



COUNCIL OF EUROPE



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

**Committee of Experts of the European Charter for
Regional or Minority Languages**

DIVMINLAN/DOC(2023)01

2 May 2023

Joint Report of the Follow-Up Dialogue meeting in Norway

on the Fifth Opinion of the Advisory Committee and the Eighth Evaluation Report of the Committee of Experts and the Committee of Ministers' Resolution CM/ResCMN(2022)5 and Recommendation CM/RecChL(2022)3.

Document prepared by the Secretariat

Introduction

The [Fifth Opinion](#) on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Framework Convention) by Norway was adopted by the Advisory Committee on 2 February 2022 and published on 19 May 2022. [Resolution CM/ResCMN\(2022\)5 on the implementation of the Framework Convention by Norway](#) was adopted by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers on 6 July 2022.

The [Eighth Evaluation Report](#) on Norway's implementation of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (Language Charter) was adopted by the Committee of Experts on 17 November 2021. The Committee of Ministers' [Recommendation CM/RecChL\(2022\)3](#) was adopted on 30 March 2022.

Objective

A follow-up meeting was organised by the Norwegian authorities in Oslo, in the Ingeniørenes Hus, on 24 November 2022. This follow-up meeting gave representatives of the authorities and national minorities, including attendees of the Contact Forum (which had taken place the day before), the opportunity to discuss current and future implementation of the recommendations contained in the Committee of Ministers' Resolution and Recommendation, as well as the Committees' respective opinions and reports.

Participants, programme and opening session

There were around 40 attendees of the event, including some 20 representatives of three national minorities, namely the Kven/Norwegian Finn, Romani/Tater and Forest Finn national minorities. Regrettably, representatives of the Roma minority, the Jewish minority and the Sami – whose languages are protected under the Language Charter, and who chose to be covered under the scope of reporting under the Framework Convention in 2020 for the first time – were invited but chose not to attend.

Nancy Porsanger Anti, State Secretary in the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development, gave an opening and closing address, and attended the event in full along with representatives of other ministries and agencies, notably the ministries of Education and Culture, the Language Council and other representatives of the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development. The State Secretary expressed her appreciation for the monitoring work of both the Committee of Experts and the Advisory Committee as the Norwegian authorities seek to better implement the two treaties domestically. Bjørn Olav Megard, Director General of the Department of Indigenous and National Minority Affairs, gave an overview of the internal reporting process which Norway undertakes to submit its state reports. Elise Cornu, Head of the Division of National Minorities and Minority Languages, and Executive Secretary to the two treaty bodies, expressed the Council of Europe's gratitude for the holding of such an event and highlighted its importance as a joint follow-up dialogue for the findings of both committees. She also expressed her gratitude to the Norwegian authorities for their excellent co-operation during the monitoring process.

Vesna Crnić-Grotić, member of the Committee of Experts in respect of Croatia, thanked the Norwegian authorities for the opportunity to have such a discussion, words echoed by Oliver Loode, member of the Advisory Committee in respect of Estonia, who also emphasised how Norway's model of minority protection is positive, and how the Advisory Committee's role in the dialogue is to facilitate a discussion between minorities and authorities. Both of them had taken part in the co-ordinated visit to Norway of August 2021.

In what should be highlighted as a **good practice**, the follow-up dialogue was moderated by an external moderator, Bjørn Engesland (former Secretary General of the Norwegian Helsinki Committee), and not by any representative of the authorities. Interpretation between Norwegian and English was also provided.

Petter Wille, additional member of the Advisory Committee elected in respect of Norway, and Pia Lane, member of the Committee of Experts in respect of Norway, also briefly introduced the Framework Convention and the Language Charter, focusing on their monitoring mechanisms, explaining the recent reform and the introduction of a confidential dialogue before the final adoption of the Advisory Committee's opinion during which the authorities can present factual corrections or provide clarifications.

