

31 May 2002



ACFC/INF(2002)001

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE FRAMEWORK CONVENTION
FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES**

THIRD ACTIVITY REPORT
covering the period from 1 November 2000
to 31 May 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Activities during the reporting period	4
i)	Plenary Meetings	4
ii)	Examination of State reports	4
iii)	Written correspondence with reporting States and other sources	5
iv)	Country-visits	5
v)	Adoption of Opinions	6
vi)	Co-operation with the Committee of Ministers	7
vii)	Follow-up to the results of the monitoring	9
viii)	Co-operation with other bodies	10
3.	Organisational issues	11
i)	Membership	11
ii)	Resources of the Advisory Committee and delays in the submission of Opinions	11
4.	Concluding remarks	12
	APPENDIX I	14
	APPENDIX II	18
	APPENDIX III	19

* * *

1. Introduction

1. The purpose of the present report is to provide the Committee of Ministers and others interested in the implementation and monitoring of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities with an overview of the work carried out by the Advisory Committee. The coverage of the present report is 18 months so as to include developments up to the end of the term of the current composition of the Advisory Committee. In Section II, the report outlines the main decisions taken during the reporting period and contacts that the Advisory Committee has had with various institutions. In Section III, the report addresses the principal organisational issues related to the work of the Advisory Committee, including the resources allocated to its work.

2. On 10 November 1994 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Opened for signature on 1 February 1995, the Framework Convention entered into force, after the deposit of 12 ratifications, on 1 February 1998.

3. During the period covered by the present report (1 November 2000 – 31 May 2002), Poland, Portugal and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia ratified the Framework Convention and Belgium signed this treaty. As a result, as at 31 May 2002, 35 States have ratified the Framework Convention and 7 member States have signed but not yet ratified this treaty (see Appendix I).

4. The monitoring mechanism of the Framework Convention is based on Articles 24 - 26 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and on the Committee of Ministers' Resolution (97) 10 as well as other relevant decisions. The evaluation of the adequacy of the implementation of the Framework Convention by the Parties is to be carried out by the Committee of Ministers, which is assisted by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee is composed of 18 independent and impartial experts appointed by the Committee of Ministers (see Appendix II).

5. The States Parties are required to submit a report containing full information on legislative and other measures taken to give effect to the principles of the Framework Convention within one year of the entry into force. These state reports are made public and examined by the Advisory Committee, which is to prepare an Opinion on the measures taken by each reporting State. Having received the Opinion of the Advisory Committee and the comment from the respective State, the Committee of Ministers is called on to adopt conclusions and, where appropriate, recommendations in respect of the State Party concerned.

6. By 31 May 2002, the Advisory Committee had received 28 state reports, ten of which were received during the reporting period (see Appendix I). By 31 May 2002, the Advisory Committee had adopted 19 Opinions, of which 15 were adopted during the period covered by the present report.

2. Activities during the reporting period

i) Plenary Meetings

7. In the course of the reporting period, the Advisory Committee held six plenary meetings in Strasbourg:

- 9th plenary meeting: 27-30 November 2000
- 10th plenary meeting: 2-6 April 2001
- 11th plenary meeting: 10-14 September 2001
- 12th plenary meeting: 26-30 November 2001
- 13th plenary meeting: 25 February - 1 March 2002
- 14th plenary meeting: 13-17 May 2002

8. In addition, the Bureau of the Advisory Committee, which usually met in the context of plenary meetings to reduce costs, held a meeting on 9 February 2001.

9. In the course of the plenaries, the Advisory Committee adopted Opinions on 15 State Parties. The process leading to the adoption of the Opinion involved several stages, which are outlined and commented upon below.

ii) Examination of State reports

10. During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee received initial reports, in one of the official languages of the Council of Europe, from the following State Parties: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Ireland, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

11. The Advisory Committee began the examination of these reports in its country-specific working groups. In addition, a number of reports received prior to the reporting period were examined in the course of the plenary meetings.

12. The Advisory Committee appreciates the quality of many of the state reports received, although there is still scope for improvement in particular as regards the inclusion of information on the relevant practice and of pertinent statistical data. The Advisory Committee welcomes the fact that an increasing number of States have consulted representatives of minority organisations and other independent sources in the course of the drafting of the state report. Furthermore, in some cases the State concerned has indicated not only positive developments but also shortcomings and difficulties that remain in the implementation of the Framework Convention in the country at issue. In the Opinion of the Advisory Committee, such an approach constitutes an excellent basis for a dialogue and improved implementation of the Framework Convention.

