore that monitoring should be expanded to include other national minorities as well.

A general lack of statistical data regarding the socio-economic situation of national minorities could be one of the reasons for the lack of consistency and structure; indeed, the monitoring of the fulfilment of the obligations under Art.4 repeatedly call for improved collection of disaggregated data.

In any case, the absence of a consistent and structured approach in monitoring socio-economic aspects of participation by the ACFC means that governments will have little incentive to develop relevant policies in this area. It is for this reason that the objectives already developed by the FCNM should be applied in the future monitoring of the socio-economic situation of all national minorities, consistently and in a structured manner, alongside renewed requests for improved data collection by governments.



Notes

¹ Gudmundur Alfredsson, 'Article 4', in Marc Weller (ed.), *The Rights of Minorities in Europe. A Commentary on the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 142-143.

² Jonathan Wheatley, 'The Economic Dimension of Minority Participation in Europe', *ECMI Issue Brief*, February 2007, p.3. Retrieved from https://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/brief_15.pdf. (Accessed 16 December 2018).

³ See Art. 4, Para.2, of the Council of Europe *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report* (1995). Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H\(1995\)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H(1995)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf) (Accessed 16 December 2018).

⁴ Council of Europe, 'Explanatory Report', in the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report* (1995), p.16. Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H\(1995\)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H(1995)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf) (Accessed 16 December 2018).

⁵ Idem.

⁶ Council of Europe, *The Framework Convention: a key tool to managing diversity through minority rights. Thematic commentary No. 4: The scope of application of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Strasbourg: Documents and Publications Production Department, Council of Europe, 2016), p.22. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806a8fe8>. (Accessed 16 December 2018).

⁷ Art. 15 of the Council of Europe *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report* (1995). Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H\(1995\)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H(1995)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf). (Accessed 16 December 2018).

⁸ Council of Europe, 'Explanatory Report' in the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report* (1995), p.22. Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H\(1995\)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/1_AtGlance/PDF_H(1995)010_FCNM_ExplanReport_en.pdf) (Accessed 16 December 2018).

⁹ Idem, pp.22-23.

¹⁰ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Commentary on the Effective Participation of Persons Belonging to National Minorities in Cultural, Social and Economic Life and in Public Affairs*, 27 February 2008, p.4. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/3_FCNMdocs/PDF_CommentaryParticipation_en.pdf.

¹¹ Idem, p.5.

¹² Ibidem.

¹³ Ibidem, pp.5-6.

¹⁴ Ibidem, p.5.

¹⁵ See Council of Europe, National Minorities (FCNM) website, *Compilation of Advisory Committee public Opinions from the fourth cycle: article by article*. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/compilation-of-opinions>. (Accessed 16 December 2018).

¹⁶ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Armenia*, Strasbourg, 2016, p.12, Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/16806f7f70>. (Accessed 16 December 2018).

¹⁷ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Hungary*, Strasbourg, 2016, pp.4-5, Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ac04b>. (Accessed 16 December 2018).



¹⁸ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Norway*, Strasbourg, 2016, p.21. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/168070741d>. (Accessed 16 December 2018).

¹⁹ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on the United Kingdom*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/16806fb9ab>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁰ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Croatia*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806c268b>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²¹ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806d23e3>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²² Barbara Wilson, 'Commentary of Article 4 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities', in Rainer Hoffman, Tove H. Malloy and Detlev Rein (eds.), *The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. A Commentary* (Leiden and Boston: Brill Nijhoff, 2018), p.121.

²³ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Armenia*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/16806f7f70>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁴ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Denmark*, Strasbourg, 2014. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016801cdeca> (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁵ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Germany*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016805946c6>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁶ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Norway*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/168070741d>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁷ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Italy*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806959b9>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁸ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on the Czech Republic*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680684ff9>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

²⁹ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Austria*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/168070f1e3>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

³⁰ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on the United Kingdom*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/16806fb9ab>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

³¹ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Estonia*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168047d0e5>. (Accessed 17 December 2018).

³² See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Finland*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from



<https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ae11a>.
(Accessed 17 December 2018).

³³ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Cyprus*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680483b48>.
(Accessed 17 December 2018).

³⁴ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Hungary*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ac04b>.
(Accessed 16 December 2018).

³⁵ Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on the Slovak Republic*, Strasbourg, 2014. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680303190>.
(Accessed 16 December 2018).

³⁶ Marc Weller, 'Article 15', in Marc Weller (ed.), *The Rights of Minorities in Europe. A Commentary on the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.455.

³⁷ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on Croatia*, Strasbourg, 2015. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806c268b>.
(Accessed 17 December 2018).

³⁸ See Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, *Fourth Opinion on 'the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'*, Strasbourg, 2016. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806d23e3>.
(Accessed 17 December 2018).



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Andreea Cârstocea

ECMI Senior Research Associate

*Contact: carstocea@ecmi.de

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION SEE

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES (ECMI)

Schiffbruecke 12 (Kompagnietor) D-24939 Flensburg

☎ +49-(0)461-14 14 9-0 * fax +49-(0)461-14 14 9-19

* E-Mail: info@ecmi.de * Internet: <http://www.ecmi.de>