The Dialogue was divided into three roundtables which are reproduced in the agenda (see appendix 2): **Session I Protection and promotion of minority languages and cultures including revitalisation; Session II Use of minority languages in education; Session III Combatting stereotypes against, and raising awareness of, national minorities**. Each roundtable followed the same structure of a presentation of the pertinent recommendations from each committee, followed by a presentation from the relevant authorities of work done to implement these recommendations, a comment from representatives of national minorities on this implementation work, and then a general discussion between minorities, authorities, and members of the two committees – who then provided a summary and some closing reflections on the discussions.

Detailed report of the sessions

Session I Protection and promotion of minority languages and cultures (incl. revitalisation)

The two experts of both Committees presented their respective Committee's recommendations.¹ **Vesna Crnić-Grotić** focused on the need for sustainable and foreseeable support for minority languages, based on the views of NGOs who found it difficult to work based on short-term project grants. She also emphasised that revitalisation of minority languages requires sustained support over years.

Oliver Loode, before beginning to explain the recommendations under this session, first highlighted one of the underlying concerns of the Advisory Committee relating to the lack of equality data which, from experience elsewhere, makes it difficult to design and implement meaningful and targeted policy interventions. Whilst acknowledging the historical sensitivities around this point, which exist in many countries across Europe, he emphasised that there are examples of collecting equality data in sensitive contexts which could serve as inspiration for the Norwegian authorities.²

He went on to draw attention to the Advisory Committee's concern about the Forest Finn Museum and the Forest Finn representatives' disappointment at the process followed so far in relation to this museum. Whilst the authorities had explained the reasons behind this during the monitoring mission, there still remained some concern on the part of the Advisory Committee that the effective participation of the Forest Finn minority was not being ensured in this process. He explained the importance of achieving shared ownership over decisions taken, particularly with regard to the cultural heritage of a given national minority and more broadly the preservation and development of a national minority culture.

He also explained the Advisory Committee's findings in relation to the Kven/Norwegian Finn minority and the internal discussion about which language is and should be taught (Kven or Finnish), and the need to look at the language dynamics within the national minority community. He emphasised that the Advisory Committee took no position on this in its opinion, as it is to be discussed at national level with minority representatives' effective participation. He explained that the Advisory Committee considered it would be beneficial for the state to collect and disaggregate data relating to language use within these communities. Importantly, he explained that this process should not be to the detriment of any person's minority rights, and the Advisory Committee's hope that in the coming years, through continuous dialogue, a mutually acceptable solution could be found.

The authorities, initially representatives of the Ministry of Culture and Equality, outlined their different means to promote minority languages and cultures. One project, the Cultural Rucksack, involves 2000 cultural professionals traveling to schools and carrying out art projects and connecting students and artists; one of the national requirements of this is the promotion of national minority cultures. In relation to the first

¹ In detail, for the Language Charter: CM recommendation: 1; Recommendations from the Evaluation Report concerned sections: 2.6(d); 2.5(a); 2.4(a+d); 2.2(d); 2.1(a, e). Recommendations in respect of the Framework Convention included further recommendations 6, 10, 11, 12, 15 13 from the CM Resolution, and paras. 89, 95 and 101 from the Fifth Opinion.

² One particular example concerns the All Ireland Traveller Health Study, <https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/b9c48a-all-ireland-traveller-health-study/>. This was carried out by University College Dublin with funding from the Irish authorities. It was undertaken in a context of past injustice and distrust from the minority towards the authorities.

recommendation of the Committee of Experts, she explained the Language Act ensures the status and protection of indigenous and minority languages, and clarifies responsibilities across the public sector. She acknowledged that no guarantees exist as to how it is implemented, but it means for example that public information on websites of public services should also be in minority languages. She highlighted also the Arts Council's work to fund the publication of literature in minority languages. A potential legislative development addressing the media was also underlined, as the Government would like to strengthen the public broadcaster's obligation to broadcast in indigenous and minority languages.