13. The Advisory Committee understands that reporting requires comprehensive consultations with both governmental and other sources. This can be a time-consuming process. The Advisory Committee therefore appreciates that a large number of States Parties have been able to submit their report by the deadline foreseen in Article 25 of the Framework Convention or within a short delay thereof.

14. The Advisory Committee is however concerned that several States were more than a year late in submitting their reports and that, in some cases, the reporting delays are so important that they risk undermining the first cycle of monitoring in the countries concerned (see

Appendix II). The Advisory Committee is therefore of the view that the Committee of Ministers should address this concern as a matter of priority with a view to ensuring that cases of persistent failure to report under the Framework Convention do not result in a continuous lack of monitoring of the countries concerned.

iii) Written correspondence with reporting States and other sources

15. During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee has continued its practice of addressing, after the initial examination of a state report, a questionnaire in writing to the State Party concerned, seeking further information and focusing notably on the implementation of relevant norms in practice, in accordance with Rule 29 of the Committee of Ministers' Resolution (97)10. This element of a constructive dialogue between the Advisory Committee and the States Parties has greatly contributed to the understanding of the situation in a country. At the same time, the Advisory Committee acknowledges that the process requires resources and time from the reporting State and from the Advisory Committee and that it would therefore be advisable to design the future monitoring cycles in a manner that ensures that most pertinent questions are addressed in the actual state reports. This would reduce the length of any follow-up questionnaires submitted by the Advisory Committee and make the pertinent information more accessible, bearing in mind that only a limited number of States have made their replies to the questionnaire public.

16. In addition to information from the Government, the Advisory Committee continued to receive a significant amount of materials from other sources. Many of the "alternative reports" drawn up specifically for the Advisory Committee on an article-by-article basis were of high quality and constituted a valuable source for the Advisory Committee. Reports from other Council of Europe bodies, such as the Committee of Experts of the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and ECRI, were also carefully consulted by the Advisory Committee. Additionally, the Advisory Committee regularly examined pertinent materials from other international organisations, including the UN, OSCE and the EU.

iv) Country-visits

17. With respect to various working methods designed over the first four years of its operation, perhaps the most important step was the introduction of country-visits by the relevant working groups of the Advisory Committee as a customary element of the monitoring procedure. During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee and the States concerned consolidated this practice further through visits to the following 13 States:

Cyprus:	6-8 November 2000
Italy:	11-13 December 2000
Estonia:	28 May-1 June 2001
UK:	4-8 June 2001
Germany:	26-29 June 2001
Moldova:	31 October - 5 November 2001
Ukraine:	3-7 December 2001
Armenia:	10-14 December 2001
Austria:	18-21 December 2001
Slovenia:	10-15 January 2002
Russian Federation:	11-15 February 2002
Norway:	29 April - 3 May 2002

In each case where the Advisory Committee sought an invitation to visit a State, such an invitation was received. This has been a highly constructive development consistent with Article 2 of the Framework Convention.

18. These visits have turned out to be instrumental not only in terms of ensuring quality Opinions but also as an essential element of the constructive dialogue with the State Party and others concerned. This dialogue has allowed the Advisory Committee to obtain a much clearer picture than that which could be developed through written correspondence only. The visits have also served to make the Framework Convention and principles contained therein more widely known in both governmental and non-governmental circles and thereby contributed significantly to the implementation of this treaty. In addition to making the Advisory Committee aware of challenges faced in the implementation of the Framework Convention, in a number of cases the country-visits have also helped the Advisory Committee to identify positive tendencies and inter-ethnic dialogue going beyond the impression given in the corresponding written submissions.

19. In addition to fruitful dialogue with various Governmental bodies, the country-visits consist of extensive contacts with NGOs and other independent sources, pursuant to the authorisation given by the Ministers' Deputies, at their 708th meeting on 3 May 2000.

20. In the context of the country visits, the Advisory Committee has realised more and more the value of travelling outside the capitals to regions where national minorities reside in substantial numbers. Such visits to the regions have often been suggested by the country concerned although they may in some cases be difficult to organise. They improve the out-reach of the Framework Convention and the quality of the work of the Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee therefore expects to make them a regular element of the visits where appropriate.

v) Adoption of Opinions

21. The Advisory Committee adopted and transmitted to the Committee of Ministers the following 15 Opinions in the last 18 months:

30 November 2000:	Liechtenstein Malta San Marino
6 April 2001:	Croatia Cyprus Czech Republic Romania
14 September 2001:	Estonia Italy
30 November 2001:	United Kingdom
1 March 2002:	Germany Moldova Ukraine
16 May 2002:	Armenia Austria

In addition, the Advisory Committee commenced the examination of 8 state reports without yet adopting Opinions on these States.

