



Italy

Promoting Social Inclusion of Roma

A Study of National Policies

Filippo Strati

Studio Ricerche Sociali (SRS)

Disclaimer: This report reflects the views of its author(s) and these are not necessarily those of either the European Commission or the Member States. The original language of the report is English.

July 2011



On behalf of the

European Commission

DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion



Content

Summary	3
1. Description of national situation.....	4
1.1 Roma population in Italy	4
1.2 Geographic distribution of Roma in Italy	6
1.3 Poverty and social exclusion situation of Roma.....	7
1.3.1 Relative income poverty and deprivation	7
1.3.2 Education.....	8
1.3.3 Employment.....	9
1.3.4 Health	10
1.3.5 Housing and the environment	11
1.3.6 Culture and social participation	13
1.4 Extent and nature of discrimination experienced by Roma	14
1.5 Main data gaps in relation to Roma	16
2. Assessment of existing policies and governance framework.....	17
2.1 Current overall policy framework and governance arrangements.....	17
2.2 Existing targets on poverty and social exclusion reduction.....	19
2.3 Roma in the National Reform Programme.....	20
2.4 Existing policies and programmes	20
2.4.1 Income (tax and welfare policies)	22
2.4.2 Education.....	22
2.4.3 Employment.....	23
2.4.4 Housing and the environment	24
2.4.5 Health	24
2.4.6 Sport, recreation and culture.....	25
2.4.7 Anti-discrimination	25
3. Structural Funds.....	26
4. Role of civil society organisations and international organisations	27
5. Recommendations	28
5.1 Key challenges and goals.....	28
5.1.1 Education.....	28
5.1.2 Employment.....	29
5.1.3 Healthcare	29
5.1.4 Housing and the environment	29
5.1.5 Income support	29
5.1.6 Sport, recreation and cultural activities	30
5.1.7 Anti-discrimination	30
5.2 Monitoring methods	30
5.3 Cooperation and dialogue.....	30
5.4 Structural Funds	31
5.5 Europe 2020 targets and National Reform Programme.....	31
6. Appendix to Sections 1, 2 and 3	32
7. Statistics	34
References	46

Summary

Information and data on Italian Roma are incomplete. In general, it is estimated that the “Roma” people constitute 0.3% of the population living in Italy. They have a common *romanés* language, but they are not recognised as a national “historical linguistic communities”. Nearly half of them have Italian citizenship, but many are considered as illegal immigrants or do not have Italian citizenship although they may be born in Italy or have lived in Italy for generations. Roma form a “galaxy” of different populations that has resulted from several migratory waves (from the 14th century). The largest share of them (nearly 80%) abandoned the nomadic life to become sedentary. This process increased in the 1960s when the Italian economic boom affected also their traditional occupations. Most of them became unemployed while the others held temporary and precarious jobs. Nearly 30% live in camps characterised by socio-environmental degradation. For them, Italy is “a land of apartheid camps”, ghettos without the minimum requisites for human health, dignity and physical integrity. Roma people have an average life expectancy twenty years less than the national average. While their population structure is much younger than the Italian average, they have the highest rate of early school leaving. Several factors hamper participation of Roma in Italian society: the difficulty to acquire Italian citizenship, a conflicting process which leads to the loss of community identity and social alienation, social stratification among the poorest, separation between older and recent Roma communities, as well as discrimination. Although Roma constitute a small percentage of the population, they are subject of social alarm and hostility. Stereotypes abound and feed xenophobia and racism against Roma. Right wing political parties use the “Roma question” to divert people’s attention away from key economic, environmental and social problems. The “Roma question” has created a vicious circle with increasing income poverty, material deprivation and social exclusion. In general, Italian authorities consider the “Roma question” to be a security issue to be faced through “emergency” rules aimed at fighting against delinquency. This attitude has resulted in a series of discriminatory practices that limit Roma rights.

The largest majority of Roma are poor and represent approximately 1.5% and 1.1% of the population at risk of poverty and at risk of social exclusion, respectively. However, the recent National Reform Programme did not mention the “Roma question” and Roma would represent roughly 8% of the Italian target to reduce overall poverty according to the Europe 2020 Strategy.

At a national level, there is a lack of effective and unitary policies to improve the present situation, while approaches remain ambiguous at a regional level. Moreover, the national government has reduced financial resources allocated to local authorities, which perform the bulk of social policies affecting Roma. Further reductions are programmed for the coming years and it is expected that Roma will be significantly affected. Other financial sources, such as the EU Structural Funds, are insufficiently used to tackle Roma poverty and social exclusion challenges. Roma represent “the last of the last”, those who exist on the margins of society, and those who are difficult to integrate. However, positive examples of active social inclusion policies can be found, especially at a local level. They provide evidence of policy commitment and good practices. By capitalising on strengths and weaknesses of these initiatives, recommendations can be formulated for specific policy fields. These experiences provide important lessons that can be used to improve analysis and monitoring methods, to strengthen cooperation and dialogue, to better utilise the EU Structural Funds and to integrate the “Roma” question in the National Reform Programme. These lessons support the following recommendations: the recognition of the *romanés* language as “historical linguistic minority”; the change of the current citizenship legislation towards “*ius soli*” orientation; the eradication of any discriminatory restrictions against Roma, immigrants and homeless from existing laws; a national plan devoted to active social inclusion of Roma.

1. Description of national situation

The present section focuses on the Roma population in Italy and their social conditions. The generic term "Roma" is used according to the EU documents "as an umbrella which includes groups of people who have more or less similar cultural characteristics, such as Sinti, Travellers, Kalè, Gens du voyage, etc." (EC, 2011).

Furthermore, in order to avoid confusion between the terms "Roma" referred to the above-mentioned persons and Roma (the capital of Italy), the latter is mentioned with the English name of Rome. Names of all other local and regional areas are described using their Italian name.

1.1 Roma population in Italy

The Council of Europe Roma and Travellers Division (CoE) estimates (14/09/2010) that 140,000 "Roma" live in Italy as an average amount corresponding to 0.23% of the total population, ranging between 110,000 (as a minimum) and 170,000 (as a maximum).

The most recent national survey (Italian Senate, 2011) quotes an average of nearly 140,000 according to a 2006 estimate of the Ministry of the Interior (Mininterno, 2006) and a range between 130,000 and 170,000 in 2010, according to a catholic organisation involved in the fight against poverty (Comunità di Sant'Egidio), the national association of Italian municipalities (ANCI) and two non-governmental organisations (NGO) of Roma, Sinti and other nomad groups (UNIRSI – Unione Nazionale dei Rom e dei Sinti in Italia; Opera Nomadi).

Another survey (Minlav, 2010) quotes estimates of between 130,000 and 150,000 Roma and Sinti (nearly 70,000 Italians) while adding useful clues on age: 45.5% aged less than 16 years (e.g. between 59,000 and 68,000 persons) and 2% to 3% aged over sixty (e.g. between 2,500 and 4,000 persons), as a combined results of high birth rates and low life expectancies.

According to these data, comparison between same age-groups shows that in 2010:

- "Roma" as a total (i.e. all ages) might represent a share of 0.22 to 0.25% of the total Italian population
- The percentage of "Roma" aged less than 16 years (45%) is three times the national average (15%) for the same age group,
- The percentage of "Roma" aged over sixty (0.3%) is nearly one tenth of national average for the same age group (25%)

A report (ERRC, 2010) states that about half of all Roma and Sinti are Italian citizens, 20 to 25% are from other EU Member States (chiefly Romania) and the rest are either from non-EU States or they are stateless (mostly from the former Yugoslavia countries). These percentages translate to nearly 75,000 Italian "Roma", 30,000 - 37,500 Roma with EU citizenship and 37,500 - 45,000 third-country nationals or stateless. It should be noted that Italian legislation on citizenship is based on "ius sanguinis" orientation (Zincon G., 2006). Foreigners and immigrants are not given Italian citizenship although they have lived in Italy for many years or born in Italy. This includes most "Roma" of the generations that arrived from the former Yugoslavia (Chirico M. R., 2008).

Other studies (Calabrò A. R., 2008 and EU Parliament, 2006) underline a high number of irregular Roma people (i.e. without any residence permit), including those considered as illegal immigrants (called *clandestini*, "hidden persons" according to the Latin etymology) although living in Italy for several generations.

However, information and data are not precise or often lacking (e.g. gender breakdowns). The complexity is apparent, although several studies have attempted to analyse the "Roma" galaxy.

The co-evolving interactions between several components (social, linguistic, ethnographic, demographic, geographical, religious, cultural, occupational and generational) make it difficult to analyse the dynamic and overlapping changes (e.g. displacements, migration flows and settlements) of the "Roma" population during the last six centuries in Italy.

Anthropological and history research, geographical and linguistic studies and fieldwork inquiries provide a common understanding of some characteristics distinguished in three main communities and four principal waves of immigration ([Table 1](#)).

There are three macro linguistic communities in Italy, namely Sinti, Roma and *Camminanti* (Travellers). Sinti and Roma have several dialects in common that constitute the Indo-European Romani language (*romanés*), while *Camminanti* speak a local language.

The first migratory wave of Roma was in the 14th century, followed by Sinti in the 15th century. Roma came mainly from the Balkans and settled in the South of Italy, while Sinti came from Prussian and Austrian regions and settled in the North and Centre of Italy. They formed a series of communities, whose name corresponds to the Italian regions where they settled (e.g. Roma *Abruzzesi* and *Molisani* and Sinti *Piemontesi*). The origin of Roma *Napoletani* probably is from Spain, while that of *Camminanti Siciliani* (since they are mainly located in Sicilia) is unknown (probably from a disappeared group of Sicilian Roma or from Nordic or Slavic people).

The second migratory wave was between the 19th and 20th centuries, especially after the two world wars. Other Sinti communities (e.g. Gäckane and Estrekhària) arrived mainly in the North of Italy from Germany, Austria and Slovenia. Roma communities (Harvati, Kalderasha, Churara and Lovara) arrived from Croatia, Istria, Slovenia, Hungary and Romania, but also from Poland and Sweden. They settled practically in all Italian regions (Roma Harvati mostly in the North).

The third wave consisted of migrants arrived during the 1960s and 1970s. They came mainly from the former Yugoslavia countries (Roma Khorakhané and Dasikhané), Poland (Roma Lovara), Romania (Romanian Roma) and also from Algeria (a small group of Roma Kaulija). The prevalent regional location of Roma Khorakhané and Dasikhané was in the North and Centre Italy, while the other groups settled throughout the national territory.

The fourth migratory wave interested all the Italian regions and started with the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union in 1989. Roma Khorakhané and Dasikhané (from the former Yugoslavia countries) were the main communities along with Romanian Roma (from Romania and Bulgaria), whose number is still increasing.

The comparison between estimates made by different sources of information allows for further distinction ([Table 2](#)): there are 148,000 to 166,000 "Roma" people in Italy (157,000 as an average), excluding those without any residence permit (e.g. irregular migrants); 45% with Italian citizenship (75,000 people at a maximum), 32% from non-EU countries or stateless (50,000

persons at a maximum) and 23% (41,000 persons at a maximum) from other EU Member States. Those with Italian citizenship are prevalently Sinti, the oldest Roma and Camminanti Siciliani, Roma Harvati and Kalderasha. Very few Lovara Roma have Italian citizenship. People of other communities are prevalently "immigrants" with foreign citizenship, taking into account that Romanian Roma have been EU citizens since 2007.

According to these hypotheses, "Roma" population might constitute between 0.25% and 0.28% of the total Italian population (0.26% as an average) in 2010. The non-Italian "Roma" might have been between 1.9% and 2.1% (2.0% as an average) of the foreigner citizens, who accounted for 7% of the Italian inhabitants as a whole.

These hypotheses distribute the above-mentioned communities as follows: Sinti between 30,000 and 35,000 persons; the oldest Roma and Camminanti Siciliani together 30,000 persons; Roma Harvati and Kalderasha together between 7,000 and 10,000 persons; Roma Lovara 1,000 persons; Roma Khorakhané and Dasikhané together 40,000 persons; Romanian Roma between 40,000 and 50,000 persons.

1.2 Geographic distribution of Roma in Italy

Available data do not provide clear evidence of the geographic distribution of "Roma" population in Italy and only partial estimates exist for some regions, for instance: Piemonte (in the North) with 6,500 people (IRES Piemonte, 2005); Lombardia (in the North) with 13,000 people (Tavolo Rom di Milano, 2009); Campania and Calabria (in the South), each of them with 9,000 people (IREF, 2010); the municipality of Rome in the Lazio Region with 15,000 to 18,000 people (Sigona N., 2008).

In 2008 the Ministry of the Interior carried out a "Roma" census in 124 unauthorised camps and 43 authorised camps located in the municipalities of Milano (in Lombardia, North of Italy), Rome (in Lazio, Centre of Italy) and Napoli (in Campania, South of Italy), discovering 12,346 persons. 5,436 were children (44%). According to the Ministry, 12,000 moved away from camps before the census. Therefore, the number of "Roma" people interested by the census might have arrived at around 25,000, corresponding to nearly 63% of the abovementioned data concerning the respective regional areas (40,000 as a maximum total). However all these data are partial, fragmented and considerably lower than those necessary to correspond to the overall estimates concerning Italy.

To estimate total "Roma" population in each region, a framework of reference based on the main characteristics of the migratory flows ([Table 1](#)) and on the hypotheses concerning the amount of "Roma" population living in Italy ([Table 2](#)) must be made. The framework provides the following clues: Nearly all Sinti (35,000 people at a maximum) and Harvati Roma (2,000 people) live in the North. Roma Korakahanè and Dasikhanè (40,000 persons) live in the North and the Centre. The oldest Roma communities and Camminanti Siciliani (30,000 persons) live prevalently in the South. Roma Lovara (1,000 persons), Kalderasha and associated groups (8,000), as well as Romanian Roma (50,000 people at a maximum) are distributed throughout the Italian regions.