The **State Secretary** in the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development highlighted the need for sustainable means for organisations of national minorities, but acknowledged the difficulties faced due to budgetary restrictions in the current year. Concerning the Kven/Norwegian Finn national minority, she explained how funding had increased in recent years to 11 million Norwegian Krone (NOK), with additional support given to the Kven Language Centre in Børself, and four active centres in Troms County. Support continues to be given across the country but is focused in Troms and Finnmark. In relation to the language dynamics within the Kven/Norwegian Finn minority, she explained that Kven as a language had been given priority because it is endangered and in need of revitalisation.

A Romanes preschool project is in development, and a school pilot project for Roma children who those who will start school in autumn 2023 has been launched in 2022, with the aim to strengthen their bilingual skills. Romano Kher continues to be supported in its media output. For Romani, NOK 1.265 million has been invested in the development of a language application, and funding has been given to the Language Council to develop language tools for Romani and Kven languages, she explained.

In the discussion, a representative of the **Norwegian Kven Association** spoke of the endangered nature of Kven language, and underlined their proposals for undertakings under Part III of the Language Charter. This would expand teaching beyond only kindergartens, to primary, secondary and tertiary education. The Norwegian Kven Museum and Troms Museum could also be engaged to help provide teaching outside of the traditional areas. She regretted the lack of broadcasting in Kven language and the reliance of the community on broadcasts from Sweden in Finnish. The need for teacher training was also emphasised, which needs to be stimulated by the Government by strengthening local language centres further. The government, she stated, may sometimes need to overrule local communities where resources are not being allocated to Kven; without such positive action, the language will not be saved. She also stated that research into the Kven language would be welcome.

Romani/Tater representatives from the Taternes Landsforening underlined that minorities' ability to revitalise their own language is subject to the state's own willingness to help them. Given there are no minority media in Norway, this help is limited, they explained. They welcomed the recommendations of the committees to provide sustainable funding to preserve the language. Lastly, they underlined the history of assimilation facing their minority and its continuing implications in terms of using the language publicly.

The **Kven Finn Association** highlighted the need for a human rights approach over a language-rights approach. He drew attention to figures his organisation had collected which showed the majority of students learn Finnish, not Kven at school. This is in part due to the lack of teachers of Kven, which is in turn due to a wider lack of knowledge of the language. He further stated that focusing on one language over another breeds more division than following a joint approach.

The **Forest Finn Association** indicated that the issue with the museum was still not resolved. Despite budgetary allocations to their organisation and the museum project, there is still no plan to have Forest Finn representatives involved and the museum is still to be organisationally subsumed within a larger 'mainstream' museum. The representative asked whether it was really in the interests of mainstream society to control a museum relating to Forest Finn culture. He also went on to explain that one regional museum will not cover the whole history of the Forest Finns, as they have been present across the whole east of Norway – so the regional museum will not even have the expertise to develop exhibits on Forest Finn history.

Responding to some of these concerns, the **State Secretary** explained that a lack of people to teach or be resource persons for the languages was a major challenge, and their focus has to be on boosting the number of language users. Even with the Language Centres, their work is inhibited by the small numbers of people speaking the Kven language.

Concerning Kven and Finnish, she explained further that the two languages cannot be compared as Kven does not have the resources or a state in which the language is spoken (which can also be a source for teaching aids, resources and media). The figures quoted by the Kven Finnish Association show on the contrary that the system works – because of the right contained within the Education Act to opt for teaching in Finnish. She finally emphasised that there is political will to protect and promote the Kven language but the number of speakers is holding them back from further action.

The **Ministry of Culture and Equality** representative regretted the dialogue of the deaf which had developed between the two sides, and that throwing suspicion on motives is not a constructive approach. They too emphasised that the political will is there, even accompanied by funding, which would mean the museum will open in 2024. They emphasised the need for museums to pool resources and expertise in a situation of budgetary restriction and the fact that many museums struggle to make ends meet.