22. The Advisory Committee did its utmost to ensure that these Opinions are as detailed, objective and accurate as possible and that they thereby constitute a good basis on which the Committee of Ministers can build its respective conclusions and recommendations. The Advisory Committee drafted the above Opinions in a manner that reflects the fact that the Framework Convention is a flexible instrument that nevertheless sets legal standards for the protection of national minorities. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee attempted to draw up Opinions that demonstrate that the Advisory Committee does not attempt to be a court but rather a catalyst for the improved implementation of the Convention. It is also important to note that the Opinions are to be read in conjunction with the corresponding state report especially since the latter often contains important descriptive elements that are not repeated in the Opinion.

23. The Advisory Committee was pleased to note that most of the countries concerned welcomed the Opinions of the Advisory Committee and provided constructive comments on them, in many cases indicating that the Opinion has already prompted increased action to address specific shortcomings in the implementation of the Framework Convention. The Opinions appear to have stimulated fresh rounds of interdepartmental discussions within governments and in some cases they have prompted an immediate dialogue with national minorities on the issues raised.

24. It is imperative that these Opinions, together with the resolutions of the Committee of Ministers, are translated into the language(s) of the countries concerned. So far, a number of States have already done this, but there remains scope for improvement in this respect.

vi) Co-operation with the Committee of Ministers

25. During its first years of operation, the Advisory Committee was able to address a number of procedural matters in a satisfactory manner as a result of the co-operation and support it received from the Committee of Ministers. But as was stated in the previous activity report, “the effectiveness in practice of the monitoring mechanism can only be tested once the Committee of Ministers has adopted its conclusions and recommendations, which the States Parties concerned will then be expected to put into effect”. Hence, a key question at the outset of the present reporting period was how the Committee of Ministers ensures complementarity between the Opinions of the Advisory Committee and the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee of Ministers.

26. The first resolutions on the implementation of the Framework Convention were adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 31 October 2001 and to date altogether 11 country-specific resolutions have been adopted. Having examined these resolutions of the Committee of Ministers, the Advisory Committee considers that these first results are promising bearing in mind that this is the initial cycle of monitoring of the Framework Convention. The Committee of Ministers decided not to follow the proposal of the Advisory Committee to adopt detailed conclusions and recommendations and preferred to formulate more general and shorter resolutions. But the Committee of Ministers’ message is very largely in line with that of the corresponding Opinion of the Advisory Committee and their concluding remarks. The Advisory Committee further notes with considerable satisfaction that in all the resolutions adopted so far, the Committee of Ministers recommends that the State take into account not only the conclusions of the Committee of Ministers but also various comments in the Advisory Committee’s Opinion. The resolutions are greatly reinforced by the fact that the Committee of Ministers has placed an emphasis on the follow-up to these first results of the monitoring. The Committee of Ministers has endorsed the idea, fully shared by the Advisory Committee, that the monitoring of the Framework Convention is not about one-off meetings, followed by a silence

of five years, but about continuing, constructive dialogue and the continuous strengthening of the implementation of the Framework Convention (see also related comments in section vii).

27. Following the adoption of the first resolutions of the Committee of Ministers, the Advisory Committee re-examined the structure of its Opinion so as to ensure that they facilitate the task of the Committee of Ministers and thereby contribute to the effective monitoring and implementation of the Framework Convention. At its meeting on 30 November 2001, the Advisory Committee decided to introduce some changes in the structure of the Opinions, which do not affect the substance of the points raised therein. In particular, it decided to discontinue the practice of submitting a “Proposal for conclusions and recommendations by the Committee of Ministers” (Section V of the earlier Opinions) and to introduce a new section IV – which may be useful also in the context of the follow-up - entitled “Main findings and comments of the Advisory Committee”.

28. Direct contacts between the representatives of the Advisory Committee and those of the Committee of Ministers have also contributed to the complementarity and co-operation between the work of these two bodies. During the period covered by the present report, the President of the Advisory Committee and other members of the Bureau were given an opportunity to address a meeting of the Ministers’ Deputies and four meetings of the Deputies’ Rapporteur Group on Human Rights (GR-H) and to have an open and constructive discussion on the implementation of the Framework Convention.

29. The principle, contained in the Explanatory Report of the Framework Convention, that the implementation and monitoring of the Framework Convention shall, in so far as possible, be transparent is essential for the success of the monitoring. It is therefore pleased that certain progress has been achieved in this respect during the period covered by the present report. The Committee of Ministers agreed that States Parties may publish the Advisory Committee’s Opinion concerning them as well as their written comments before the adoption of the respective conclusions and possible recommendations by the Committee of Ministers.