Other data concern "Roma" people living in camps, who might correspond to nearly one third of total "Roma" population. Therefore, the exercise can try and infer from these data of fieldwork evidence (i.e. their proportional distribution in each region) to the estimated total "Roma" population in each region ([Table 3](#)).

According to these results, seven out of the twenty Italian regions might account for 80% of the total "Roma" population. The first region is in the Centre (Lazio), the following four are in the North (Lombardia, Piemonte, Emilia Romagna and Veneto, successively) and the remaining two are in the South (Calabria and Campania). The average share of "Roma" people over the total population of the abovementioned regions might be between 0.32% and 0.36%. A group of six regions follows and covers 16% of the total "Roma" population, which might constitute 0.14% to 0.16% of the overall population in the concerned regions: Toscana in the Centre, Abruzzo, Puglia and Sicilia in the South and Trentino Alto Adige in the North. The remaining seven regions might account for 4% of the total "Roma" population, namely Liguria and Valle d'Aosta in the North, Marche and Umbria in the Centre, Sardegna, Molise and Basilicata in the South. The presence of "Roma" people in these regions might constitute between 0.09 and 0.12% of the total population.

According to fieldwork studies (Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009; Calabrò A. R., 2008), "Roma" people live prevalently in segregated and shanty neighbourhoods, mainly in big cities (e.g. between 2 and 4 million inhabitants), such as Rome, Milano, Napoli and Torino, but also in smaller cities (e.g. from 70,000 to 900,000 inhabitants) such as Padova, Reggio Emilia, Bologna, Brescia, Pavia, Genova and Bari (ANCI, 2011). In fact, many "Roma" people have been progressively leaving rural areas to reach urban suburbs since the 1960s, during the Italian economic boom that increased the process of sedentarisation while changing traditional occupations of the concerned communities (Calabrò A. R., 1992; Mininterno 2006).

1.3 Poverty and social exclusion situation of Roma

Lack of data does not allow for an in-depth analysis by age, gender and "Roma" sub-groups. However, qualitative studies and surveys permit an outline to be made of the living conditions of the "Roma" population with respect to: relative income poverty and deprivation; education; employment; health; housing and the environment; culture and social participation (excluding sport and recreation).

1.3.1 *Relative income poverty and deprivation*

All Italian literature on the "Roma question" underlines that its main problem consists in the close relationship between relative income poverty, material deprivation and socio-cultural exclusion. A long series of narrative books describing the living conditions of children, women, adults, elderly people, their households and "Roma" communities is available. The surveys quoted in this report confirm the vicious circle between poverty, precarious jobs, irregular and precarious housing and household hardships.

Studies (Calabrò A. R., 2008) show that the recently immigrated "Roma" communities face more difficult and precarious living conditions than those already settled (e.g. in Napoli and Milano). For instance, comparisons between current conditions and those recorded twenty years ago demonstrate a clear improvement in living conditions for the older immigrant generations but not for the recent Romanian Roma and those coming from Macedonia or Kosovo, who constitute half of the current "Roma" population living in Milano. Improvement in household income and housing conditions characterises the older generations: no more tents and shacks but containers, camper vans, caravans, and small-prefabricated houses. A kind of social stratification among the poorest can be discovered in Milano. There, in old settlements, it is easy to notice that relatively "well-off" households live illegally in "villas" next to shacks inhabited by the poorest. Income poverty assumes the form of a hierarchical pyramid, where people involved in criminal organisations and

activities are on the top, a minority of people who have legal employment and housing are in the middle, while the majority of people live in camps on the borders of legality and on the fringe of survival.

Apart from regular but mainly precarious jobs, other income sources provide livelihood means for survival. They consist, for instance, in (Ambrosini M., 2010): activities developed to meet basic needs of the belonging communities and other households (e.g. small bars, food stores, bakeries, garbage collection, cleaning and maintenance services, and sometime driving school-buses); begging (*manghe*); public assistance; support from charitable organisations (e.g. Caritas, parish churches and other associations) or from individuals and households more sensitive to needs of the poor; self-help through family networks; as well as illegal activities.

Unfortunately, statistics do not exist to analyse the impact of the risk of poverty and social exclusion on "Roma" people. Likely the largest majority of them should be considered as poor.

By including them in national statistics, they might represent respectively 1.5% and 1.1% of total Italians at risk of poverty (11,076,742 persons equal to a 18.4% rate) and at risk of social exclusion (14,835,312, equal to a 24.7% rate).

If "Roma" were included in the Italian target to reduce poverty according to the Europe 2020 Strategy, they would constitute only 7.7% of the target (lifting 2,200,000 people out of poverty by 2020).

However, whether "Roma" population is included in the Italian social targets concerning Europe 2020 (in the fields of poverty, employment and education; indebtedness; persistent poverty; housing, etc.) is unclear given that "Roma" people were not mentioned in the National Reform Programme, approved by the Italian national government and Parliament in April 2011.

1.3.2 Education

A survey carried out by the Education Ministry (MIUR, 2000) in the 1999/2000 school year recorded 8,982 "Roma" pupils (0.12% of total pupils) in both primary and secondary education: 19% of the total "Roma" pupils at the nursery level (1,713 pupils); 57% in elementary schools (5,100 pupils); 20% at lower secondary schools (1,768 pupils); 4% in upper secondary schools (401 pupils).

These numbers correspond to 14% of the "Roma" children population aged less than 18 years, estimated by the NGO Opera Nomadi in 2000 (quoted in Cospe, 2006 and EUMC, 2006). More specifically, according to the estimate of Opera Nomadi, Roma and Sinti children amounted to about 66,000 persons (60% on the entire "Roma" population), of which 22,000 are below 5 years of age, 30,000 aged between 6 and 14 years of age and 14,000 between 15 and 17 years of age. Therefore, early education and school leavers might be summed as: 86% as a total; 92% in nursery level; 73% in elementary schools; 84% in lower secondary schools primary and 84% in lower secondary education; 97% % in upper secondary schools.

More recent data provided by the Education Ministry (MIUR, 2009) refer to the 2007/2008 school year, when 12,242 Roma, Sinti and Travellers (Camminanti) pupils as a whole were enrolled at both primary and secondary education, constituting 0.14% of total pupils: 17% in nursery level (2,061 pupils); 55% in elementary schools (6,801); 27% at lower secondary schools (3,299 pupils); 1% in upper secondary schools (181 pupils).

Regional distribution of pupils was concentrated in 6 out of the 20 regions (71% as a whole): Lazio (Centre) with 2,331 pupils (19%); Lombardia (North) with 1,939 pupils (16%); Veneto (North) with 1,186 pupils (10%); Calabria (South) with 1,167 pupils (9%); Piemonte (North) with 1,162 pupils (9%) and Emilia Romagna (Centre) with 921 pupils (7%).

Therefore there was a 37% increase with respect to the 1999/2000 school year, while rates of early education and school leavers might have decreased to 79% and 82% (between 7 and 4 percentage points less). In fact, the total amount of pupils (12,242) corresponds to 18% - 21% of the estimated child "Roma" population aged less than 16 years (between 59,000 and 68,000 persons, as reported in paragraph 1.1).

Other data stem from the results of the 2008 investigation of "Roma" people living in camps carried out by the Italian Red Cross in the municipality of Rome (Italian Senate, 2011). These data provide a picture that seems to be better than the abovementioned national averages (e.g. nearly 32% people have had some formal education, including children and adults). These results show 8% as having completed their elementary studies, 23% having a secondary education degree, only 1% having a five-year upper secondary certificate and only 0.3% reaching a five-year university degree. However, these results may have been biased by the sampling conditions.

1.3.3 Employment

Data on unemployment rates of "Roma" population do not exist at a national level. Some approximated clues can be found in the results of the 2008 census of "Roma" people (less than 5,000) living in camps carried out by the Italian Red Cross in the municipality of Rome (Italian Senate, 2011): 73% were without employment, blacksmiths (5% women and 8% men), housewives (4% as an average and 8% women); itinerant (street) vendors (3.5% both men and women), domestic workers (1.2% as an average and 2.3% women) and unskilled workers in building industry (1.2% in general and 2.3% men). Other estimates (Chirico M. R., 2008) show that nearly 90% Roma and Sinti are unemployed.

Surveys (Ambrosini M., 2010; Regione Toscana and Fondazione Michelucci, 2010; Sigona N. and Monasta L., 2006) provide qualitative information that confirms the abovementioned picture. They add other activities such as collecting recyclable garbage, decontaminating asbestos sites, creating bands that play the traditional repertoire of Roma and Sinti minorities, washing windscreens near to traffic lights and begging. The latter is an occupational activity carried out prevalently by women and children among the poorest communities, as a consequence of unemployment.

The surveys underline that irregular housing and residence conditions (e.g. residence permit and enrolment in registry office) compromise and make it impossible for "Roma" people to find any job (including within the black economy). In return, losing a job or being unemployed hampers the renewal of residence permits as employment is a key requirement. Current laws on immigration (e.g. Laws No 189/2002 and 222/2002) specify the mandatory link between residence permit, appropriate housing contracts and legal labour contract. These rules concern half the "Roma" population according to data already estimated ([Table 2](#)). A distinction should be therefore made between foreigner and Italian "Roma", as well as between old and new "Roma" generations ([Table 1](#)).

Surveys (IRES Piemonte, 2005; Mininterno, 2006; Tavolo Rom di Milano, 2009; IREF, 2010) showed that persons of the old Italian “Roma” communities are more regularly employed than those of recent migration waves. This is evident, for example, for nearly 65% Roma and Sinti households living in Torino (North), as well as for Roma Abruzzesi in other Italian regions, for Romanian Roma, Roma Dasikhanè and Khorakhanè in Foggia (South), for nearly 50% of the “Roma” labour forces in Reggio Calabria (South), for Roma and Sinti in Milano (North).

Unfortunately, it is an employment consisting of temporary jobs, including itinerant vendors, seasonal agricultural labourers, scrap-metal dealers, shop assistants, cleaners, industrial workers, unskilled workers in building industry.

Economic growth in Italy has, in fact, changed the traditional occupations of “Roma” people, especially after the 1960s and during the last 25 years (Calabrò A. R., 1992). A typical example is that of the Sinti *Giostrai* (fairground folk). At least 60% of them (but some estimates arrive at 90%) lost their original employment as fairground artists when a national law aimed at ensuring adequate places to the performance of Sinti artists (Law No 337/1968) was not applied by most municipalities (only 10 municipalities in the North followed the law) (Calabrò A. R., 2008 and Chirico M. R., 2008).

Information on the change in the prevalent activities of the “Roma” population was well described in two basic studies carried out twenty years ago (Mattioli G., 1989) and ten years ago (Dragutinovic R., 2000). The following analysis is based on these studies and data on trends concerning specific local or regional areas. All information can be summarised according to main “Roma” communities living in Italy (Table 4), while general results largely correspond to job typologies commonly analysed at European level (Liègeois J-P., 2007).

Once their traditional occupations were lost, the “Roma” have become largely unskilled workers, on the fringe of local labour markets, involved in black economy and employed in undeclared work, living in in-work poverty conditions much worse than Italian workers. Currently, most “Roma” people are self-employed mainly collecting and selling scrap-metal, but this occupation places them on the fringe of both the market and society. For a few of them who are fortunate to be legally employed, living conditions have improved significantly (Calabrò A. R., 2008).

1.3.4 Health

It is a Constitutional and legal commitment to make health services accessible to all the population, including immigrant citizens. Enrolment into health services is mandatory for regular immigrants and those without a residence permit or with an expired residence permit can access medical assistance through public health agencies. Unfortunately, the risk of being identified as irregular workers or citizens strongly limits the utilisation of these basic health rights. For instance, according to data provided by the Ministry of the Interior (Mininterno, 2010), the number of foreign citizens enrolled into the national health service was 58% of the foreign population in 2008 and, according to data provided by the national institute of statistics (ISTAT, 2008), 18% foreigners used health service (e.g. medical examination) against 25% Italians in 2005. This is of course particularly true for foreign “Roma” people.

Unfortunately, health statistics do not exist in Italy specifically devoted to analyse the “Roma” conditions and only few enquiries provide very partial data on specific local areas and different period of time; data that can not be generalised.

According to a research carried out in 2008 in three camps of Rome (Save the Children, 2008), about 70% of interviewed women did not have access to any health assistance, 18% had access as a temporary foreigner (e.g. a specific health card for irregular immigrants) and only 11% were regularly enrolled in the national health system.

According to other enquiries (PCM, 2000), infant mortality rate was 15.3 per thousand for "Roma" newborn babies between 1992 and 1995 in Lazio (Centre), compared to 4.4 per thousand for Italian newborn babies. Health conditions were recognised to be heavily compromised for persons living in camps, campers, caravans and shacks without essential services (such as water, hygienic utilities, electricity and heating). The living conditions in camps were recognised incompatible with the respect of human health, dignity and integrity. Life expectancy of "Roma" people is generally shorter at least by 20 years (e.g. 55 years) than that of the "national" population (Chirico M. R., 2008). In addition, people die in caravan fires, or excessive cold or domestic accidents caused by extreme degradation of camps where they are forced to live (e.g. 39 Roma children died between 1990 and 2000).

Other studies (Sigona N. and Monasta L., 2006) highlight how socio-environmental degradation impacts the health conditions and is one of the main factors of child death in camps while describing several cases scattered throughout the national territory.

Analyses on health conditions of "Roma" population and needs for adequate health services are developed at regional and local level, but in sporadic way (IREF, 2010; Fondazione Basso, 2011).

1.3.5 Housing and the environment

Housing hardship constitutes a considerable problem for "Roma" population and it is closely linked to the "camps". Italy is, in fact, a land of camps of "Roma" (ERRC, 2000 and Piasere, 2004), where they live in an extremely degraded environment at the margin of society.

Between 40,000 and 50,000 "Roma" people are estimated to live in camps in 2010 (ANCI, 2011). They were 10,500 persons in 1996 (PCM, 2000) and at least 18,000 foreign Roma in 2001 (Sigona N. and Monasta L., 2006), demonstrating a significant growth.

