



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION  
IKV BRIEF  
2011



December 2011

Prepared by: **Simona De Pra**  
(Intern at IKV from September 2011 to February 2012)

**ITALIAN VISA POLICY TOWARDS TURKISH NATIONALS: BEFORE AND  
AFTER SOYSAL**

**Main chronological events:**

- 1950: Air transportation agreement between Turkey and Italy (10.02.1950)<sup>1</sup>
- 1951: Treaty of Friendship, conciliation and regulation between the Republic of Turkey and the Republic of Italy (15.06.1951).<sup>2</sup>
- 1951: Italy ends visa requirement for Turkish citizens<sup>3</sup>.
- 1957: The European Agreement on Regulations governing the Movement of Persons between Member States of the Council of Europe (13.12.1957)<sup>4</sup>
- 1963: signing of Ankara Association Agreement (12.09.1963)<sup>5</sup>
- 1970: signing of Additional Protocol (23.11.1970).<sup>6</sup>
- 1971: signing of International road transportation agreement between the Republic of Italy and the Republic of Turkey (30.06.1971)<sup>7</sup>
- 1990: Martelli's bill (28.02.1990)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>

<http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/main.aspx?home=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/7429.pdf&main=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/7429.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/BGT/487417.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Sindisp&leg=16&id=491955>; and in K. Groenedijk and E. Guild, "Visa policy of Member States and the Eu towards turkish nationals after SOYSAL", p. 22

<sup>4</sup> <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/025.htm>

<sup>5</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21964A1229\(01\):EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21964A1229(01):EN:NOT)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www1.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/ankara\\_agreement\\_protocole.pdf](http://www1.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/ankara_agreement_protocole.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> signed on 26.04.1972, in Ankara; <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/main.aspx?home=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/14170.pdf&main=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/14170.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> The Martinelli's bill is the first immigration bill speaking about a visa: despite, in 1986, the Italian government adopted an immigration law (L. 934/1986), there was still a lack of regulations about the right of entry in the Italian country and about the resident permit. That's the reason why, just four years after the first immigration bill, a new one was adopted. The Martinelli's bill introduced the need of a visa for certain country's citizens, regulated the terms of resident permit's issue, of its renewal, revocation. Moreover it regulated the foreigner stream, how to control it. It established, also, a better regulation in legal guardianship area, for the case of refusal or revocation of the resident permit or of the refugee status.

- 1990: The 19<sup>th</sup> June 1990 it is the day of the signing of the Convention for the Schengen Agreement.
- 1990: on 3<sup>rd</sup> of September, Italy requires a visa for Turkish citizens before entering in Italy<sup>9</sup>.
- 1991: The Minister of Foreign Affairs promulgated the ministerial memorandum n.0002 of the 18.02.1991 regarding the general laws about the visa issue.<sup>10</sup>
- 1993: Italy ratifies the Schengen Agreement with the law L. 30.09.1993 n. 388.<sup>11</sup>
- 2001: The EU introduced the list of states that need to acquire a visa to enter in the Schengen area (15.03.2001)<sup>12</sup>.
- 2006: Italy and Turkey celebrate 150 years of bilateral relations.<sup>13</sup>
- 2007: Turkey abolished visa for Italian citizens.<sup>14</sup>
- 2009: The European Court of Justice ruled C-228/06: “*Mehmet Soysal and Ibrahim Savatli v. Bundesrepublik Deutschland*”<sup>15</sup>.
- 2010: The European Commission has introduced the Handbook for the processing of visa applications and the modification of issued visas<sup>16</sup>
- 2010: On 29<sup>th</sup> of June 2010, there is a parliamentary question about the abolishment of visa for Turkish citizens.<sup>17</sup>
- 2011: the European Parliament modifies on 24<sup>th</sup> of May 2011 the CE n. 539/2001 (regulations that established which States need a visa to get in the Schengen area) taking care, also, about the impacts of the *Soysal* sentence on the EU legislation.<sup>18</sup>

The *Soysal* judgment is the first case dealing about the question whether requiring visas for Turkish citizens, desiring to travel to EU, is compatible with the provision of the Turkey-EC Association Agreement. According to the conclusions of the European Court of Justice on the case C 228/06<sup>19</sup> any signatory State's imposition of a mandatory visa to a

<sup>9</sup> K. Groenedijk and E. Guild, “*Visa policy of Member States and the Eu towards turkish nationals after SOYSAL*”, p. 28

<sup>10</sup> P. Mariani e Amici dei popoli Onlus, “*Scheda tematica-Immigrazione*”, pag. 17, 1995

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.meltingpot.org/articolo3855.html>

<sup>12</sup> CE n. 539/2001, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:081:0001:0007:IT:PDF>

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata\\_Ankara/Menu/L\\_rapporti\\_bilaterali/Cooperazione\\_politica/Attualita/](http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata_Ankara/Menu/L_rapporti_bilaterali/Cooperazione_politica/Attualita/)

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata\\_Ankara/Menu/L\\_rapporti\\_bilaterali/Cooperazione\\_politica/Accordi/](http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata_Ankara/Menu/L_rapporti_bilaterali/Cooperazione_politica/Accordi/)