30. Since the adoption of the above-mentioned decision, the following States have decided to publish the Opinion together with the State’s comments thereon before the adoption of the corresponding resolution of the Committee of Ministers, on the dates indicated below:

- Finland (6 July 2001)
- Slovakia (6 July 2001)
- Liechtenstein (4 September 2001)
- Hungary (14 September 2001)
- Romania (10 January 2002)
- Czech Republic (25 January 2002)
- Estonia (12 April 2002)
- United Kingdom (22 May 2002)

31. The Advisory Committee appreciate these decisions, which have improved the transparency of the process and contributed to the dialogue of all the relevant actors on the implementation of the Framework Convention. It is to be hoped that other States will also support transparency in a similar manner. In this connection, the Advisory Committee recalls that, whereas so far the States opting for early publication of the Opinion have made the Opinion public after the submission of the corresponding comment by the State, nothing prevents the State concerned from publishing the Opinion immediately upon its receipt. Such an approach would further advance the accessibility of the process, bearing in mind that the States are required to submit their comments four months after the submission of the Opinion.

32. The Advisory Committee also appreciated the opportunity to have a dialogue with the Committee of Ministers outside the formal monitoring framework, notably as regards the Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation 1492 on the rights of national minorities. Further to a request by the Committee of Ministers, the Advisory Committee formulated an Opinion on the said Recommendation at its 11th meeting on 14 September 2001.

vii) Follow-up to the results of the monitoring

33. In all resolutions adopted so far on the implementation of the Framework Convention the Committee of Ministers has asked the country concerned to “continue the dialogue in progress” with the Advisory Committee and to keep the Advisory Committee regularly informed of the measures taken in response to the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee of Ministers. Furthermore, the Committee of Ministers has invited the Advisory Committee to take note of these resolutions, in particular as regards the follow-up to the adopted conclusions and recommendations.

34. The monitoring of the Framework Convention should be an on-going process, which is to be carried out in a spirit of constructive dialogue. The Advisory Committee therefore welcomes the emphasis placed by the Committee of Ministers on the follow-up and the role given to the Advisory Committee therein, in accordance with Rule 36 of Resolution (97)10.

35. As regards the methods through which the constructive dialogue could be pursued between the submissions of state reports, the Advisory Committee believes that this issue should be approached in a flexible manner, and it is in this spirit that the Advisory Committee has commenced the practice of contacting, after the adoption of the respective resolutions, the countries concerned to discuss how such follow-up could be carried out. Certain valuable initiatives have already emerged in this connection, and merit being expanded further.

36. In particular, the Advisory Committee would like to highlight the initiative of a number of States Parties to organise, in co-operation with the Council of Europe, so-called “follow-up seminars”, bringing together authorities and experts from both Governmental and non-governmental circles as well as representatives of the Advisory Committee to discuss the implementation of the first results of the monitoring of the Framework Convention in the country concerned.

37. The first “follow-up seminar” was organised in Helsinki on 1 February 2002 to discuss the implementation of the first results of monitoring with respect to Finland and the second follow-up seminar was organised in Zagreb on 21 March 2002 to discuss the first results of monitoring as regards Croatia. A number of other States on which a resolution of the Committee of Ministers have been adopted are planning to organise similar events, including Hungary and Romania.

38. These seminars proved to be an excellent means to promote the implementation of the Framework Convention. The basis of discussion were the Opinion of the Advisory Committee and the Resolution of the Committee of Ministers and the written comments of the Government on the Opinion were also central material for the seminars. It was considered particularly useful that these events were inclusive in nature and that both governmental and non-governmental views were expressed in an open and constructive manner. It was also emphasised that publication of the results of such seminars, including on the Internet, would further increase their impact. It was obvious that in both countries certain steps had been taken to address the

concerns expressed in the context of the monitoring and to consolidate work being undertaken. At the same time, there was a willingness to examine the challenges that still remain to be tackled.

39. Such seminars are also a useful example of a linkage between the monitoring activities and co-operation programmes of the Council of Europe. Although they are clearly linked to the monitoring process and the programmes of the meetings are based on the first results of the monitoring, the follow-up seminars as such are construed not as formal monitoring but rather as co-operation activities. This enables the organisers to design the format of seminars in an optimum manner. For example, the seminars can be organised in a more transparent way than the in-country meetings organised in the context of the formal monitoring process by the Advisory Committee, as the latter meetings are as a rule to be held in closed session pursuant to Resolution (97)10. The flexible format of these seminars makes it possible to include, where appropriate, other relevant bodies in the discussions. For example, the follow-up seminar in Finland included representatives of the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, and part of the session was devoted to the examination of the implementation of the Charter, and the participants of the Croatia follow-up seminar included representatives of the OSCE and other international bodies working on related issues.