Sources of information (Il Sole 24 ore, 2008), based on information from Prefectures (i.e. the representative of the Ministry of the Interior in each province), provide details on geographical distribution of nearly 41,300 "Roma" people living in camps in 2008. Foreigner "Roma" constitute 63% of the total amount persons living in camps. They reach 89% in the Centre but decline to 67% in the South and to 45% in the North, where "Roma" persons with Italian citizenship constitute the majority of persons in camps. A 10% of underestimation must be added. In doing so, the total amount arrives at 45,400 persons that correspond to nearly 30% of the total "Roma" population living in Italy ([Table 5](#)).

The largest share of "Roma" living in camps is in the North (47%), followed by the Centre (31%) and the South (22%). A quarter of them are concentrated in camps existing in Lazio (Centre) and this share arrives at 51% when the numbers concerning just other two regions of the North are added: 17% in Lombardia and 9% in Piemonte (North). It is enough to add Emilia Romagna (9%) and Veneto (8%) in the North, Campania (7%) in the South and Toscana (5%) in the Centre to arrive at the share of 80%. The remaining 20% is distributed in the other 13 regions with respective percentage decreasing from 4% to nearly 0%.

Looking at a sub-regional level, 52% “Roma” people live in camps located in seven out of the 110 Italian provinces (i.e. 6%). This share arrives at 80% by adding other 21 provinces. The provinces of Rome (in Lazio) and Milano (in Lombardia) have the larger degree of concentration (22% and 11% respectively). The provinces of Napoli (in Campania) and Torino (in Piemonte) have 5% each of the total “Roma” people living in Italian camps. Other three provinces follow with an individual share of 3% each: Catanzaro (in Calabria), Latina (in Lazio) and Reggio Emilia (in Emilia Romagna). Seven provinces have 2% of the total number of camps; four of them are in the North (Pavia in Lombardia; Venezia and Verona in Veneto; Bologna in Emilia Romagna), two in the South (Pescara in Abruzzo and Foggia in Puglia) and only one in the Centre (Firenze in Toscana). The number of “Roma” persons living in camps located in these 14 provinces arrives at nearly 26,800, which is 65% of the abovementioned 41,300 total amount, 27% in the North, 26% in the Centre and 12% in the South. The remaining 35% is distributed in 33 provinces, each of them with around 1% of “Roma” people and 63 provinces, each of them with less than 1%. Unfortunately comparison of these data with those provided by regional surveys reveals differences that can be significant (Table 6).

“Roma” persons live in authorised permanent camps, authorised temporary camps and unauthorised temporary camps in peripheral and isolated areas, far away from the city centres and their services, poorly connected to the towns, lacking in essential services (such as water, hygienic utilities, electricity and heating), or providing precarious and inadequate services, without public transport (buses, underground, etc.), under bridges (e.g. Tevere river in Rome), often close to motorways, railways, canals, waterways, landfills or former waste dump sites, cemeteries and abandoned industrial areas (Fondazione Basso, 2011; Enwereuzor U. C. and Di Pasquale L., 2009; ENAR, 2010). However, lack of essential services is a result of an unplanned and disorderly urban development also for Italian citizens.

When camps are located in the inner urban places (e.g. inside the cities), they are just closed slums separated from the social structure of the “polis” (ANCI, 2011). Local authorities have created equipped camps as temporary facilities for non-sedentary groups. However, as underlined in the 2010 ENAR shadow report: both authorised and unauthorised camps are “often targets of social alarm and hostility from residents”; “unauthorized settlements are often subject to eviction orders”; “the inhabitants of the settlements are moved out without alternative accommodation by law enforcement authorities”.

Evictions “are carried out without any consultation with the Roma and Sinti populations and often without offering alternative accommodation”. Relocations have “a negative effect on the employment prospects of those who have a job and on schooling for children”. “The only solution for most of the families evicted from camps is to find some shelter and create another non authorized settlement in another area”.

They are “apartheid camps”, ghettos without minimum requisites, where “gypsies and nomads” (stereotyped and offensive appellations) are not visible and the land value is minimal (Sigona, 2005). Camps, both regular and abusive, in metropolitan areas of Rome, Bologna, Firenze, Napoli, Palermo, Venezia, Torino and Milano have become real “bidonvilles” (slums) (PCM, 2000).

On the contrary, according to some students (Sigona N. and Monasta L., 2006), most foreign Roma living in camps ask for dignified “normal houses”, in either public social housing projects or private housing, while most Sinti ask for equipped residential areas where small groups and households can live in mobile houses or self-made one floor brick houses.

1.3.6 Culture and social participation

“Roma” communities have been always open to external influences, sometime acquiring new cultural characteristics and modifying their original languages in such a way that they become Italian dialects (Piasere L., 2004), as well as adopting the Italian dominant religion (i.e. Catholicism) while contributing to the presence of minor religious groups. As an example, the overall religious map can be summarised as follows. The oldest communities of Roma and Camminanti Siciliani are mostly Catholics. Sinti are Catholics and increasingly Evangelical Christians. Roma Lovara are basically Evangelical Christians (Pentecostalism). Muslim is the majority of Roma Khorakhanè, while Roma Kalderasha and Dasikhanè are prevalently Orthodox Christians. Romanian Roma form several religious groups, mainly with Christian roots.

The process of social integration is apparent for the oldest generations of Sinti, Roma and Travellers with names according to their regional placement (e.g. Piemontesi, Lombardi, Veneti, Emiliani, Abruzzesi, Molisani, Napoletani, Cilentani, Lucani, Calabresi, Siciliani, etc.)

According to some studies (Osservatorio di Politica Internazionale, 2010 and Mininterno, 2006), the “Roma” communities are mostly settled (sedentary); only few groups have been itinerants (e.g. Sinti, Camminanti Siciliani, Roma Lovara and Kalderasha). Mostly of them, generally those belonging to the first, second and third migratory waves abandoned the nomadic life and became sedentary. This process has been apparent since the 1960s and has increased in the last 25 years for several reasons, such as economic changes that affected traditional occupations accompanied by ageing and relatively improved living conditions. Semi-sedentary communities are estimated to arrive at nearly 20,000 people (13% of all “Roma” population), a minority group formed prevalently by Roma Kalderasha, Sinti and Camminanti Siciliani, all Italian citizens (Calabrò A. R., 2008 and Chirico M. R., 2008).

Economic changes have clearly modified the living conditions of older communities. Their life styles follow spatial and temporal rules dramatically different from traditional practices and behaviours of the original communities (Ambrosini M., 2010).

Changes were also negative, such as in the Roma Lovara living in Milano (Calabrò A. R., 2008). Twenty years ago, they represented an exception to ghetto's conditions, social and cultural isolation. They acknowledged themselves as “rich and honest people” while defending their cultural and religious identities along with their economic autonomy. This defence was not sufficient to prevent them from drifting into poverty and social marginality, as well as into the culture of delinquency.

Several factors still hamper social and cultural participation of the “Roma” communities in Italian society, especially for recent migratory waves. These can be summarised as follows. On one hand, the difficulty to acquire Italian citizenships, on the other hand, a process that presents the conflict between the loss of community identity and social alienation. There are persons who embraced deviant behaviour while integrating themselves in delinquency culture, acting as operational arms of organised criminality, for instance the eco-mafia that controls waste business in Napoli and Campania (Cianciullo A. and Fontana E., 1995; Legambiente, 2004). On the other hand, there are persons who remained “honest people” but for whom material deprivation, poverty and social exclusion have increased (Calabrò A. R., 2008).

As a result, the possibility of bringing the two universes closer (namely, the Italian galaxy and the “Roma” galaxy) is problematic, as well as are attempts to facilitate better communication and mutual understanding (Cefisi L., 2011).

Unfortunately, there is no available information concerning the participation of Roma, Sinti and Travellers in sport and recreation activities (Cospe, 2009).

1.4 Extent and nature of discrimination experienced by Roma

Stereotypes often nourish xenophobia and racism, and foster discrimination against “Roma” persons in Italy. As an example, during the political competition in the recent municipal elections (May 2011) in Milano, declarations of right wing parties (especially the autonomist *Lega Nord*, Northern League Party) focused on the fight against *zingaropoli* (i.e. the city of nomads and gypsies) and against Muslims and their mosques in order to defend purity and identity of the original population of Padania (a land constituted by northern population but never existed as a State or Region).

Also the current Prime Minister (leader of the major right wing party *Popolo della Libertà*, people of freedoms) joined this racist political orientation by declaring its fight against an Islamic city, a *zingaropoli* besieged by foreigners, to whom the opposition party promised the right to vote. Also during the campaign for the provincial elections (May and June 2009), the Prime Minister declared that Milano seemed like an “African” city as there were so many foreigner citizens, while claiming that “we don’t want a multiethnic Italy”.

Similar terms have been used in the past. The term “Africa” appeared in a popular film (“Rocco and His Brothers”) directed by Luchino Visconti in 1960 to tell the story of an immigrant family from the South to Milano. The family was called “Africa” from original inhabitants of a peripheral neighbourhood. During the internal migratory waves of the 1960s, derogative terms to describe Italians coming from Calabria, Sicilia and other Southern regions were also *terroni* (people from the South) or *marocchini* (to define the Southern Italians as if they came from Morocco). These terms are still partly used today.

Therefore, these examples constitute the tip of an iceberg, whose real problem is prejudice against other people, a prejudice that can be found in political debate from the Unity of Italy, 150 years ago (Teti V., 1993). In fact, information sources and Italians in general use the term *zingari* (gypsies) and *nomadi* (nomads) to describe Roma, Sinti and Travellers. These terms are considered offensive, a source of discrimination based on stereotypes. The generic appellation *zingari* or *nomadi* refers to a kind of “natural” inclination to travel from place to place while avoiding social integration with other communities. “Italian authorities have consistently referred to Roma and Sinti as “nomads” despite the fact that most Roma in Italy do not follow an itinerant lifestyle. During the 1999 review of Italy’s compliance with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the head of the Italian delegation (...) told members of the CERD that as “natural nomads,” Gypsies “preferred to stay in their camps” (ERRC, 2010).

This official stance persists and in its 2008 State Report for the CERD’s most recent review of Italy, the Italian Government explicitly stated that Romani populations are “characterized in all cases by nomadism” (ERRC, 2010).

The choice of places where camps are built is indicative of a “planning of contempt” based on the concepts that Gypsies must be kept away from the general population, and the general population does its best to maintain this distance (Solimano N. and Mori T., 2000). Stereotypes include a kind of “natural” inclination of *zingari* and *nomadi* towards illegal activities, although these are mainly determined by survival reasons while facing apparent difficulties to restructure, reorganise and adapt their traditional life styles according to rules and rhythms of industrial and post-industrial society (Ambrosini M., 2010 and Calabrò A. R., 2008). According to surveys carried out at European level (Eurobarometer, 2008), in Italy almost half of respondents would feel uncomfortable having a Roma neighbour (47%), 24 percentage points more than the EU average (24%).

According to national surveys (ISPO, 2008): 35% Italians overestimate the number of *zingari* living in Italy (giving estimates of between one and over 2 million persons) while 56% do not know how many they might be; 84% think that *zingari* are prevalently nomads; 83% that they prefer to live in isolated camps and 87% that they are closed communities; 73% think that all *zingari* have same culture, language and origin; only 24% know that half of the “*zingari*” are Italians; 92% think that Roma and Sinti often exploit children and live through thefts and other expedients. Interestingly, only 35% Italians think that Roma and Sinti are not discriminated against.

Reports (e.g. those written by the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)) give extensive evidence of discriminatory actions and acts that allow for some basic considerations. The overall consideration is that “Italian authorities have in the past and continue today to racially segregate Roma” (ERRC, 2010). Specifically, restrictive measures, control policies and forced evictions have continued at municipal level affecting the integration process of families and children in local communities. Violent political declarations and manifestations against Roma and Sinti have been organised by representatives of the Northern League Party (ENAR, 2010). Examples of discrimination have been found in acts and procedures at municipal level by UNAR (the national office against racial discrimination). They indicate case-law and sentences such as that concerning a mayor in the North condemned for hate speech against “Roma” population (Tega D., 2011). UNAR in fact intervenes significantly also from the legal point of view to remove discriminatory restrictions, while supporting and collaborating with “Roma” organisations ([Box 1](#)).

The FRA Annual Report 2010 reports a survey providing detailed information on incidents and practices (including Italian acts) of racism and discrimination against Roma and Sinti individuals and communities (Cospe, 2009a).

Between February and June 2010, the UN Universal Periodic Review, which promotes and protects human rights in the world, formulated 10 recommendations concerning the Italian policies in order to combat discrimination of Roma and Sinti and to improve their living conditions (Italian Senate, 2011).

The Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (Hammarberg T., 2009) presented a report where he expressed a worry about “a trend of racism and xenophobia in Italy occasionally supported by actions of local authorities, which has led also to violent acts against migrants, Roma and Sinti or Italian citizens of migrant descent”. The Commissioner recommended that Italian authorities ensure a prompt reaction to and strong condemnation of all racist or intolerant manifestations and reinforce the anti-discrimination legislation.

Amnesty International (Amnesty International, 2010 and 2011) underlined that “Roma” rights continued to be violated in Italy. Derogatory and discriminatory remarks by politicians against “Roma” and migrants (but also against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people) have created a climate of rising intolerance.

Unlawful forced evictions of “Roma” communities continued and “contributed to driving those affected deeper into poverty and marginalisation”, while new legislation introduced discriminatory restrictions to basic rights and services. The reports mentioned the “security package” (Law No 94/2009), which included the legalisation of vigilante groups to patrol municipal territories in order to prevent criminal activities of immigrants and “Roma” people. This law introduced measures that make it more difficult for “Roma” people to obtain identification documents, as noted in the ERRC, 2010. The report cites the “Pacts for Security” adopted in various cities since December 2006, which are aimed at mitigating the problems of “Roma” people living in camps and protecting local communities from criminality and disorder. According to the Ministry of the Interior, nearly 60 Pacts were finalised by April 2011 at regional, provincial and municipal, mostly in Lombardia (60%). According to the ERRC report, the Pacts have resulted in “systematic and targeted campaign of recurrent raids on Romani camps, checks of personal documents, arbitrary destruction of home and property owned by Roma and forced evictions of Roma”.