<sup>15</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:62006J0228:IT:HTML>

<sup>16</sup>

<http://www2.mfa.gr/softlib/00.%20HANDBOOK%20FOR%20THE%20PROCESSING%20OF%20VISA%20APPLICATIONS%20AND%20THE%20MODIFICATION%20OF%20ISSUED%20VISAS.PDF>

<sup>17</sup> [http://banchedati.camera.it/sindacatoispettivo\\_16/showXhtml.Asp?idAtto=26773&stile=6&highlight=1](http://banchedati.camera.it/sindacatoispettivo_16/showXhtml.Asp?idAtto=26773&stile=6&highlight=1)

<sup>18</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v10.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1_EN_ACT_part1_v10.pdf), pag. 9

<sup>19</sup> “...on those grounds, the Court (first chamber) hereby rules:

*Article 41 of the Additional Protocol, which was signed on 23 November 1970 at Brussels and concluded, approved and confirmed on behalf of the Community by Council Regulation (EEC) No 2760/72 of 19 December 1972, is to be interpreted as meaning that it precludes the introduction, as from the entry into force of that protocol, of a requirement that Turkish nationals such as the appellants in the main proceedings must have a visa to enter the territory of a Member State in order to provide services there on behalf of an undertaking established in Turkey, since, on that date, such a visa was not required.”*

Turkish service provider, after the entry into force of the Additional Protocol dated 1973, is recognized as a restriction of the economic freedom and therefore a violation of the standstill clause (Article 41-1 Additional Protocol)<sup>20</sup>.

As a consequence of a petition requiring the immediate implementation of the Soysal judgment in all the EU members;<sup>21</sup> firstly the Commission gave guidelines<sup>22</sup> through a Practical handbook for Border Guards which contain a recommendation to the border guards and the consular authorities of Member States. Secondly, it has underlined the importance that each state has to examine their own legislation and has to implement the Soysal judgment also in their jurisdiction.

The only States that have fulfilled their obligation were Germany and Denmark while the rest of the members have not done it yet; Italy included.

This note will discuss the evolution of the Italian visa policy towards Turkish citizens. It has been more than 150 years since Italy and Turkey have started their bilateral relations<sup>23</sup> in which the importance of dialogue and respect has supported their partnership that reached, nowadays, an excellent level.

Focusing on the history, it should be remembered that in 1951, Italy abolished the mandatory visa for the Turkish people entering the country and it has signed the *Treaty of friendship conciliation and regulation between the Republic of Turkey and the Republic of Italy*<sup>24</sup>. Moreover, as a Member of the Council of Europe and European Economic Community, Italy has signed *The European Agreement on Regulations governing to the Movement of Persons between Member States of the Council of Europe*<sup>25</sup>, the *Ankara Association agreement*<sup>26</sup> and its *Additional protocol*<sup>27</sup>. In accordance to the goal of the CEE policy, Italy and Turkey increased their bilateral relations and signed various agreements<sup>28</sup>.

Consequently, before 1973, Italy was one of the countries where there was no visa requirement for Turkish citizens seeking to enter for short stays but it was decided to (re)-introduce it the 3<sup>rd</sup> of September 1990<sup>29</sup>. What was the aim of this decision? Can it be considered as legal in view of Article 41 of the Additional Protocol? According to the Soysal judgment should Italy change its visa policy towards Turkey? These are questions which have been answered by the European Union but not the Italian government.

Regarding the aim of the reintroduction of the visa, we have to follow the evolution of the events.

Italy, since 1861, has been a State of emigrants and this phenomenon has slowed down only in the seventies, when immigration began. The statistics show that in Italy, differently than in other European countries, the immigration process developed slowly: in the seventies foreigners were less than 300 thousand and one third of them were from the EC. Only in the late eighties Italy became one of the immigrants' destinations.

---

<sup>20</sup> Article 41-1 of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement states that:

"The Contracting Parties shall refrain from introducing between themselves any new restrictions on the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services."

<sup>21</sup> [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009\\_2014/documents/peti/cm/792/792282/792282it.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/peti/cm/792/792282/792282it.pdf)

<sup>22</sup>

<http://www2.mfa.gr/softlib/00.%20HANDBOOK%20FOR%20THE%20PROCESSING%20OF%20VISA%20APPLICATIONS%20AND%20THE%20MODIFICATION%20OF%20ISSUED%20VISAS.PDF>

<sup>23</sup>

[http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata\\_Ankara/Menu/I\\_rapporti\\_bilaterali/Cooperazione\\_politica/Attualit%C3%A0/](http://www.ambankara.esteri.it/Ambasciata_Ankara/Menu/I_rapporti_bilaterali/Cooperazione_politica/Attualit%C3%A0/)

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/BGT/487417.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/025.htm>

<sup>26</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21964A1229\(01\):EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21964A1229(01):EN:NOT)

<sup>27</sup> [http://www1.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/ankara\\_agreement\\_protocol.pdf](http://www1.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/ankara_agreement_protocol.pdf)

<sup>28</sup> Just to make an examples, in 1972 it was concluded an *agreement on International transportation on road* (<http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/main.aspx?home=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/14170.pdf&main=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/14170.pdf>), or, furthermore, in 1986 the one on *cooperation in the tourism fields*.