40. It is important to keep the Committee of Ministers and others interested in the process regularly informed about the progress with respect to the follow-up. The Advisory Committee considers that the future activity reports of the Advisory Committee could be one a suitable channel to submit such information.

viii) Co-operation with other bodies

41. During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee also established and/or strengthened contacts with various bodies of the Council of Europe. For example, there were contacts with the representatives of the Committee of Experts of the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, ECRI as well as the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights. Notwithstanding these contacts, there is scope for intensifying further these contacts and developing synergies with the relevant bodies of the Council of Europe, particularly in the implementation of the resolutions of the Committee of Ministers on the Framework Convention and in the follow-up process.

42. The Advisory Committee also had contacts, in particular during its country-visits, with representatives of various international organisations in the countries concerned, including the EU, OSCE and the UNHCR.

43. In order to make the Framework Convention better known among experts and the public at large, members of the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat of the Framework Convention took part in a range of international and domestic events organised on minority issues during the reporting period. These included the 8th (Strasbourg, 21 May 2001) and 9th Meeting of the Government Offices for National minorities (Vilnius, 25-26 April 2002), which provided a valuable forum for discussion on issues pertaining to the Framework Convention. Members of the Advisory Committee also provided input to the annual training programme of the NGO *Minority Rights Group* (MRG) aimed at strengthening NGOs awareness of, and role in, the implementation and monitoring of the Framework Convention throughout Europe and they also participated in a number of other initiatives carried out in the framework of the Council of Europe's Activities for the development and consolidation of democratic stability programme and the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe.

44. To meet the increasing demand for materials related to the Framework Convention, the Web site of the Secretariat of the Framework Convention (<http://www.humanrights.coe.int/minorities/index.htm>) has been expanded further, although the limited staff resources have hampered its further development.

3. Organisational issues

i) Membership

45. As at 31 May 2002, the Advisory Committee has 18 ordinary members (see Appendix III). The composition remained unchanged during the reporting period, except that the casual vacancy caused by the resignation of the expert appointed in respect of Finland was filled by an appointment by the Committee of Ministers on 15 November 2000.

46. As indicated in Appendix III, the terms of office of 9 ordinary members will expire on 31 May 2002. Following the drawing of lots by the Ministers' Deputies at their 718th meeting on 19 July 2000, on the basis of Rule 16 of Resolution (97) 10, the terms of office of 9 ordinary members were extended by two years and will thus expire on 31 May 2004.

47. At their 788 meeting on 13 March 2002 and in accordance with Rules 15 and 16 of Resolution (97) 10, the Committee of Ministers appointed by drawing lots 9 experts as ordinary members to fill the 9 seats on the Advisory Committee which will become vacant on 1 June 2002. These experts were appointed for a four-year term expiring on 31 May 2006 (see Appendix III).

ii) Resources of the Advisory Committee and delays in the submission of Opinions

48. From the outset of its activities, the Advisory Committee has stressed that, in order to ensure the effective functioning of the monitoring mechanism of the Framework Convention, adequate resources must be allocated for the work of the Advisory Committee. During the reporting period, the Advisory Committee witnessed certain improvements, including the appointment of an Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention. Notwithstanding these improvements, the Advisory Committee considers that the level of its staff and other resources remain a matter of serious concern as these resources are still clearly incommensurate to its increasing workload.

49. During the last 18 months, lack of adequate resources had a negative impact on the work of the Advisory Committee. In particular, the delays between the submission of state reports and the adoption of the respective Opinions were so long that, when coupled with delays in the considerations by the Committee of Ministers, they damaged the effectiveness of the entire monitoring mechanism. It took on average over 20 months from the time of receiving a state report to the adoption of the respective Opinion by the Advisory Committee (see Appendix I). The importance of speeding up the monitoring procedure has been repeatedly emphasised by both Governmental and non-governmental circles, including the 9th meeting of the Governmental Offices for National Minorities in Vilnius on 25-26 April 2002.

50. Faced with limited resources, the Advisory Committee has done its utmost to streamline its working methods. An increasing amount of preparatory work is carried out in working groups and the number of plenary meetings has been reduced from five to three per year in order to release funds for country-visits. But without staff and operational resources - needed inter alia

for additional working group meetings - it is impossible for the Advisory Committee to eliminate the existing undue delays in the monitoring without harming the quality of its work.