In general, Italian authorities consider the problems of “Roma” population to be first of all a security issue. As a consequence, they adopt “emergency” rules aimed at fighting against crime and delinquency, which often result in discriminatory acts and practices. As an example (ERRC, 2010), the national government adopted in May 2008 a “Declaration of the state of emergency with regard to settlements of nomad communities in the territories of Campania, Lazio and Lombardia regions”, followed by specific acts (“emergency orders”) that appointed the Prefects of Rome, Milano and Napoli as Commissioners with powers “derogating from the rules of law in force”. Following observations by the EU Commission (July 2008), the Italian government issued some “implementation guidelines” to specify that any intervention by the Prefects shall not target specific individuals or groups (e.g. Roma and Sinti), but rather all people living in camps, regardless their nationality, ethnicity and religion. Another example is the “Roma census” (FRA, 2008). In June 2008, the national government announced its intention to carry out a “census” in those regions where “extraordinary” Commissioners had been appointed to face the “Roma emergency”. The census included fingerprinting and information on religious beliefs and ethnic origin. Negative reactions by civil society (including members of the Catholic Church), the European Commission, the European Parliament (July 2008), and Italian Data Protection Authority (DPA), stopped this investigation (with the exception of Napoli for a limited number of adults and children). Surveys were carried out in 167 camps that respected the national law on personal data protection (Law No 196/2003), the DPA’s directives, the EU Treaties and Directives (e.g. 2000/43/EC) against any direct and indirect discrimination.

1.5 Main data gaps in relation to Roma

The previous paragraphs demonstrate to what extent the lack of statistics affects the analysis of issues concerning “Roma” population. Only rough estimates exist along with qualitative descriptions. Some quantitative information is available, but it is often dated and limited to specific regional or local areas. The preparation of this report revealed how difficult it is to provide information and data concerning “Roma” population in Italy and their geographic distribution. An in-depth analysis of the key aspects of poverty and social exclusion was impossible (namely, relative income poverty and deprivation, employment, health, housing and the environment,

cultural and social participation including sport and recreation). Available data indicate an improvement in education statistics but they cannot be disaggregated by groups, gender and geographic distribution.

2. Assessment of existing policies and governance framework

The present section focuses on the main policies carried out at national and sub-national levels to tackle the issues of poverty and social exclusion of “Roma” population living in Italy, starting from the current overall policy framework and governance arrangements.

2.1 Current overall policy framework and governance arrangements

The policy framework concerning “Roma” population is influenced by the security and emergency rules embedded into recent national acts (previously mentioned) that introduced limits to immigrants and homeless rights (e.g. Laws No 125/2008, 133/2008 and 94/2009 on public security that modified the framework Law No 286/1998 on immigration), for instance:

- irregular immigration, illegal entrance and permanence are considered crimes with a risk of imprisonment of between one and five years;
- more severe public security rules regarding expulsion from Italy including the extension of the period of detention in centres for identification of irregular immigrants;
- penalties and prison sentences for employing, providing lodging and favouring illegal immigration;
- denial of access to essential services in relation to new residence requirements (such as a nationally centralised register of homeless people linked to hygiene and health conditions of dwellings) making life more difficult for persons who live on the street, mobile homes or non-conventional buildings (including migrants, asylum-seekers, refugees, Roma, Sinti, Travellers and similar groups);
- restricted access to the national plan for public housing and housing allowances (linked to the minimum permanency time of ten years in Italy or five years in the same region);
- restricted access to health services for European citizens not in compliance with existing laws (e.g. without a job and adequate income, generally Romanian Roma);
- volunteer municipal civilian patrols, created to protect neighbours from micro-criminality mainly attributed to immigrants and particularly to *zingari* (nomads).

The abovementioned acts have amplified the risk of being stigmatised and discriminated against, as well as subject to vigilantism. Furthermore, these acts have influenced public opinion into becoming resigned to xenophobia and racism, in a certain sense legitimising discriminatory behaviour (Cospe, 2008).

However, national case-law and sentences of the Constitutional Court have raised doubts on some restrictions against immigrants. Also, the Court of Justice of the European Union ruled (28 April 2011) that the full respect for fundamental rights, dignity and physical integrity must be

ensured in immigration policies in compliance with international and Community laws, including refugee protection, removal and repatriation (e.g. return obligations).

More than half “Roma” people are immigrants ([Table 3](#)) and therefore must respect the immigration legislation. The other share of “Roma” population is “Italian Roma”, but they do not benefit from any specific legislation. Although Sinti and Roma have similar dialects attributable to the *romanés* language and Camminanti speak a local language, they are not recognised as national minorities. The relevant national legislation on “historical linguistic minorities” (Law No 482/1999) recognises at least other twelve linguistic stocks (Toso F., 2008), but these do not include any “Roma” groups ([Table 1](#)).

The cancellation of any reference to Roma, Sinti and Camminanti Sicilliani allowed the Parliament to approve the linguistic minorities’ law after strong debate (Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009). As noted by the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, (Hammarberg T., 2008), “Roma and Sinti have been excluded from Law 482/1999 on the protection of historical linguistic minorities, on the grounds that they had no links with any specific area. In Italy, it seems to be widely, and erroneously, held that Roma and Sinti are “nomads” who prefer to live in camps. In this regard, it should be noted that Italy has signed (on 27 June 2000) but not as yet ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages”. The Charter was adopted by the Council of Europe in 1992 and it was followed by other acts, such as the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities signed in 1995 by the Council of Europe, the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (the Barcelona Declaration) approved by UNESCO in 1996 and the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity adopted by UNESCO in 2001. The latter raises cultural diversity to the “level of the common heritage of humanity (...) as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature” (...), an ethical imperative indissociable from respect for the dignity of the individual”.

The policy evolution at an international level can be summarised as a shift from an approach based on the concept of protecting minority groups to a concept based on the understanding of the plurality of human identity (Sen A., 2006). While plural identities are recognised as an important resource of human development, protection of minority groups is intended as necessity to be more tolerant or to show solidarity with people living in bad conditions.

A prevalent opinion among some experts on the “Roma” issues (Calabrò A. R., 2008; Chirico M. R., 2008; Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009) is that there is a lack of effective social inclusion policies concerning “Roma” people. They represent “the last of the last”, those who live on the margins of society, those who are difficult to integrate, and those who are continuously subject to social discrimination.

Policies are not coherent at a national level while they are ambiguous at a regional level. At a national level, the policy framework is characterised by legislation that combines security and emergency arguments while hampering the above-mentioned strategic shift. Few positive exceptions were: in 1985 with a memorandum of the Ministry of the Interior, which recognised the importance of equality and cultural respect for Sinti and Roma; between 2007 and 2008 with policy attempts to recognise Roma and Sinti as national minorities, as well as with the European Conference on Roma population (held in Rome in January 2008).

At a sub-national level, some Regions have enforced laws specifically devoted to Roma, Sinti and Travellers since the 1980s. These sometimes contrast as some are “assimilation” policies (i.e. the process whereby a minority group gradually adopts the prevailing culture of a regional context)

while others are “integration” policies (i.e. the process whereby people of all cultural backgrounds come together to develop shared value mutually).

Governance reflects both the abovementioned cultural and political conflicts, as well as institutional conflict between the State and the Regions. The latter has arisen between different level of responsibilities attributed according to the Constitutional Charter: exclusive legislative power to the Regions in social, housing and urban planning, vocational training and employment policies; a dual converging legislation between the State and the Regions in health and land use policies; exclusive legislative power to the State in citizenship rights, basic levels of civil and social rights (to be ensured throughout the national territory), migration policy, public order and security policies, as well as social insurance (e.g. pensions, unemployment benefits and other monetary allowances to mitigate the impact of economic crisis on workers and companies).

As a conclusion, main strengths of the policy framework can be identified in positive examples of active social inclusion policies developed by some regional and local authorities. Main weaknesses consisted in the lack of unitary policies and a systematic programme for active inclusion of Roma, Sinti and Travellers at a national level. The following paragraphs will provide more in-depth consideration of this assessment.

2.2 Existing targets on poverty and social exclusion reduction

The analysis of the currently available official documents reveals the lack of specific targets aimed at reducing poverty and social exclusion of the “Roma” population.

The National Strategic Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (NSRSPSI, shortly NSR), prepared by the Italian government in 2008, included a plan for the integration of immigrants, Roma and Sinti people as one of its four policy priorities. Unfortunately, the NSR did not specify targets or indicators to measure progress, nor the required financial resources. Main measures were: actions already financed by a fund for social inclusion of immigrants, e.g. teaching of the Italian language, access to regular employment and to housing; actions supported by the 2007-2013 National Strategic Reference Framework (EU Structural Funds), e.g. an analysis of socio-demographic-economic situations of the existing ethnic communities as well as of the services devoted to them (e.g. education, vocational training, employment, health and social services), selection, analysis and transfer of good practices against discrimination; re-construction of a consultation body for issues concerning immigrants and their families; dissemination of the EU DOSTA campaign by adapting their contents to the Italian language and context in order to stop prejudices and stereotypes against the Roma population. It is worth noting the role played by UNAR in the DOSTA campaign ([Box 1](#)).

The “Roma” conditions represented a key aspect also in 2006- 2008 NSR under the policy priority devoted to vulnerable categories. The NSR presented measures concerning a national plan dedicated to social inclusion of “Roma” minors (e.g. education and health services) to be prepared through a close collaboration between government, “Roma” associations and other NGOs, along with strengthening the action of cultural mediators in favour of Roma, Sinti and Travellers. The NRS fostered a more coherent, open, multi-dimension approach aimed at solidarity, social inclusion and multi-cultural cohesion. The approach was associated with a series of acts enforced to correct the restrictive legal framework created in between 2002 and 2006 (e.g. Laws No 189 and 222/2002), as well as bills aimed at modifying the “ius sanguinis” orientation present in the Italian legislation on citizenship rights. However, a series of events (including

national elections and change in the policy orientation of the followed government) nullified the results of approach.

As commented by some students (Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009), the abovementioned measures were generic and have a mere programmatic nature without targets or monitoring mechanisms. Furthermore, financial resources have not been assigned to relevant ministries (e.g. for education and school integration of minors) or cancelled (e.g. the fund for social inclusion of immigrants created in 2007 and declared unlawful in 2008 by the Constitutional Court because it violated the exclusive legislative power to the Regions in social policies).

2.3 Roma in the National Reform Programme

As already specified in paragraph 1.3 of this report, one of the main weaknesses of the current National Reform Programme (NRP) is that it does not mention any policy aimed at tackling poverty and social exclusion experienced by "Roma" people.

This weakness is linked to fiscal decentralisation started with specific acts (e.g. Law No 42/2009; Legislative Decrees No 216/2010 and 23/2011). All funding functions will be attributed to regional and local authorities, ending the current financial allocations from the State. Unfortunately, national funds related to social inclusion have been reduced while basic levels of quality in social services have yet to be defined to ensure civil and social rights throughout the national territory, as stated by the 2000 framework reform on social policies (Law No 328/2000). The reductions in financial resources, the lack of harmonised rights and the still existing regional inequality in services will further affect "Roma" people in the coming years.

2.4 Existing policies and programmes

Local authorities in Italy perform the bulk of social policies. Law No 328/2000 facilitated the development of integrated systems of social policies and services at a local level. The law considered the interconnection of social policies with education, training and health policies, while stimulating the creation of differentiated systems to address local diversities and needs. Subsidiarity within institutional unity was the driving force for diversity, stakeholders' involvement and participative decision-making. Successive acts (including a major Constitutional reform in 2001, confirmed by a referendum) provided a coherent legal framework aimed at empowering local authorities to implement local welfare plans, which were supported by several sentences of the Constitutional Court regarding the decentralised institutional structure and the associated governance mechanisms.

As a national average in 2008 (ISTAT, 2011), the expenditure of municipalities on social services amounted to € 6,662,232,600 as a whole (Table 7), corresponding to 0.42% the national GDP (gross domestic product). Considering inflation, the increase was 13.5% with respect to the total amount recorded in 2003 (€ 5,198,277,766). The largest share of the 2008 social expenditure was in the North (57.2%), followed by the Centre (22.3%) and the South (20.5%). Six regions absorbed a 64% share of the total expenditure: four in the North (Lombardia, Emilia Romagna, Piemonte and Veneto) and two in the Centre (Lazio and Toscana).

As a national average, the amount per inhabitant was € 111 in 2008 and € 90 in 2003, but the increase in per capita expenditure was of only € 8 when measured in inflation-adjusted prices. In 2008 (Table 8), per capita expenditure varied from € 231 in the Autonomous Province of Trento

(in the North) to € 30 in the Calabria Region (in the South). Nine regions and the two Autonomous Provinces of Trento and Bolzano were above the national per capita expenditure, mostly in the North (Valle d'Aosta, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Emilia Romagna, Piemonte, Liguria and Lombardia), two in the Centre (Lazio and Toscana) and only one in the South (Sardegna). The Veneto Region (North) recorded the national average per capita. The remaining nine regions were below the national average, seven in the South and two in the Centre.

A balance between the expenditures devoted to the general social policies and those targeted specifically at "Roma" people can be roughly assessed. "Roma" people are included in the measures concerning immigrants. The total amount of social expenditures for immigrants and "Roma" was € 181,402,675 in 2008, corresponding to 2.7% of the overall expenditure of municipalities on social services (Table 7). By adding expenditure devoted to homeless people (€ 30,865,293 as a whole) the percentage reaches 3.2%.