Forest Finn representatives took the floor again to explain that from their perspective, they have been cooperating since the 1970s based on shared knowledge, leaving Forest Finn issues to the minority itself. They agree with the authorities on the construction projects, because this is a good initiative which they want to be a part of. But concerning the professional cooperation in the museum, they are not in agreement and this has to be discussed more, especially if this is a pre-condition to receiving the grant. They criticised the approach of the authorities which places the structural policy of museums over the interests of national minorities; in the context of a long history of assimilation, and having their history ‘robbed from them’, a reflex of distrust develops.

The **Kven Finn Association** disputed the State Secretary’s claim that statistics show that people want to learn Finnish, and argued that Kven and Finnish should be seen as two varieties of the same language. He stated that the only way, for him, to see Kven meaningfully promoted is through making it a Part III language under the Language Charter.

The **Norwegian Kven Association** stated that equality data had never asked them whether they are Kven so there are no figures. They called for the authorities to meet with representatives of the three endangered languages (Kven, Romani and Romanes) to develop the tools needed to save these languages. Resources are also needed, as well as research, to support students choosing Kven.

Another representative of **Taternes Landsforening** expressed regret about the history of assimilation and the lack of resources for revitalising Romani language, underlining the huge effort needed to do so.

In her final remarks of this session, the **State Secretary** emphasised that the authorities are happy to provide education in Finnish, but that in respect of the Language Charter, it was defined separately from Finnish in 2005 and as a Part II language. She again stated that figures given by the Kven Finn Association do not reflect reality as there is no “real choice” between the two languages, as there are relatively few places in which you can choose Kven in practice.

Concluding the session, **Vesna Crnić-Grotić** strongly emphasised that the Council of Europe instruments should not be used to create or further divisions within society, and that there should be no sense of taking from one group to give to another. She stressed that 35 undertakings are needed for Part III of the Language Charter, meaning there has to be serious thought and resources given to moving Kven from Part II to Part III. Revitalising languages is about bringing the language back to those who have lost it, but that requires a dedicated infrastructure and populace. From experience, she mentioned the experience in the Isle of Man (included in the report on the United Kingdom) and the revitalisation of the Manx Gaelic language there over many years, as well as the experience of Scottish Gaelic which has gone through a similar process. She also highlighted the need for positive incentives for people to become kindergarten teachers.

Oliver Loode echoed the point made about the misuse of Council of Europe instruments to foster divisions. He explained also the different approaches of the two treaties. He stressed that whilst the Language Charter protects the languages, the Framework Convention protects persons belonging to national minorities. Concretely, then, whereas Kven language is covered under the Language Charter (and Finnish is not), the Kven/Norwegian Finn national minority is protected under the Framework Convention – which means that the language(s) they speak are protected, insofar as they are indeed spoken by the national minority. This means that Finnish and Kven languages can be, together, both essential elements of the culture of national minorities, per Article 5 of the Framework Convention and other articles. He further elaborated that this should not be a zero-sum game where some win and some lose access to minority rights.

Session II Use of minority languages in education³

Oliver Loode introduced the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the use of minority languages in education. He drew attention to the good situation in terms of legal protection, and good practices at Romano Kher. One particular barrier highlighted was the lack of knowledge of Norwegian which may make some Roma families reluctant to send their child to preschool, and leads to worse education outcomes overall. For this reason the Advisory Committee recommended setting up a bilingual kindergarten, also based on practices elsewhere in Europe, where the minority language can be freely spoken, and knowledge of the state language can also be improved. For the Kven/Norwegian Finn minority, the Advisory Committee was concerned that vital services like kindergartens are subject to project grants, adding uncertainty to the continuity of these services. The need for incentives, learning from the experience with Sami languages, to encourage students to continue learning Kven beyond grade 8 was also emphasised.