51. It needs to be noted in this connection that the role of the members of Secretariat is not restricted to servicing the Advisory Committee but they carry out also a wide range of other related tasks, including a substantial amount of time devoted to the work related to the monitoring function of the Committee of Ministers under the Framework Convention and work related to the co-operation activities in the minorities field, such as non-discrimination reviews and other Stability Pact initiatives as well as annual meetings of the Government Offices for National Minorities.

52. The Advisory Committee would also like to emphasise that the need to bolster the Secretariat resources is particularly acute now that the follow-up activities are being designed and implemented. It is imperative that the importance of the follow-up be reflected also in the Secretariat resources allocated for this purpose.

53. Bearing in mind that the Framework Convention and its effective implementation is one of the priorities of the Council of Europe, the Advisory Committee urges that the issue of adequate resources current shortcomings in means available to its monitoring mechanism will be rapidly addressed and overcome.

54. The Advisory Committee recalls in this connection that there will be a new peak in the submission of state report in 2004, in the course of which 23 States Parties are due to submit their second report on the implementation of the Framework Convention. In addition to the need to secure adequate resources for that period, the Advisory Committee underlines that the second reporting cycle needs to be designed in a manner that ensures the maximum level of efficiency. It is with this in mind that the Advisory Committee has begun to consider a draft outline for the second state reports with a view to submitting it to the Committee of Ministers for approval in accordance with Rule 41 of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee.

4. Concluding remarks

55. The monitoring of the Framework Convention advanced greatly during the period covered by the present report. The Advisory Committee developed further its working methods, including country-visits, and adopted 15 Opinions. The Committee of Ministers established the modalities of its monitoring work and adopted its first country-specific conclusions and recommendations on the implementation of the Framework Convention, which reflected to a great extent the corresponding concluding remarks of the Advisory Committee.

56. There was also progress with respect to transparency of the monitoring process, with an increasing number of State Parties making the Opinions of the Advisory Committee public at an early stage.

57. In the course of the reporting period, the importance of the follow-up to the results of the monitoring was emphasised by the Advisory Committee and others concerned and first examples of the way in which this could be carried out emerged during the reporting period. In particular, the idea of inclusive "follow-up meeting" was supported by the Advisory Committee and a number of State Parties.

58. The Advisory Committee was pleased with the support it received from the Committee of Ministers and the State Parties, albeit it was concerned about the significant delays in the submission of some state reports. The commitment to the monitoring process was however not fully reflected in the resources allocated to this task. Despite some improvements, the resources

remained incommensurate to the workload. This contributed further to the substantial delays in the monitoring process, which prompted strong calls, from both Governmental and non-governmental circles, to speed up the procedure. Furthermore, lack of adequate resources raised questions as to whether the Advisory Committee can effectively carry out its tasks in relation to the follow-up. The Advisory Committee therefore finds it essential that the resource issue is addressed prior to the beginning of the second monitoring cycle.

59. The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and its effective implementation is one of the stated priorities of the Council of Europe. During the last 18 months the Framework Convention as its monitoring mechanism has developed to become a central tool in the protection of national minorities in Europe. The protection of national minorities, through the Framework Convention, is a process. This process is still at an early stage and the forthcoming stages will be a crucial test of the capacity of the Framework Convention to promote practical moves from analysis to action.

* * *

APPENDIX I

Updated 31 May 2002 / Mis à jour le 31 mai 2002

FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES (CHART OF SIGNATURES AND RATIFICATIONS AND STATUS OF MONITORING WORK)

CONVENTION-CADRE POUR LA PROTECTION DES MINORITES NATIONALES (ETAT DES SIGNATURES ET RATIFICATIONS ET LA SITUATION DU SUIVI)

MEMBER STATES / ETATS MEMBRES	Date of signature / Date de signature	Date of ratification/ Date de ratification	Date of entry into force / Date d'entrée en vigueur	First report due/ Premier rapport attendu	First report received/ Premier rapport reçu *	First Committee adopted / Premier Comité consultatif le
ALBANIA / ALBANIE	29/06/95	28/09/99	01/01/2000	01/01/2001	26/07/2001	
ANDORRA / ANDORRE						
ARMENIA / ARMENIE	/ 25/07/97	20/07/98	01/11/1998	01/11/1999	11/06/2001	16/05/2002 (not yet public / pas rendu public)
AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE	/ 01/02/95	31/03/98	01/07/1998	01/07/1999	15/11/2000	16/05/2002 (not yet public / pas rendu public)
AZERBAIJAN / AZERBAIDJAN	Accession / adhésion 26/06/2000		01/10/2000	01/10/2001		
BELGIUM / BELGIQUE	31/07/2001					
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE ET HERZÉGOVINE	Accession / adhésion 24/02/2000		01/06/2000	01/06/2001		
BULGARIA / BULGARIE	09/10/97	07/05/99	01/09/1999	01/09/2000		
CROATIA / CROATIE	06/11/96	11/10/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	16/03/1999	06/04/2001 (published on / public le 06/02/2001)
CYPRUS / CHYPRE	01/02/95	04/06/96	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	01/03/1999	06/04/2001 (published on / public le 21/02/2001)