The largest share of expenditure in favour of immigrant and "Roma" people was in the North (59.7%), followed by the Centre (29.9%) and the South (10.4%). An 80% share of this expenditure was concentrated in seven regions: five in the North (Lombardia, Emilia Romagna, Piemonte, Veneto and Friuli Venezia Giulia) and two in the Centre (Lazio and Toscana).

As a national average, the expenditure per foreigner population resident was € 50 (Table 8). Per capita expenditure varied from € 134 in the Autonomous Province of Bolzano (in the North) to € 12 in the Abruzzo Region (in the South). Apart from the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, nine regions were above the national per capita expenditure, four in South (Basilicata with the second largest per capita, equal to € 99, followed by Sardegna, Molise and Puglia), three in the North (Friuli Venezia Giulia, Piemonte and Emilia Romagna) and two in the Centre (Lazio and Toscana). The remaining ten regions were below the national average, two in the Centre, four in the South and four in the North, to which the Autonomous Province of Trento must be added.

Local authorities finance 62% of the expenditure for social policies with their own resources. The State and the Regions provide for another 34% and the remaining share of the total social expenditure is covered by private funds (ISTAT, 2011). This was the situation in 2008, but perspectives are less favourable for both universal policies and policies targeted specifically at "Roma" people. A significant reduction in public spending has had a strong influence on the access to quality services. Financial resources for social inclusion services decreased considerably (by 33.7%) between 2008 and 2010 and a further decrease (82% with respect 2010) is expected by 2013. The decrease concerns national funds devoted to social policies, family, children, youth, not-self-sufficient persons, immigrants, degraded cities, housing and community services. Regional and sub-regional authorities manage a large share of these funds (between 75 and 80%). Moreover, a consistent cut (nearly 9 billion euros) in their overall budget (necessary to provide other services to their citizens) is expected with the new financial manoeuvre proposed by the national government by the end of June 2011.

Since the 1980s, eleven out of the twenty Regions enforced laws (RL) specifically devoted to Roma, Sinti and Travellers, such as: Piemonte (RL 26/1993); Lombardia (RL 77/1989); Liguria (LR 21/1992); Veneto (RL 41/1984 and 54/1989); Friuli Venezia Giulia (RL 11/1988 and 25/1991); Emilia Romagna (RL 47/1988, 34/1993 and 2/2003); Toscana (RL 73/1995, 17/1998 and 2/2000); Umbria (RL 32/1990); Marche (RL 3/1994 and 2/1998); Lazio (RL 82/1985); Sardegna (RL 9/1988). The Autonomous Province of Trento must be added with the provincial laws No 15/1985 and 12/2009. These laws show a converging assessment: many of them (especially those enforced between the 1980s and 1990s) were oriented to ensure rights of "nomadic people" as

they were a single identity group (Chirico M. R., 2008; Calabrò A. R., 2008; Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009). Attention was focused to promote the construction of various kinds of camps. Moreover, the effective enforcement of these acts by the part of the concerned municipalities has been low. Specific comments on housing conditions (Enwereuzor U. C. and Di Pasquale L., 2009) highlight that the 1990s regional laws “portrayed the link between their objectives of protecting ‘nomads and nomadic cultures’ and the construction of camps (...) as if it were a cause-effect relation. The outcome of this linkage is that most Roma and Sinti are forced by law and public policy to live in camps, thereby reinforcing the popular stereotypes of the Roma held by the majority population”. The most recent laws (e.g. in Toscana and Emilia Romagna) present a more holistic approach based on citizenship rights, inter-cultural understanding, mutual respect, full access to essential services and a better integration between social, housing, education, health, training and employment policies.

As a conclusion, regional and local authorities have developed many initiatives to tackle “Roma” hardships with different degrees of policy completeness, consistency and concreteness. Several examples provide evidence of policy commitment; some of them were effective policies and good practices. By analysing a series of reports (Chirico M. R., 2008; Enwereuzor U. C. and Di Pasquale L., 2009; Cerchi R. and Loy G., 2009; Cospe 2008a and 2009; EC, 2010; ENAR, 2010; IREF, 2010; ANCI, 2011; ISTAT, 2011), strengths and weaknesses of good practices can be identified according to specific policy fields.

2.4.1 Income (tax and welfare policies)

Italy does not have any national minimum income scheme. Tax relief follows general rules but appears to be insufficient to lessen the hardships experienced by low-income people and the poor. Local authorities support income of “Roma” and immigrants through direct monetary transfer, which constituted 29.2% of the total social expenditure for this category of people in 2008 (Table 7). The combination of monetary support and indirect support to income, through services (37.4%) and structures (33.4%), demonstrates a fairly good utilisation of available resources.

2.4.2 Education

Good practices

The creation of a national working group on disaffection at compulsory level (called GLID) in 2008 by the Ministry of Education.

A project carried out by the Rome municipality (Centre) since 1991 to increase participation of “Roma” pupils in formal education.

A project launched in 2001 and carried out by the municipality of Reggio Emilia (North) to improve school attendance of Sinti young people and to promote awareness-raising campaigns.

Strengths: involvement of adults and families; improvement of pupils’ attendance and education results; role played by cultural mediators; reduction of stereotypes and prejudices, as well as a better environment for mutual understanding and communication between “Roma” and other pupils; networking between local authorities, NGOs, social and educational workers; involvement of relevant NGOs.

Weaknesses: limited number of cultural mediators available; limited professional skills of teachers; scarce integration with other social services; limited financial resources; cultural resistance and diffidence.

2.4.3 *Employment*

Good practices

The "Lacio Grave", a transnational project that involved relevant stakeholders in the municipality of Reggio Calabria (South) in 1999 and 2000 (under the EU "Integra" Community Initiative), which created four entrepreneurship workshops devoted to Roma Calabresi.

A project started in 2005 and financed by the municipality of Rome (Centre) to increase access of Roma, Sinti and Camminanti people to labour market through a specific help desk managed also by Roma operators (called "social secretariat").

A project financed by the Rome Province (Centre) and carried out by a relevant NGO in 2003 and 2004 to create a dress-maker workshop.

The "Roma Cisti" (a cleaner Rome) project, carried out in 2005 by the municipal environmental agency to train and employ Roma persons in recycling activities.

The "Pijats Romanò" (a Roma and Sinti market) project, launched by two social co-operatives in 2002 and aimed at improving trade and artisan activities performed by Roma, Sinti and Camminanti people in the Rome municipality (Centre).

Two projects carried by the NGO Opera Nomadi in Milano (North) to facilitate the insertion of Roma cultural mediators in mandatory schools (2006) and to facilitate labour insertion of former convicted Roma persons (2005).

A project carried out by Opera Nomadi in Mantova (North) to employ Sinti and Roma cultural mediators in authorised camps (since 1994).

A project in Milano (North) carried out by social co-operatives to provide maintenance services in authorised camps through the employment of Roma persons (2005).

The "Kimeta" (women for women, named after a young Roma woman who died) project carried out by a sub-municipality council in Firenze (Centre) to train and facilitate the employment of Roma women (since 1997).

Strengths: multi-dimension approach including the promotion of citizenship rights, social and cultural integration; involvement of relevant NGOs; sensitisation of local communities; attention to cultural identities; full acknowledgment of informal skills and professional attitudes; cultural mediation.

Weaknesses: lack of specific national laws concerning "Roma" people; insufficient financial resources; low skills and professional competence of "Roma" people; restrictive norms on immigration and citizenship rights; sectoral and fragmented initiatives; limited incentives for

companies to employ "Roma" workers; scarce integration between employment and social policies; lack of placement competence in employment services as far as "Roma" professional profiles are concerned (e.g. data on labour supply).

2.4.4 Housing and the environment

Good practices

A project carried out by the municipality of Firenze (Centre) to build a small village initiated 1998.

The project "Città Sottili" launched by the municipality of Pisa (Centre) in 2001 to manage in a coordinate and integrated manner the transition of "Roma" families from accommodations in camps to apartments in different locations of the Pisa city.

A project started in 2001 for social housing in Cosenza municipality (South) through two small villages devoted to "Roma" families.

The projects on equipped micro areas and micro villages developed in different years in the province of Reggio Emilia ("from camps to towns") and Bolzano (North) to provide accommodation to individual families in centrally located areas.

The "Sucar Plaza" (beautiful square) small village for Sinti families in the Guastalla municipality, supported by the Province of Reggio Emilia (North) and inaugurated in 2006.

Monetary support to buy or rent a home provided by the municipality of Venezia (North) between 2001 and 2003 in order to dismantle two major camps.

The project "Il Dado" launched in 2008 by the municipality of Settimo Torinese (North) to favour self-made houses and recovery of abandoned houses by "Roma" people.

The "Villaggio della Speranza" (village of hope) promoted by the municipality of Padova (North) in 2006 to favour self-made houses by Sinti people.

Housing de-localisation projects to favour social integration and avoiding segregation in isolated camps, as developed in Reggio Calabria (South), as well as other interesting projects promoted by the municipalities of Mantova, Modena, Buccinasco, Trento and Rovereto (North).

Strengths: participatory urban planning and social housing by involving "Roma" communities; cultural mediation and social dialogue; involvement of relevant NGOs; mutual understanding and respect of different life conceptions and styles; housing policies oriented to social mix and social integration.

Weaknesses: housing seen by some "Roma" people as a way to maintain a forced segregation; insufficient dialogue between "Roma" and local communities; some housing approaches aimed at isolating "Roma" communities.

2.4.5 Health

Good practices

A project carried out by the local health agency in Rome (Centre) from 1997 to provide basic health case assistance, health education and information to Roma and Sinti people.

The project "health without exclusion" developed by Caritas and other NGOs in 2006 in Lazio region (2006) and supported by the regional government to provide essential health services to "Roma" communities while promoting an intensive awareness-raising campaign.

A project carried out by Opera Nomadi in Milano (Centre) from 1996 to provide basic health services to "Roma" households.

The 2003 "Gipsy" project carried out by Opera Nomadi and other associations and a social co-operative to provide support to drug-addicted Roma and Sinti persons in the municipality of Rome (Centre).

Strengths: cultural mediators; involvement of relevant NGOs; integrated preventive actions; public awareness campaigns; cultural mediation to facilitate access to health services.

Weaknesses: few public information campaigns; limited awareness of health rights from the part of "Roma" people; scarce integration between health and social projects; poor coordination between institutional actors.

2.4.6 Sport, recreation and culture

Good practices

The project "Sportrom", launched by the Province of Napoli (South), the Ministry of the Interior and a social association in 2009, in order to promote sports to Roma children and to promote social and cultural integration through sports.

Strengths: collaboration between different institutions, level of government and civil society organisations; integrated approach to combine education, culture and sport activities; cultural mediation.

Weaknesses: resistance to inter-cultural approach.

2.4.7 Anti-discrimination

Good practices

Initiatives carried out by UNAR with adequate resources (Box 1).

The regional centre of discrimination created by the Emilia Romagna Region (North).

The "observatory on discrimination" created in Mantova (North) with the participation of the Institute of Sinti culture.

Significant activities developed by many NGOs (e.g. Cospe, Opera Nomadi, Caritas, Cestim, Novo Drom, OsserVazione, AIZO).

Strengths: institutional capacity; activism and commitment.

Weaknesses: limited resources to face increasing xenophobia and racist policy orientation, especially as far as civil society organisations are concerned.

3. Structural Funds

Considering the recent update of the 2007 – 2013 National Strategic Framework (NRP, 2011), 3,868 million Euros are allocated to social inclusion policies, corresponding to 6.5% of the total EU Structural Funds for Italy. Nearly 60% of the resources for social inclusion policies (nearly 2.3 billion Euro) concern actions to promote labour market participation of women and disadvantaged persons, such as immigrants and ethnic minorities. The remaining 40% is directed at improving socio-health services and to ensure security conditions in four regions with high levels of criminality (in the South).

There is no specific programme targeted at Roma, Sinti and Travellers, who are generically included in the category of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Therefore, it is not easy to calculate the amount of the EU Structural Funds devoted to social inclusion of “Roma” communities.

As a general consideration, courses of action favouring “Roma” people can be implemented through two Operational National Programmes on “Governance and system actions” and “System actions”. These programmes promote three policy pillars: Employability to build models and tools which enhance the employability and the effectiveness of the social work insertion of disadvantaged persons; Equal opportunities and no discrimination to overcome the stereotypes related to discrimination; Transnationality to support partnerships and networks, as well as to exchange models and best practices.

A third Operational National Programme concerns “Security for the development of the South of Italy” and includes actions to improve cultural cohesion with attention to ethnic groups (and therefore also “Roma”).

Other courses of action might be implemented within the 21 Operational Regional Programmes. However, only three of them identified “Roma” people as categories within the programming axis concerning social inclusion policies (Abruzzo and Calabria in the South; Liguria in the North). This axis is devoted to developing integrated pathways for the social insertion and employment of disadvantaged people.

In 2009, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policies started a monitoring process of projects devoted to “Roma” communities, in collaboration with ISFOL (national institute for vocational training).

Provisional results are included in a report prepared by the European Network on Social Inclusion and Roma (EURoma, 2010) to provide information on all the EU Member States.

These results are partial and do not allow for a comparison with the current utilisation of the EU Structural Funds. A rough estimate shows that the overall amount of the projects (nearly 6 million Euro) constitutes approximately 0.3% of the resources for social inclusion policies.

Within the ESF (European Social Fund), UNAR manages a national project for social inclusion (Box 1), which includes the fight against discrimination concerning Roma, Sinti and Camminanti in five regions in the South of Italy (Campania, Basilicata, Sicilia and Puglia). The present report utilised results of the UNAR project (IREF, 2010). Other interesting results can be found in an in-depth analysis of local case studies (Catania D. and Serini A., 2011).

By using the ESF, the Autonomous Province of Bolzano and the Emilia Romagna Region (North), have developed three projects on labour market inclusion of “Roma” people. Through a regional act, the Lazio Region (Centre) funded six projects on vocational training for “Roma” persons in different activities.