Vesna Crnić-Grotić focused on the need for sustainable teacher training for Kven, the challenges posed by recruiting teachers and the fact that at upper secondary school few students choose Kven as a second language because this does not give extra credits for higher education applications. There is also a problem with the teacher training requirements, which may be too stringent for persons belonging to numerically smaller national minorities to effectively access teacher training. She also highlighted how revitalisation and promotion of less used minority languages can be achieved through positive measures in informal and formal education. She also stressed again the importance of sustainable support to kindergartens and language nests as keystones of the education system. She finally underlined the Committee of Experts' concern at the absence of Romani language teaching.

Representatives of the **Ministry of Education** informed that a working group has been set up with the education directorate and the Language Council to facilitate Romani language teaching. They stressed the importance of co-operation with minorities, and that the good practice of Romano Kher had been possible with the good co-operation of the Roma minority.

Regarding teacher training requirements, they informed that these had changed since the visit in August 2021, and now a grade of 30 instead of 40 is necessary. This is planned to make 2 000 more people eligible for teacher training. Additionally, anyone who opts for Kven or other minority languages at university can have up to 50% of their student loan cancelled. There have also been grant schemes developed to allow preschool and primary teachers to train in Kven once graduated – with funding paying for their replacement. In Troms and Finnmark, NOK 800 000 has been allocated to Kven kindergartens, and it is hoped that the number of applicants will increase hereon in.

They also informed of positive incentives, including a film about the benefits of learning Kven and address the drop-out of Kven learners and motivational funds which apply to Kven and Finnish.

The bilingual kindergarten at Romano Kher is an excellent example, and it will also offer transport services to encourage pupils and families to attend without a financial burden. It will also expand its intake and cover two academic years.

³ For the Language Charter: CM Recommendation, paras. 2 and 3; COMEX Report, recommendations: 2.6(a+c); 2.5(a+c); 2.4(a+c); 2.3(b+c); 2.2(b+c+d); 2.1(b, c, d); Advisory Committee opinion and CM Resolution, paras. 3, 5, 13.

Finally, in relation to Romani, they indicated being in the early phases of working out a plan for the language in education.

For their part, the **Norwegian Kven Association** emphasised the need to make fuller use of existing speakers as a bank of resource persons to travel around communities. However they stressed how much of the existing progress in Kven rests on the back of willing volunteers.

The **Kven Finn Association** argued that language nests are not sufficient to properly learn Kven, and that NOK 800 000 was not sufficient funding in relation to the size of Troms and Finnmark county. They suggested that trilingual education should be generalised, as in Kautokeino and Karasjok.

Romani/Tater representatives regretted that their language is not prioritised, because on this issue they do not have as much to say as other groups. They stated that the ageing population of Romani speakers means the teacher training requirements' amendments will not translate into any benefits for them. A sort of "knowledge bank" could work to make use of these older people who have knowledge of the language, and teach alongside qualified teachers in schools.

They further emphasised that project funding was not sufficient to improve minority language education and that broader efforts are needed. A language centre for Romanes and Romani would be one proposal to bring these speakers together and focus efforts, as has been achieved for Kven.

Vesna Crnić-Grotić welcomed the relaxing of conditions for teacher training, but emphasised the need for patience. She addressed the concern that Romani and Romanes teachers have to be from the minorities themselves, and suggested that the scope could be widened to others. Language nests are also a very positive way of bringing together old and young, encouraging the young to take the language home to their parents, and fostering knowledge of the language.

Oliver Loode regretted that no Roma representatives were present to address the statements made by the authorities. However, he cautiously welcomed developments at Romano Kher which are implementing the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. He also expressed enthusiasm for the idea of a Romani and Romanes language centre, a concrete proposal which he felt could be advanced by the authorities.

Session III Combatting stereotypes against, and raising awareness of, national minorities⁴

Oliver Loode highlighted the range of good practices which Norway has in this area, and which the Advisory Committee considered could be expanded to other national minorities. Notably, the Pathfinders project seemed to have been a very positive experience for the Jewish national minority and the Sami, and in light of findings of a low awareness of national minorities in society, this seemed like a relatively simple and effective way of raising such awareness, as well as actively engaging young people belonging to national minorities.