* The dates below refer to the submission of reports in one of the official languages of the Council of Europe. This is without prejudice to a possible earlier submission in the original language. / Les dates ci-dessous se réfèrent à la présentation des rapports dans l'une des langues officielles du Conseil de l'Europe, sans préjudice d'une présentation antérieure dans la langue originale.

** Date on which the Council of Europe received the country's communication relating to the publication of the opinion before the adoption of the Committee of Ministers Conclusions and Recommendations. / Date à laquelle le Conseil de l'Europe a reçu la communication relative à la

publication de l'avis avant l'adoption des conclusions et recommandations du Comité des Ministres

14

MEMBER STATES / ETATS MEMBRES	Date of signature / Date de signature	Date of ratification/ Date de ratification	Date of entry into force / Date d'entrée en vigueur	First report due/ Premier rapport attendu	First report received/ Premier rapport reçu *	First Committee adopted / Premier Comité adopté le
CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE	28/04/95	18/12/97	01/04/1998	01/04/1999	01/04/1999	06/04/2001 (published on / public le 25/01/2001)
DENMARK / DANEMARK	01/02/95	22/09/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	06/05/1999	22/09/2000 (published on / public le 31/10/2000)
ESTONIA / ESTONIE	02/02/95	06/01/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	22/12/1999	14/09/2001 (published on / public le 12/04/2001)
FINLAND / FINLANDE	01/02/95	03/10/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	16/02/1999	22/09/2000 (published on / public le 06/07/2000)
FRANCE						
GEORGIA / GEORGIE	21/01/00					
GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE	11/05/95	10/09/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	24/02/2000	01/03/2002 (not yet public encore rendu public)
GREECE / GRECE	22/09/97					
HUNGARY / HONGRIE	01/02/95	25/09/95	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	21/05/1999	22/09/2000 (published on / public le 14/09/2000)
ICELAND / ISLANDE	01/02/95					
IRELAND / IRLANDE	01/02/95	07/05/99	01/09/1999	01/09/2000	13/11/2001	
ITALY / ITALIE	01/02/95	03/11/97	01/03/1998	01/03/1999	03/05/1999	14/09/2001 (not yet public encore rendu public)
LATVIA / LETTONIE	11/05/95					
LIECHTENSTEIN	01/02/95	18/11/97	01/03/1998	01/03/1999	03/03/1999	30/11/2000 (published on / public le 04/09/2000)
LITHUANIA / LITUANIE	01/02/95	23/03/2000	01/07/2000	01/07/2001	31/10/2001	
MEMBER STATES / ETATS MEMBRES	Date of signature / Date de signature	Date of ratification/ Date de ratification	Date of entry into force / Date d'entrée en vigueur	First report due/ Premier rapport attendu	First report received/ Premier rapport reçu *	First Committee adopted / Premier Comité adopté le
LUXEMBOURG	20/07/95					