Within the ERDF (European Regional Development Fund), four Regions (Calabria, Campania, Puglia and Sicilia; all in the South) planned courses of action to ensure equal access to social services with specific attention to people at risk of social exclusion, including Roma and Sinti communities.

Unfortunately, there is insufficient information to analyse how the EU Structural Funds complement other financial resources provided by Italian authorities (at national and sub-national level) and international organisations.

As a conclusion, it seems that only limited resources are devoted to tackle the poverty and social exclusion experienced by “Roma” people. “Roma” remain as a minority (ethnic groups) of a minority (the poor) within the national society. Monitoring mechanisms do not provide sufficient information to assess the effectiveness of programmes and projects that affect “Roma” people.

4. Role of civil society organisations and international organisations

The role played by civil society organisations has increased as a result of many years of activism promoting the civil, cultural and social rights of “Roma” people, as well as national/local initiatives and projects. Many “Roma” organisations are connected with international organisations (e.g. the European Network on Social Inclusion and Roma), also through the support of EU programmes and Structural Funds.

Some of the most important associations representing “Roma” communities are as follows.

Opera Nomadi is a national association founded in 1965 (www.operanomadinazionale.it). The association is present in several regional and provincial territories. It is a federation based on autonomous branches that express different levels of mobilisation and involvement in social policies.

OsservAzione is a national NGO acting from 2005 as a Centre for Action Research Against Roma and Sinti Discrimination (www.osservazione.org).

Nevo Drom is a Sinti association founded in Bolzano but acting at a national level as well to promote cultural and social rights and asking for the recognition of Sinti and Roma as national linguistic minorities (www.nevodrom.it).

Sucar Drom (“Beautiful Road” in the Sinti language) is an organisation formed by Sinti, Roma and other ethnic communities (www.sucardrom.eu). Its mission is the recognition of full rights of citizenship for national and European Sinti and Roma Communities.

AIZO (Associazione Italiana Zingari Oggi) is the Italian Association of Gypsies Today, created in 1971 and based on Torino (www.aizo.it).

Federazione Romaní (<http://federazioneromani.wordpress.com>) is a national association created in 2009 to promote self-determination of Romani people and inter-cultural cohesion.

O Vurdón is the Italian web site on Romaní history and culture (www.vurdon.it).

Federazione Rom e Sinti Insieme is a federation of Roma and Sinti created in 2008 with a membership of several regional and local “Roma” organisations, as well as by Nevo Drom and Sucar Drom (<http://comitatoromsinti.blogspot.com>).

COSPE is a national ONG (www.cospe.it/cospe/old/index; Co-operation for the Development of Emerging Countries) created in 1983, based in Firenze and involved in activities devoted to Roma, Sinti and Travellers. COSPE carries out studies on behalf of international organisations, such as the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA).

5. Recommendations

The results of this report provide the groundwork to identify several recommendations directed at improving the social inclusion policies regarding the “Roma” people. The first would be the recognition of the *romanés* language (and its dialects) as “historical linguistic minority” according to the current national legislation. The second would be a change of the current legislation towards “ius soli” orientation (e.g. birthright citizenship). Thirdly, efforts should be made to eradicate any discriminatory restrictions (against “Roma” people and immigrants) from existing laws. Fourthly, a national plan devoted to active social inclusion of “Roma” communities and individuals should be prepared.

Other recommendations are listed below in relation to the challenges and goals in specific policy fields, to improve monitoring methods, to strengthen cooperation and dialogue, to suggest a better use of the EU Structural Funds and to integrate the “Roma” question in the National Reform Programme.

5.1 Key challenges and goals

5.1.1 Education

- To increase the number of well-trained teachers, cultural mediators and other social workers in order to carry out projects aimed at reducing the rates of early school leavers and at increasing educational attainments.
- To develop an inter-cultural approach open to the understanding of the plurality of human identity involving “Roma” people, local communities and other ethnic groups.

5.1.2 *Employment*

- To valorise informal labour competences and to respect work culture, artisan skills and traditional occupations.
- To integrate employment and social dimensions and active social citizenship also by means of cultural mediation.

5.1.3 *Healthcare*

- To increase preventive actions, information and sensitisation.
- To valorise the human resources of "Roma" persons, while respecting their cultural identities.
- To increase cultural mediation activities.

5.1.4 *Housing and the environment*

- To increase cultural mediation.
- To adopt housing solutions that respect different life styles and the different "Roma" cultures.
- To develop social housing instead of camps, also through monetary support for house rental.
- To adopt the concept of house dislocation in small villages and different city places.
- To create micro-areas and small villages.
- To promote participatory planning, involving the concerned communities.
- To support self-made house building, while respecting rules of urban planning.

5.1.5 *Income support*

- To introduce national rules in favour of minimum income schemes to be adopted at regional level in connection with local welfare policies and services.
- To introduce monetary bonuses (linked to the minimum income schemes) in favour of those who do not receive any benefit from tax deductions since they do not pay any taxes due to low income (the so-called *incapienti*).
- To increase financial resources devoted to local welfare systems and managed by local authorities in order to ensure a better combination between monetary transfers and the provision of quality services.

5.1.6 *Sport, recreation and cultural activities*

- To integrate sport and recreation activities aimed at improving mutual respect and communication between different cultural identities.

5.1.7 *Anti-discrimination*

- To increase financial resources devoted to anti-discrimination in line with international declarations on human rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
- To foster initiatives such as the EU DOSTA initiative, through the involvement of public authorities, NGOs and other representatives of civil society, trade unions, business associations, press and other media.
- To integrate gender equality with mainstream policies and initiatives to address discrimination against “Roma” women and children, and to fight against domestic and societal violence and exploitation.

5.2 **Monitoring methods**

- To map the “Roma” communities.
- To involve, train and employ representatives (delegates) of “Roma” communities in a systematic survey of their cultures, plural identities, needs and numbers.
- To involve the above-mentioned “delegates” in focus groups for the adaptation of a national strategy for social integration.

5.3 **Cooperation and dialogue**

- To promote the participation of “Roma” persons with an Italian citizenship in elections (e.g. at national, regional and local levels).
- To promote their participation in councils and governments.
- To create consultation and advisory bodies aimed at debating policies (national, regional and local levels).

5.4 Structural Funds

- To identify a share of financial resources devoted to active social inclusion policies of “Roma” communities in the national and regional operational programmes, according to targets based on the analysis of needs and regional distribution.

5.5 Europe 2020 targets and National Reform Programme

- To improve and strengthen the National Reform Programme dedicated to the fight against poverty and social exclusion.
- To involve “Roma” representatives in decision making process concerning social inclusion policies in close cooperation with regional and local authorities through coordination mechanisms as those envisaged in the Open Method of Coordination.
- To identify targets, measures and actions concerning a national plan for active social inclusion of “Roma” communities and individuals.
- To integrate these targets with those concerning the use of the EU Structural Funds.
- To translate the “Roma” targets into the overall targets for poverty reduction by 2020.

6. Appendix to Sections 1, 2 and 3

Box 1: UNAR, the national office against racial discrimination in Italy; <http://www.unar.it/>

UNAR was created within Italy's Presidency of the Council of Ministers – Department of Equal Opportunities by Legislative Decree No 215/2003 pursuant to the EU Directive 2000/43/EC that implements the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

UNAR plays a key role in the monitoring, prevention and eradication of ethnic and racial discrimination throughout the national territory, investigating alleged cases of discrimination and assisting victims during court and government proceedings.

UNAR is financed yearly (€ 2 million according to Law No 39/2002) as well as by EU programmes and projects including actions supported by the EU Structural Funds.

Since entering into office (2004), UNAR devoted specific attention to discrimination against Roma, Sinti and Travellers. To this end, UNAR maintains regular contacts and collaboration with several non-governmental organisations that deal with the fight against discrimination. Some of them are enrolled in a special registry (Article 6 of the Legislative Decree No 215/2003): Federazione Rom e Sinti Insieme, Federazione Romani, Opera Nomadi, Associazione Italiana Zingari Oggi (AIZO), Unione Nazionale ed Internazionale Rom e Sinti in Italia (UNIRSI), OsservAzione, Nevo Drom e Rom Sinti@Politica Abruzzo Opera Nomadi.

The UNAR main body is the national Contact Centre, which receives numerous discrimination cases. UNAR operates through a network of territorial contacts in close collaboration with sub-national authorities (i.e. Municipalities, Provinces and Regions). UNAR recorded 859 discrimination cases between January and October 2011 (a 32% increase with respect to the same ten months of 2010): 50% in the North, 31% in the Centre and 13% in the South (the remaining 6% without a clear territorial attribution); 21% concerning employment discrimination, 18% public life, 18% mass media, 12% the access to public services, demonstrating a kind of "institutional racism".

According to UNAR, discrimination against "Roma" population is most evident in the lack of access to basic services (e.g. housing, employment, education, health and legal assistance). Furthermore the office notes that there are no significant and coherent policies to support effectively social inclusion of "Roma" people at national and sub-national levels.

Many municipal ordinances were withdrawn (especially in the North – East) thanks to the juridical support provided by UNAR (e.g. in 50 case law during two years).

UNAR fights against stereotypes and racial hate in mass media, schoolbooks and political speeches and propaganda. UNAR noted that a number of events characterised by ethnic and racial hate especially were attributable to right wing politicians. For all these reasons, several times *Lega Nord* (the autonomist Northern League Party) accused UNAR of being an unwieldy body, while urging the national Parliament to close UNAR (without success).

Source of information: Permanent technical committee (CTP) of the Inter-ministry Committee for European Community Affairs (CIACE) secretary, Comments to the draft of the present report (July 2011), received by e-mail the 16th of November 2011.

Box 1: UNAR, the national office against racial discrimination in Italy; <http://www.unar.it/>

UNAR launched the DOSTA campaign in 2010 with a series of events in more than 30 Italian towns with direct involvement of local authorities and “Roma” non-governmental organisations (NGOs). UNAR is promoting further initiatives to raise awareness and improve communication in 2011 and 2012 through “Roma” NGOs involvement, media campaigns and training devoted to journalists.

Another significant project carried out by UNAR is within the ESF (European Social Fund) National Operational Programme (PON GAS 2007 – 2013), Axis D (Equal opportunities and non discrimination), Objective 4.2: “Promotion of the governance of policies and tools for social inclusion and fight against discrimination of Roma, Sinti and Camminanti”.

The project aims at elaborating a participatory action plan in the South, supporting Regions and local authorities (e.g. regional operational programmes) and improving institutional capacity (e.g. regulations, administration, planning of and monitoring of adequate policies) to remove obstacles in the path of social inclusion.

Results of the UNAR project include: the analysis of social, demographic and economic conditions of “Roma” communities in southern Regions along with the analysis of institutions, third sector and civil society organisations, services and local initiatives for social inclusion (IREF, 2010); in-depth analysis of local case studies (Catania D. and Serini A., 2011).

In 2011, the UNAR project provided support to develop intercultural mediation mechanisms within local authorities. The project launched also the publication of training instruments for local authorities (e.g. manuals on policies and practices of social inclusion) in the 2011 – 2013 period.

Future steps will be to strengthen collaboration between regional and local authorities within an integrated system of social inclusion initiatives (e.g. coordination mechanisms, information, pilot projects in key policy fields such as local development, employment, education and housing), while overcoming emergency attitudes in local planning.

Source of information: Permanent technical committee (CTP) of the Inter-ministry Committee for European Community Affairs (CIACE) secretary, Comments to the draft of the present report (July 2011), received by e-mail the 16th of November 2011.

7. Statistics

The generic term “Roma” is used according to the EU documents “as an umbrella which includes groups of people who have more or less similar cultural characteristics” (EC, 2011). This term is used in the following Tables, unless otherwise specified. The capital of Italy, Roma, is the only Italian city cited using its English term (Rome).

Table 1: “Roma” communities in Italy by migratory waves		
First migratory wave The oldest communities		
Sinti <i>Giostrai</i> (“fairground folk”) arrived since the XV century and divided in:	Prevalent regional location (1)	Prevalent or probable origin
• Sinti <i>Piemontesi</i>	Piemonte	Prussian and Austrian regions
• Sinti <i>Lombardi</i>	Lombardia, Emilia and Sardegna	
• Sinti <i>Mucini</i> (Valstiké)	Emilia and Piemonte	
• Sinti <i>Veneti</i>	Veneto	
• Sinti <i>Emiliani</i>	Emilia Romagna	
• Sinti <i>Marchigiani</i>	Marche, Umbria e Lazio	
Roma, divided in:	Prevalent regional location (1)	Mainly from the Balkans (including the former Yugoslavia countries, Bulgaria, Romania and Albania). Abruzzesi and Molisani from Albania. Napoletani probably from Spain and Cilentani from Greece.
• Roma <i>Abruzzesi</i> and <i>Molisani</i> arrived since the XIV century	Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Puglia, Lazio. Small groups in Alto Adige, Veneto, Lombardia, Emilia, Toscana, Umbria and Marche	
• Roma <i>Napoletani</i> (Napulengre)	Campania	
• Roma <i>Cilentani</i> (Ròmje Celentani)	Campania	
• Roma <i>Lucani</i> (Ròmije Basalisk)	Basilicata	
• Roma <i>Pugliesi</i>	Puglia	
• Roma <i>Calabresi</i>	Calabria	
<i>Camminanti Siciliani</i> (Travellers)	Sicilia. Small groups in Lombardia, Lazio and Campania	Unknown origin. Likely from Sicilian Roma or from Nordic or Slavic people.
(1) Geographical distribution of the Italian regions. North: Piemonte, Valle d’Aosta, Lombardia, Liguria, Trentino Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Emilia Romagna Centre: Toscana, Umbria, Marche, Lazio South: Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Puglia, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicilia, Sardegna		
Elaboration on data from: Italian Senate, 2011; ImNin’alu.net, 2011; IREF, 2010; Bravi L. and Sigona N., 2009; Chirico M. R., 2008; Mauri L., 2008; Liègeois J-P., 2007; Mininterno, 2006; Plasere L., 2004; Abbiezzi M., 2003.		