The Advisory Committee also recommended to develop an action plan on antigypsyism, based on the good examples of the antisemitism and anti-Muslim hatred action plans. This was also done in light of the reports of antigypsyism facing the Roma and Romani/Tater minorities, and of the Advisory Committee's experience in other states parties where such plans have been successful and demonstrated a clear commitment to eliminating this specific form of racism.

The lack of trust between the Romani/Tater minority and the authorities was also concerning for the Advisory Committee, and it has found also elsewhere that such a situation needs to be addressed with active steps from the authorities, working closely with a broad range of minority representatives. Finally, the low level of information about national minorities in public broadcasting was concerning, and as the media are a key tool for informing the majority about minorities' cultures, identities and concerns, the

⁴ Recommendations of the CM Resolution on the Framework Convention: 1, 2, 8, 10, 12, see also para.136 of the Advisory Committee's Fifth Opinion; for the Language Charter, recommendations 2.4,a+b and 2.5 a+b of the Eighth Evaluation Report.

Advisory Committee asked the authorities to work with the Norwegian public broadcaster NRK to boost such programming.

Vesna Crnić-Grotić underlined the importance of a climate of tolerance and intercultural dialogue for minority languages to flourish in society, thus explaining the recommendations made in this regard by the Committee of Experts. She also echoed that programming and knowledge about national minorities and minority language speakers in society can boost the numbers of speakers by creating interest and knowledge in the languages.

The **Ministry of Culture and Equality** spoke about the Action Plan against Racism, which contains 50 measures to address racism, and complemented by the two specific action plans on antisemitism and anti-Muslim hatred. Additionally, the strategy against hate speech should be strengthened to focus on online hate speech too. They emphasised that Norway has been recognised internationally for its work against hate speech. Concerning intercultural dialogue, they informed about a funding stream of NOK 19.6 million to promote diversity and provide support to those who fall victim to hate speech. They also recalled the data collected by the Norwegian Centre for Holocaust Studies on attitudes towards Jews, Muslims and Roma.

The **State Secretary** welcomed the Advisory Committee's findings related to the Romani/Tater collective reparation fund. She explained that they will continue to promote reconciliation and build trust, but that this must be mutual. Their participation is ensured in the Contact Forum and through other individual meetings, where the organisations will make known their concerns. She emphasised that Romani/Taters are represented on the Arts Council board managing the grant scheme, and they have made an awareness-raising campaign to make sure Romani/Tater individuals are aware of the scheme. She stressed the importance of meeting with also persons in communities, besides those represented in the organisations.

On antigypsyism, she took note of the Advisory Committee's recommendation but informed that no decision has yet been taken on whether to develop it, because the general aim is to streamline plans and not duplicate actions for different religious groups and minorities.

A **Forest Finn representative** at this point took the floor to raise an issue which had been covered in the Advisory Committee's opinion under [Article 11](#), concerning personal names. He explained that he cannot have access to his ancestral personal name since those who have that name and reside in Norway effectively have a veto right over this reclamation of personal names.

A representative of **Taternes Landsforening** expressed regret that the Roma representatives have not attended the dialogue. She went on to express her view that reconciliation has not happened yet, and referred to the report carried out by the Telemark Research Institute which showed that compensation was being carried out without the full participation of national minorities, as they had no way of influencing decisions. Rather, the state decides how this culture is to be protected. She expressed her wish that the collective reparation be given back to the minority group. She also took slight issue with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which she felt implied a distrust between minority organisations which does not correspond to reality. The lack of trust, she stated, is toward the government.