MALTA / MALTE	11/05/95	10/02/98	01/06/1998	01/06/1999	27/07/1999	30/11/2000 (published on / public le 27/11/20
MOLDOVA	13/07/95	20/11/96	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	29/06/2000	01/03/2002 (not yet public / pa rendu public)
NETHERLANDS PAYS-BAS	/ 01/02/95					
NORWAY NORVEGE	/ 01/02/95	17/03/99	01/07/1999	01/07/2000	02/03/2001	
POLAND / POLOGNE	01/02/95	20/12/2000	01/04/2001	01/04/2002		
PORTUGAL	01/02/95	07/05/2002	01/09/2002	01/09/2003		
ROMANIA ROUMANIE	/ 01/02/95	11/05/95	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	24/06/1999	06/04/2001 (published on / public le 10/01/20
RUSSIAN FEDERATION FEDERATION RUSSIE	/ 28/02/96	21/08/98	01/12/1998	01/12/1999	08/03/2000	
SAN MARINO SAINT-MARIN	/ 11/05/95	05/12/96	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	03/02/1999	30/11/2000 (published on / public le 27/11/20
SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE	/ 01/02/95	14/09/95	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	04/05/1999	22/09/2000 (published on / public le 06/07/20
SLOVENIA SLOVENIE	/ 01/02/95	25/03/98	01/07/1998	01/07/1999	29/11/2000	
SPAIN / ESPAGNE	01/02/95	01/09/95	01/02/1998	01/02/1999	19/12/2000	
SWEDEN / SUEDE	01/02/95	09/02/2000	01/06/2000	01/06/2001	05/06/2001	
SWITZERLAND SUISSE	/ 01/02/95	21/10/98	01/02/1999	01/02/2000	16/05/2001	
MEMBER STATES / ETATS MEMBRES	Date of signature / Date de signature	Date of ratification/ Date de ratification	Date of entry into force / Date d'entrée en vigueur	First report due/ Premier rapport attendu	First report received/ Premier rapport reçu *	First Committee adopted / Premier Comité cor adopté le
“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” / “L’EX-REPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE”	25/07/96	10/04/97	01/02/1998	01/02/1999		
TURKEY / TURQUIE						
UKRAINE	15/09/95	26/01/98	01/05/1998	01/05/1999	02/11/1999	01/03/2002 (not yet public / pa rendu public)

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME UNI	01/02/95	15/01/98	01/05/1998	01/05/1999	26/07/1999	30/11/2001 (published on / public le 22/05/20
NON-MEMBER STATES / ETATS NON MEMBRES	Date of accession / date d'adhésion		Date of entry into force / Date d'entrée en vigueur	First report due/ Premier rapport attendu	First report received/ Premier rapport reçu	First Committee adopted / Premier Comité adopté le
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA / REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE DE LA YOUgoslavie	Accession / adhésion 11/05/2001		01/09/2001	01/09/2002		

<http://www.humanrights.coe.int/Minorities/index.htm>

* * *

APPENDIX II*REPORTING DELAYS IN THE SUBMISSION OF STATE REPORTS
Situation on 31 May 2002*

Country	Length of delay
“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”	39 months
Bulgaria	21 months
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 months
Azerbaijan	8 months
Poland	2 months

* * *

APPENDIX III*COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE*

NAME	COUNTRY	BEGINNING OF THE MANDATE	EXPIRY OF THE MANDATE
HOFMANN, Rainer President of the Advisory Committee	Germany	1 June 1998	31 May 2004
PHILLIPS, Alan First Vice-President of the Advisory Committee	United Kingdom	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
BÍRÓ, Gáspár Second Vice-President of the Advisory Committee	Hungary	1 June 1998	31 May 2004
BARTOLE, Sergio	Italy	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
DOMINI, Mirjana	Croatia	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
ELLUL, Tonio	Malta	16 February 2000	31 May 2004
GELEV, Dimitar	“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”	1 June 1998	31 May 2004
HAJOS, Ferenc	Slovenia	7 October 1998	31 May 2004
JACOVIDES, Andreas	Cyprus	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
JÍLEK, Dalibor	Czech Republic	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
LAURISTIN, Marju	Estonia	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
MARKO, Joseph	Austria	7 October 1998	1 June 2002
MITSIK, Vsevolod	Ukraine	1 June 1998	31 May 2004
MOTOC, Iulia	Romania	1 June 1998	31 May 2004
MYNTTI, Kristian	Finland	15 November 2000	1 June 2002
NUÑEZ DE PRADO Y CLAVEL, Sara	Spain	16 February 2000	31 May 2004
SÍVAK, Jozef	Republic of Slovakia	1 June 1998	1 June 2002
SMITH-ASMUSSEN, Eva	Denmark	1 June 1998	31 May 2004

* * *

NEW MEMBERS AS FROM 1 JUNE 2002

<i>NAME</i>	<i>COUNTRY</i>	<i>BEGINNING OF THE MANDATE</i>	<i>EXPIRY OF THE MANDATE</i>
BASTA FLEINER, Lidija	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
CERNENCO, Mihai	Moldova	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
CRICKLEY, Anastasia	Ireland	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
EIDE, Asbjørn	Norway	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
GALICKI, Zdzisław	Poland	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
MALINVERNI, Giorgio	Switzerland	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
SIRUTAVIČIUS, Vladas	Lithuania	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
SPILIPOULOU ÅKERMARK, Athanasia	Sweden	1 June 2002	31 May 2006
ŽILIC, Ahmed	Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 June 2002	31 May 2006

* * *