Table 1: "Roma" communities in Italy by migratory waves		
Second migratory wave Between the 19 th and 20 th centuries, especially after the two world wars		
Communities	Prevalent regional location (1)	Prevalent or probable origin
Sinti Gàckane	North and Centre	Germany
Sinti Estrekhària	Trentino Alto Adige	Austria
Sinti Kranària	Friuli Venezia Giulia	Carnia, former Austrian region
Sinti Krasària	Friuli Venezia Giulia	Carso or Krast Plateau between Slovenia and Italy
Roma Harvati with sub-groups: Slovensko and Hrvatsko	Friuli Venezia Giulia, Veneto, Lombardia and Liguria	Croatia, Istria and Slovenia
Roma Kalderasha with sub-groups: Chukuresti, Doresti and Zurkaja.	All regions, Molise and Basilicata excluded	Former Yugoslavia countries, Romania and Hungary
Roma Churara (a small group) actually united to Roma Kalderasha.		
Roma Lovara	All regions	Hungary, Sweden, Poland. Mostly with French and Spanish citizenship
Third migratory wave During the 1960s and 1970s		
Communities	Prevalent regional location (1)	Prevalent or probable origin
Roma Khorakhanè with sub-groups: Cergarija Vlasenicaqi, Cergarija Crna Gora, Rudasha, Gambasha, Shiftarija, Mangiuppi, Kaloperija and Arlija	All regions with more concentration in North and Centre Italy	Former Yugoslavia countries such as Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Macedonia and Kosovo
Roma Dasikhanè with sub-groups: Kanjaria, Rudari, Mrznarija, Busniarija, Bulgarija, Gurbeti and Bankulesti	Prevalent regional location in North and Centre Italy with small groups in Campania and Sicilia	Serbia (some with Romanian origin), Kosovo and Bulgaria
Roma Lovara	All regions	Poland
Romanian Roma	All regions	Romania
Roma Kaulija	All regions	Algeria
(1) Geographical distribution of the Italian regions. North: Piemonte, Valle d'Aosta, Lombardia, Liguria, Trentino Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Emilia Romagna Centre: Toscana, Umbria, Marche, Lazio South: Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Puglia, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicilia, Sardegna		
Elaboration on data from: Italian Senate, 2011; ImNin'alu.net, 2011; IREF, 2010; Bravi L. and Sigona N., 2009; Chirico M. R., 2008; Mauri L., 2008; Liégeois J-P., 2007; Mininterno, 2006; Plasere L., 2004; Abbiezzi M., 2003.		

Table 1: "Roma" communities in Italy by migratory waves		
Fourth migratory wave After the collapse of communist regimes in eastern Europe and Soviet Union (e.g. since 1989)		
Communities	Prevalent regional location (1)	Prevalent or probable origin
Roma Khorakhanè	All regions with concentration in Lombardia	Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Roma Kalderasha	All regions	Former Yugoslavia, Hungary and Romania
Romanian Roma	All regions, starting from original presence in Lombardia, Liguria, Emilia, Lazio, Abruzzo, Campania and Puglia	Romania and Bulgaria
<p>(1) Geographical distribution of the Italian regions. North: Piemonte, Valle d'Aosta, Lombardia, Liguria, Trentino Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Emilia Romagna Centre: Toscana, Umbria, Marche, Lazio South: Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Puglia, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicilia, Sardegna</p>		
<p>Elaboration on data from: Italian Senate, 2011; ImNin'alu.net, 2011; IREF, 2010; Bravi L. and Sigona N., 2009; Chirico M. R., 2008; Mauri L., 2008; Liègeois J-P., 2007; Mininterno, 2006; Piasere L., 2004; Abbiezzi M., 2003.</p>		

Table 2: Estimates of "Roma" population in Italy according to different studies			
Italian citizens			
Communities	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimates	Average estimate
Sinti	30,000	35,000	32,500
Oldest Roma and Travellers (<i>Camminanti</i>)	30,000	30,000	30,000
Roma Harvati	7,000	2,000	8,500
Roma Kalderasha		8,000	
Total	67,000	75,000	71,000
Non-Italian citizens (1)			
Main ethnic groups	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimates	Average estimate
Roma Lovara	1,000	1,000	1,000
Roma Khorakhanè and Dasikhanè	40,000	40,000	40,000
Romanian Roma	40,000	50,000	45,000
Total	81,000	91,000	86,000
Total			
Main features	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimates	Average estimate
Total "Roma" population	148,000	166,000	157,000
Total "Roma" / total Italian population (2)	0.25%	0.28%	0.26%
Italian "Roma" / total "Roma"	45%	45%	45%
Percentage of "Roma" from other EU Member States (2), mainly Romania	20%	25%	23%
Percentage of "Roma" from non-EU countries or stateless (2), mainly from the former Yugoslavia	35%	30%	32%
(1) Excluding those without any residence permit (e.g. irregular migrants).			
(2) Estimates on 2010 data. The other estimates refer to data of different years, generally between 2006 and 2010.			
Elaboration on data from: Italian Senate, 2011; ANCI, 2011; Fondazione Basso, 2011; Minlav, 2010; Osservatorio di Politica Internazionale, 2010; ERRC, 2010; IREF, 2010; Chirico M. R., 2008; Mininterno, 2006; Caritas-Migrantes, 2006.			

Region	“Roma” residents per Region	“Roma” residents / Regional population
Piemonte	13,000 – 14,400	0.30 - 0.33%
Valle d’Aosta	50 – 60	0.04%
Lombardia	25,700 – 28,800	0.27% - 0.30%
Liguria	1,800 – 2,000	0.11% - 0.12%
Trentino Alto Adige	2,800 – 3,200	0.28% - 0.32%
Veneto	11,200 – 12,600	0.23% - 0.26%
Friuli Venezia Giulia	2,000 – 2,300	0.16% - 0.19%
Emilia Romagna	12,800 – 14,400	0.30% - 0.34%
Total North Italy	69,400 – 77,700	0.26% - 0.29%
Toscana	7,700 – 8,700	0.21% - 0.24%
Umbria	180 – 200	0.02%
Marche	1,300 – 1,400	0.08% - 0.09%
Lazio	36,400 – 40,800	0.65% - 0.73%
Total Centre Italy	45,600 – 51,100	0.39% - 0.44%
Abruzzo	4,000 – 4,800	0.30% - 0.36%
Molise	1,300 – 1,800	0.41% - 0.56%
Campania	9,900 – 11,100	0.17% - 0.19%
Puglia	3,600 – 4,100	0.09% - 0.10%
Basilicata	30 - 40	0.01%
Calabria	9,000 – 9,500	0.45% - 0.47%
Sicilia	3,500 – 3,600	0.07%
Sardegna	1,700 – 2,300	0.10% - 0.14%
Total South Italy	33,000 – 37,200	0.16% - 0.18%
Total Italy	148,000 – 166,000	0.25% - 0.28%

Elaboration on information and data concerning: prevalent regional location of “Roma” by migratory waves (Table 1); hypotheses of total “Roma” population in Italy (Table 2); proportional distribution of “Roma” people living in camps throughout the regions (Table 5).

Communities	Prevalent occupation
Sinti	Traditionally, "fairground folk" (Giostrai), e.g. horse trainers, merry-go-round-keepers, artists and performers in amusement parks and circuses. Currently, some dealing in scrap-metal and second hand cars, others selling artificial bonsai.
Roma and <i>Camminanti</i> (Travellers). More specifically:	Precarious activities substituted for traditional occupations, following economic changes (e.g. some families specialised in bricklaying and seasonal agricultural work or working in their own plots of land).
▪ Roma <i>Abruzzesi</i> and <i>Molisani</i>	Horse breeders and dealers, palmistry (mainly women).
▪ Roma <i>Napoletani</i> (Napulengre)	Traditionally, involved in travelling shows with ponies and player-pianos, production of fishing tools, training of little parrots in palmistry. Currently, some of them still practice the ancestral occupation, but the many are small street-traders.
▪ Roma <i>Cilentani</i> (Ròmje Celentani)	Traditionally, involved in street-repairing activities of agricultural tools. Currently, integrated in local economy and with high education attainments (e.g. university degrees).
▪ Roma <i>Lucani</i> (Ròmije Basalisk)	Traditionally, horse breeders and artisans of small metal utensils. Currently, the most integrated communities in local economy.
▪ Roma <i>Pugliesi</i>	Still involved in traditional activities such as horse-butchers, soap producers, artisans of small metal utensils and seasonal agricultural labourers. Integrated in local economy, but with a lower living standard than Roma Lucani.
▪ Roma <i>Calabresi</i>	Traditionally, blacksmiths and horse-dealers. Currently, most of them dealing in scrap-metal and few of them involved in some social co-operatives. They represent the poorest of the oldest Roma communities in Italy.
▪ <i>Camminanti Siciliani</i>	Still involved in traditional activities such as knife-grinders, maintaining gas cookers, repairing, making and selling umbrellas. Chiefly street retailers and seasonal agricultural labourers.
Roma Harvati	Traditionally, horse-keepers. Currently, dealing in scrap-metal and second hand cars, fruits and vegetables.
Roma Kalderasha, Churara and Lovara	Traditionally, door-to-door services such as metal repair, polishing and finishing touches of metal articles, producing metal and other goods, palmistry (e.g. women). Currently, retail trade in local fairs, buying and selling old iron, old clothes.
Roma Khorakhanè	Traditionally, blacksmiths. Currently, some of them work in clothing sales.
Romanian and Rudari Roma	Still involved in retail trade, production of wooden articles, selling flowers (e.g. women and children)
Elaboration on information from: ImNin'alu.net, 2011; EC, 2010a; Chirico M. R., 2008; Mauri L., 2008; Liègeois J-P., 2007; Mininterno, 2006; EU Parliament, 2006; Abbiezzi M., 2003.	

Table 5: Geographical distribution of "Roma" people living in camps in Italy (2008)						
Total population	"Roma" Foreign citizens	"Roma" Italian citizens	"Roma" % of foreign "Roma" with respect to total "Roma"	% of foreigner citizens with respect to Italian population		
"Roma" living in camps in the North Italy by regions and by concentration in NUTS 3 units (Provinces)						
Region: Piemonte						
3,585	1,681	1,904	47%	7%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Torino						
2,048	1,387	661	68%	7%		
Region: Valle d'Aosta with only one Province having the same name						
15	10	5	67%	5%		
Region: Lombardia						
7,157	3,795	3,362	53%	8%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Milano						
4,763	3,168	1,595	67%	9%		
Region: Liguria						
499	240	259	48%	6%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Genova						
328	171	157	52%	5%		
Region: Trentino Alto Adige						
793	238	555	30%	7%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Bolzano						
493	108	385	22%	7%		
Region: Veneto						
3,128	1,340	1,788	43%	8%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Venezia						
830	371	459	45%	6%		
Region: Friuli Venezia Giulia						
570	13	557	2%	7%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Trieste						
209	11	198	5%	6%		
Region: Emilia Romagna						
3,585	1,295	2,290	36%	9%		
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Reggio Emilia						
1,064	70	994	7%	10%		
Total Northern Regions						
19,332	8,612	10,720	45%	8%		

Table 5: Geographical distribution of "Roma" people living in camps in Italy (2008)						
Total "Roma" population	Foreign citizens	"Roma"	Italian citizens	"Roma"	% of foreign "Roma" with respect to total "Roma"	% of foreigner citizens with respect to Italian population
"Roma" living in camps in the Centre Italy by regions and by concentration in NUTS 3 units (Provinces)						
Region: Toscana						
2,157	1,564		593		89%	7%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Firenze						
768	768		0		100%	9%
Region: Umbria (all concentrated in the Province of Perugia)						
49	19		30		39%	9%
Region: Marche						
359	73		286		20%	7%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Ancona						
284	1		283		0.4%	7%
Region: Lazio						
10,160	9,655		505		95%	7%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Rome						
9,000	9,000		0		100%	8%
Total Central Regions						
12,725	11,311		1,414		89%	7%
"Roma" living in camps in the South Italy by regions and by concentration in NUTS 3 units (Provinces)						
Region: Abruzzo						
1,556	177		1,379		11%	5%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Pescara						
874	174		700		20%	3%
Region: Molise (all concentrated in the Province of Campobasso)						
519	0		519		0%	2%
Region: Campania						
2,755	2,477		278		68%	2%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Napoli						
2,065	2,065		0		100%	2%
Region: Puglia						
1,013	1,003		10		99%	2%
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Foggia						
624	614		10		98%	2%

Table 5: Geographical distribution of "Roma" people living in camps in Italy (2008)							
Total "Roma" population	Foreign citizens	"Roma" citizens	Italian citizens	"Roma" citizens	% of foreign "Roma" with respect to total "Roma"	% of foreigner citizens with respect to Italian population	
"Roma" living in camps in the South Italy by regions and by concentration in NUTS 3 units (Provinces)							
Region: Basilicata (all concentrated in the Province of Potenza)							
5	5		0		100%	1%	
Region: Calabria							
1,435	898		537		63%	3%	
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Catanzaro							
1,337	800		537		60%	2%	
Region: Sicilia							
1,053	802		251		76%	2%	
Province with the largest amount of "Roma" population: Catania							
500	481		19		96%	2%	
Region: Sardegna							
902	872		30		97%	2%	
Province with the largest amount: of "Roma" population: Sassari							
400	370		30		93%	1%	
Total Southern Regions							
9,238	6,234		3,004		67%	2%	
Total Italian Regions							
41,295	26,157		15,138		63%	6%	
Proportional distribution (%) by macro-regional areas							
Macro-regional areas		Foreign "Roma" citizens		Italian "Roma" citizens		Total "Roma" population	
North		33%		71%		47%	
Centre		43%		9%		31%	
South		24%		20%		22%	
Total Italy		100%		100%		100%	
"Roma" people living in camps as a share of estimated total "Roma" population in Italy							
Probable "Roma" people living in camps adding an underestimation of 10% as an average							45,425
"Roma" population (see Table 3)			Minimum estimate	Maximum estimates	Average estimate		
Total Italy			148,000	166,000	157,000		
Percentage of those living in camps (2008)			31%	27%	29%		
Elaboration on data from Il Sole 24 Ore, 2008, based on information provided by Prefectures (i.e. the representative of the Ministry of the Interior in each Italian province)							

Table 6: Comparison between different data concerning “Roma” people living in camps in Italy

Geographical area	2008 data from Table 5	Data range (in rounded numbers) from different surveys, publications and years (1)
Lazio (Centre)	Region: 10,160 Rome province: 9,000	Rome province: 7,200 Rome municipality: 4,900 – 11,500
Lombardia (North)	Region: 7,157 Milano province: 4,763	Region: 9,600 – 11,000 Milano Province: 6,300 – 7,400 Milano municipality: 3,600 – 4,300
Emilia Romagna (North)	Region: 3,585	Region: 1,900 (Regione Emilia Romagna, 2006)
Campania (South)	Region: 2,755 Napoli province: 2,065	Napoli province: 3,000 (IREF, 2010)
Toscana (Centre)	Region: 2,157 Firenze province: 768	Region: 1,600 – 1,800 Firenze province: 570 – 1,300 Firenze municipality: 330 – 1,500

(1) Range of data based on available information collected from the following publications concerning specific geographical areas.