Concerning antigypsyism and anti-nomadism, Romani/Tater representatives regretted the government's position which, they said, implied this is not an issue. On the contrary, they state that they face such discrimination in particular those who follow a nomadic way of life with the child welfare services. In this regard it is also urgent to facilitate education for children with a nomadic way of life. They also reported that some public statement by the authorities had implied that the assimilation policy stopped in 1945, when in fact it went on longer. Finally she stated that an app to report incidents of hate speech and racism would be welcome, as persons belonging to national minorities may not know to whom to report such incidents.

Kven Finn Association representatives stated that co-decision for national minorities was vital for them to be able to protect their interests.

The **State Secretary** replied that “invisibilisation” is a form of discrimination and that they would look at how to improve knowledge of national minorities. She also replied to the Romani/Tater representative that the official policy documents on reconciliation and the report of the Commission found that assimilation policies went on until the 1980s.

The Council of Europe representatives also drew attention to relevant recommendations adopted by the Committee of Ministers.⁵

Oliver Loode concluded the session by emphasising the importance for the Advisory Committee, not of having a separate action plan per se, but of seeing antigypsyism effectively tackled, whether that is through specific measures in another plan or within its own plan. In this sense, it is an expectation of outcome, not means, on the part of the Advisory Committee. He also expressed some regret that the situation with regard to the Romani/Tater collective reparation continued to cause friction.

Conclusions

Oliver Loode and **Vesna Crnić-Grotić** thanked the Ministry for coordinating the event and the minorities for their ongoing commitment to improving the situation. They emphasised in particular how useful the shadow reports had been in monitoring the implementation of the two treaties by Norway in the previous cycle, and hoped that they would repeat this again for the sixth and ninth monitoring cycles, starting in 2025. They recapped that a lot of good ideas had been shared today, and it was up to the authorities to work with minorities to see some of these ideas tested and implemented

The **State Secretary** thanked all participants for their active engagement, including the Council of Europe for coming to Oslo and explaining further the recommendations and reasoning for the recommendations. She had taken particular note of the need for developing professionals skilled in minority languages and in particular efforts to keep students studying minority languages, notably Kven, beyond the 8th grade. She also recalled that this would feed into the preparation of the mid-term report for the Language Charter as to the implementation of the recommendations for immediate action from the previous evaluation report.

⁵ See [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2020\)2](#) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the inclusion of the history of Roma and/or Travellers in school curricula and teaching materials, adopted on 1 July 2020 and [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2022\)5](#) of the Committee of Ministers to member States on passing on remembrance of the Holocaust and preventing crimes against humanity adopted on 17 March 2022.

Appendix

Agenda

Follow-up event

November 24 2022, kl. 09.00–16.00

Ingeniørernes hus, Kronprinsens gate 17

08.30 Arrival/registration

09.00 Opening

Session I Protection and promotion of minority languages and cultures including revitalisation

09.30 Presentation of the recommendations

By the experts and representatives from the Council of Europe

09.40 Follow-up of the recommendations

By the representatives from the ministries

10.00 Comments on the recommendations

By representatives of the national minorities

10.20 Discussion

10.35 Break

10.40 Roadmap for implementation

By the experts from the Council of Europe

11.00 Break/lunch

Session II Use of minority languages in education

12.00 Presentation of the recommendations

By the experts and representatives from the Council of Europe

12.10 Follow-up of the recommendations

By the representatives from the ministries

12.30 Comments on the recommendations

By representatives of the national minorities

12.50 Discussion

13.05 Break

13.10 Roadmap for implementation

By the experts from the Council of Europe

Session III Combatting stereotypes against, and raising awareness of, national minorities

- 13.45 Presentation of the recommendations
 - By the experts and representatives from the Council of Europe
- 13.55 Follow-up of the recommendations
 - By the representatives from the ministries
- 14.15 Comments on the recommendations
 - By representatives of the national minorities
- 14.35 Discussion
- 14.50 Break
- 14.55 Roadmap for implementation
 - By the experts from the Council of Europe
- 15.20 Conclusion
- 16.00 Programme ends