Lazio: Italian Senate, 2011; ANCI, 2011; Fondazione Basso, 2011; Amnesty International, 2010a; Save the Children, 2008; Sigona N., 2006 and 2008.

Lombardia: Italia Senate, 2011; ANCI, 2011; Enwereuzor U. C. and Di Pasquale L., 2009; Tavolo Rom di Milano, 2009; Calabrò A. R., 2008; Ismu – Caritas Ambrosiana, 2006; Sigona N., 2006 and 2008.

Emilia Romagna: Regione Emilia Romagna, 2006.

Toscana: Fondazione Michelucci, 2007; Regione Toscana and Fondazione Michelucci, 2010.

Table 7: Social expenditure of local authorities by Italian region in 2008: EURO						
Regions and autonomous Provinces	(A) expenditure	Total	% of national total	(B) Social expenditure for immigrants and "Roma"	% of national total	% (B) / (A)
Piemonte	621,626,958		9.3	19,019,913	10.5	3.1
Valle d'Aosta	33,272,949		0.5	1,806	0.0	0.0
Lombardia	1,164,929,686		17.5	29,807,760	16.4	2.6
Liguria	222,439,539		3.3	4,794,536	2.6	2.2
<i>Autonomous Province Bolzano</i>	103,818,844		1.6	4,653,060	2.6	4.5
<i>Autonomous Province Trento</i>	144,908,610		2.2	1,161,581	0.6	0.8
Veneto	538,851,761		8.1	18,880,507	10.4	3.5
Friuli Venezia Giulia	258,974,626		3.9	8,614,428	4.7	3.3
Emilia Romagna	723,457,974		10.9	21,334,220	11.8	2.9
Total North Italy	3,812,280,947		57.2	108,267,811	59.7	2.8
Toscana	481,426,556		7.2	15,266,753	8.4	3.2
Umbria	84,881,434		1.3	2,787,287	1.5	3.3
Marche	166,487,294		2.5	4,008,592	2.2	2.4
Lazio	750,904,855		11.3	32,096,864	17.7	4.3
Total Centre Italy	1,483,700,139		22.3	54,159,496	29.9	3.7
Abruzzo	86,156,607		1.3	784,686	0.4	0.9
Molise	13,255,436		0.2	525,909	0.3	4.0
Campania	312,039,395		4.7	2,913,985	1.6	0.9
Puglia	224,936,434		3.4	4,677,889	2.6	2.1
Basilicata	34,129,675		0.5	1,044,673	0.6	3.1
Calabria	60,901,905		0.9	1,950,936	1.1	3.2
Sicilia	354,047,507		5.3	4,836,678	2.7	1.4
Sardegna	280,935,555		4.2	2,240,612	1.2	0.8
Total South Italy	1,366,402,514		20.5	18,975,368	10.5	1.4
(C) Total Italy	6,662,232,600		100	181,402,675	100	2.7%
Adding expenditure for homeless people				(D) Expenditure	% (D) / ©	
Expenditure for homeless (1)				30,865,293	0.5%	
Total expenditure for immigrants, "Roma" and homeless				212,267,968	3.2%	
Social expenditure for immigrants and "Roma" (€ 181,402,675) distinguished in:						
Direct monetary transfer		Services		Structures		
52,894,913	29.2%	67,886,243	37.4%	60,621,519	33.4%	
(1) Expenditure for homeless people is extracted from the total expenditure classified under the category "poverty, adult hardship and homeless"						
Elaboration on data from ISTAT, 2011						

Table 8: Social expenditure of local authorities by Italian region in 2008: EURO per capita		
Regions and autonomous Provinces	Total expenditure per capita (1)	Total expenditure for Immigrants and "Roma" per capita (2)
Piemonte	141	58
Valle d'Aosta	263	0
Lombardia	120	35
Liguria	138	49
<i>Autonomous Province Bolzano</i>	209	134
<i>Autonomous Province Trento</i>	281	29
Veneto	111	44
Friuli Venezia Giulia	211	97
Emilia Romagna	168	54
Toscana	130	52
Umbria	95	35
Marche	107	33
Lazio	134	76
Abruzzo	65	12
Molise	41	78
Campania	54	24
Puglia	55	68
Basilicata	58	99
Calabria	30	36
Sicilia	70	46
Sardegna	168	82
Total Italy	111	50
(1) Total social expenditure divided by total population of the region		
(2) Social expenditure for immigrants and "Roma" divided by number of foreigner population resident in the region		
Elaboration on data from ISTAT, 2011		

References

- Abbiezzi M. (2003), Breve storia del popolo Zingaro, CGIL Lombardia
- Ambrosini M. (2010), Richiesti e Respinti, Il Saggiatore, Milano
- Amnesty International (2010), Amnesty International Report 2010 – Italy
- Amnesty International (2010a), La risposta sbagliata. Italia: il “piano nomadi” viola il diritto all'alloggio dei Rom a Roma
- Amnesty International (2011), Annual Report 2011 – Italy
- ANCI (2011), Le politiche di integrazione urbana e la marginalità: il caso dei Rom e Sinti in Italia, Marzo 2011
- Bravi L. and Sigona N. (2009), “Rom e sinti in Italia. Permanenze e migrazioni” in Storia d'Italia - Migrazioni, Annali 24, Einaudi, Torino
- Calabrò A. R. (1992), Il vento non soffia più, Marsilio, Venezia
- Calabrò A. R. (2008), Zingari. Storia di un'emergenza annunciata, Liguori Editore, Napoli
- Caritas-Migrantes (2006), Immigrazione 2006, Dossier statistico, XVI Rapporto, Idos 2006
- Catania D. and Serini A. (2011), Il circuito del separatismo, UNAR, Armando Editore, Roma
- Cefisi L. (2011), Bambini ladri, Newton Compton Editori, Roma
- Cerchi R. and Loy G. (ed.) (2009), Rom e Sinti in Italia, Ediesse, Roma
- Chirico M.R. (ed.) (2008), Buone Prassi. Rapporto di ricerca sulle politiche di inclusione di Rom e Sinti in Italia
- Cianciullo A. and Fontana E. (1995), Ecomafia. I predoni dell'ambiente, Editori Riuniti, Roma
- Cospe, Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti (2006), Roma, Sinti, Gypsies and Travellers in public education – Italy
- Cospe, Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti (2008), Razzismi quotidiani
- Cospe, Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti (2008a), Contribution to the FRA Annual Report 2009
- Cospe, Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti (2009), Preventing racism, xenophobia and related intolerance in sport across the European Union - Italy
- Cospe, Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti (2009a), Contribution to the FRA Annual Report 2010

- Dragutinovic R. (2000), Kanjarija. Storia vissuta dei rom dasikhanè in Italia
- EC (2010), Improving the tools for the social inclusion and non-discrimination of Roma in the EU
- EC (2010a), Ethnic minority and Roma women in Europe. A case for gender equality?
- EC (2011), An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, COM(2011) 173/4
- ENAR, European Network Against Racism, (2010), Racism and Discrimination in Italy, ENAR Shadow Report 2009/2010.
- Enwereuzor U. C. and Di Pasquale L. (2009), Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in Italy, RAXEN Thematic Study
- ERRC, European Roma Rights Center, (2000), Campland. Racial segregation of Roma in Italy
- ERRC, European Roma Rights Center, (2010), Submission of the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), OsservAzione and Amalipè Romanò concerning Italy for consideration under the universal periodic review by the United Nations Human Rights Council at its 7th Session, February 2010
- EUMC, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, (2006), Roma and Travellers in Public Education
- EU Parliament (2006), Economic aspects of the condition of Roma women, IPOL/C/FEMM/ST/2005_09
- Eurobarometer (2008), Discrimination in the European Union, Special Eurobarometer 296
- EURoma, European Network on Social Inclusion and Roma (2010), Roma and the Structural Funds, EURoma Report 2010
- Fondazione Basso (2011), Identità di genere e prospettive di vita delle donne appartenenti alle comunità rom, finalised in 2009 and updated in 2011
- Fondazione Michelucci (2007), Rom e Sinti in Toscana: le presenze, gli insediamenti, le politiche FRA, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, (2008), Incident Report – Violent Attacks Against Roma in Ponticelli district of Naples, Italy
- Hammarberg T., Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (2008), Memorandum following his visit to Italy on 19-20 June 2008, 28 July 2008
- Hammarberg T., Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (2009), Report on Italy, 16 April 2009
- Il Sole 24 ore (2008), La "mappa" del popolo rom: il 36% sono cittadini italiani, 16 Maggio 2008, page 18
- ImNin'alu.net (2011), Roma and "Gypsies", <http://www.imninalu.net/Gypsies.htm>

IREF (2010), Rom, Sinti, Camminanti e comunità locali, Maggio 2010

IRES Piemonte (2005), Rom e Sinti in Piemonte, Contributi di ricerca n. 187/2005

Ismu – Caritas Ambrosiana (2006), Vivere ai margini. Un'indagine sugli insediamenti rom e sinti in Lombardia

ISPO, Istituto Italiano per gli studi sulla Pubblica Opinione, (2008), Italiani, Rom e Sinti a confronto. Una ricerca quali-quantitativa, presented in the European Conference on Roma population, held in Rome in January 2008

ISTAT (2008) Salute e ricorso ai servizi sanitari della popolazione straniera residente in Italia, 11 Dicembre 2008

ISTAT (2011), Gli interventi e i servizi sociali dei comuni singoli e associati, 19 Aprile 2011

Italian Senate (2011), Commissione Straordinaria per la tutela e la promozione dei diritti umani, Rapporto conclusivo dell'indagine sulla condizione di Rom, Sinti e Camminanti in Italia

Legambiente (2004), Rapporto Ecomafia 2004. Il caso Campania, SE, Napoli

Liègeois J-P. (2007), Roma in Europe, Council of Europe

Mattioli G. (1989), Romi i romologija u Italici, in Jezik i kultura Roma

Mauri L. (2008), "I figli del vento" in Cittadini senza territorio, Volume 2, I.Re.F, Milano

Mininterno, Ministero dell'Interno (2006), Pubblicazione sulle minoranze senza territorio

Mininterno, Ministero dell'Interno (2010), Terzo rapporto sull'attività dei Consigli Territoriali per l'Immigrazione nel 2008

Minlavoro, Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali (2010), Le città ai margini, Quaderni della Ricerca sociale 4, Luglio 2010

MIUR, Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (2000), Indagine sugli alunni appartenenti a comunità nomadi

MIUR, Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (2009), Alunni con cittadinanza non italiana. Anno scolastico 2007/2008

NRP, National Reform Programme (2011), Programma Nazionale di Riforma, 13 Aprile 2011

Osservatorio di Politica Internazionale (2010), Rom e sinti in Italia: condizione sociale e linee di politica pubblica, n. 21 - Ottobre 2010

Piasere L. (2004), I rom d'Europa, Laterza, Roma - Bari

PCM, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (2000), Commissione per le politiche di integrazione degli immigrati, Rom e Sinti: un'integrazione possibile. Italia ed Europa a confronto, Napoli, 23 – 24 Giugno 2000

Regione Emilia Romagna (2006), Rapporto sulla popolazione Sinti e Rom presente nella Regione Emilia Romagna

Regione Toscana and Fondazione Michelucci (2010), Abitare precario in Toscana. Rapporto 2009/2010

Save the Children (2008), Studio sulla salute materno infantile nelle comunità Rom. Il caso di Roma

Sen A. (2006), *Identity and Violence*, Norton, New York

Sigona N. (2005), "I confini del "problema zingari". Le politiche dei campi nomadi in Italia" in Caponio T. and Colombo A. (ed), *Migrazioni globali, integrazioni locali*, Il Mulino, Bologna

Sigona N. (2006), *Political participation and media representation of Roma and Sinti in Italy*, OsservAzione

Sigona N. (2008), *The "latest" public enemy: Romanian Roma in Italy*, OsservAzione

Sigona N. and Monasta L. (2006), *Cittadinanze imperfette*, OsservAzione

Solimano N. and Mori T. (2000), "A Roma ghetto in Florence" in *The UNESCO Courier*, June 2000

Tavolo Rom di Milano (2009), *Rom e Sinti. Politiche possibili nell'area metropolitana di Milano*

Tega D. (ed.) (2011), *Le discriminazioni razziali ed etniche*, UNAR, Armando Editore, Roma

Teti V. (1993), *La razza maledetta*, manifestolibri, Roma

Toso F. (2008), *Le minoranze linguistiche in Italia*, il Mulino, Bologna

Zincone G. (2006), *Familismo legale*, Laterza, Roma - Bari