<sup>29</sup> K. Groenedijk and E. Guild, "Visa policy of Member States and the Eu towards turkish nationals after SOYSAL", p. 28

For the first time, Italy faced immigration that was regulated only by the OIL convention ratified in 1981.

As a consequence of the Pope's attempted murder, committed in Rome by a young Turkish man, and the following two terrorist attempts committed in the airports of Vienna and Rome, by a Palestinian terrorist group, a common fear of immigrants sprang up and Italy felt the need of enacting a proper legislation to control and protect the borders from what was called an "immigrant invasion".

Despite those impressions, the first immigration law<sup>30</sup> dealt only about the rights of foreign workers but it did not mention any documents or rules regarding the rights to enter and live in the country. The first regulation came in 1990, year in which Italy signed also the Schengen agreement.

According to the idea of being part of the Schengen area, Italy has established a detailed legislation where, for the first time, the need of visa to cross the borders for the citizens of certain state was mentioned. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, according to Article 3 of the new immigration law, was charged to determine the list of countries whose citizens needed a mandatory visa to enter to the country.

So on 3<sup>rd</sup> of September 1990, Italy changed its visa policy towards Turkish citizens introducing a mandatory visa, which was followed by a circular of the Minister of Foreign Affairs regarding the procedures for issuing a visa for foreign citizens.<sup>31</sup> The introduction of visa can be seen as a consequence of bringing the Italian visa policy in line with the Schengen visa rules,<sup>32</sup> even if it was introduced shortly before Italy joined the Schengen group, and not as an instrument to discourage the entry of Turkish citizens to Italy. Looking at the 150 years of Italian-Turkish relations and considering the low percentage of Turkish immigrants in Italy, it can be concluded that a "menace of invasion" does not exist in the case of Turkish immigrants, a situation which contrast with the conditions in Germany.<sup>33</sup> Firstly, according to the statistical data, which collects the numbers of immigrants living in Italy, it can be observed that the number of Turkish people are lower than the other immigrants: the Romanian citizens living in Italy are 887.763 followed by Albanian and Moroccans, whose numbers is more or less 450 000 people, while Turkish immigrants are only 17.650<sup>34</sup> (see attached 1). Turkish immigrants, in fact, are not included among the first 16 States whose nationals reside in Italy (see Annex 2). Secondly, even though if the data shows that most of the Turkish immigrants are low qualified workers<sup>35</sup> and their percentage of unemployment is one of the highest<sup>36</sup>, compared to the other immigrants, nowadays Italy has 1777<sup>37</sup> Turkish companies and many Turkish citizens are doctors, lawyers, engineers and architects. Moreover, because the two countries share several values, the integration of the Turkish people in Italy has never been problematic.

---

<sup>30</sup> L 30.12.1986 n.943

<sup>31</sup> Minister of foreigner affairs n. 2, 18.02.1991

<sup>32</sup> The Schengen agreement removes the border's controls between the States that had ratified it and imposes this control to rest of the countries with the aim of stopping the illegal immigration

<sup>33</sup> The amount of the Turkish population in Turkey is around 2.7 millions of people.

<sup>34</sup> <http://demo.istat.it/str2009/index.html>

<sup>35</sup> From the interview made by Radio Rai to Dott. Ibrahim Gultekin Kankilic, <http://www.turchia.net/turchia/turchi.htm>;  
[https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/documento\\_unico\\_internet.pdf](https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/documento_unico_internet.pdf)

<sup>36</sup> [https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/documento\\_unico\\_internet.pdf](https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/documento_unico_internet.pdf), page 17, last view 12.12.2011.

[https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/III\\_Rapporto.pdf](https://www.inps.it/docallegati/mig/informazioni/template/migranti/repository/node/N123456789/III_Rapporto.pdf)

<sup>37</sup>From "Immigrazione: presentato al Cnel il Rapporto Ocse-Sopemi «International Migration Outlook 2010». Allarme sbarchi: dopo la prima accoglienza, pensare all'integrazione", [http://www.cnel.it/19?shadow\\_comunicati\\_stampa=3038](http://www.cnel.it/19?shadow_comunicati_stampa=3038) dated on 03.03. 2011.

In 2001, the Council of Europe<sup>38</sup> established that Turkey is one of the States which require a visa to get in the Schengen area can demonstrate that the previous Italian law was exactly in accordance with the agreement policy.

However, it is necessary to remark that the agreement concluded with the Additional Protocol, since it is a primary source of EU law while the Schengen regulation is a secondary source of EU law, is superior then the Schengen Agreement. The consequence is that any law, which violates Article 41 of the Additional Protocol, even if it has been adopted according to the Schengen agreement, has to be abrogated.

Regarding the other two questions “Can the reintroduction of a mandatory visa be considered respectful of article 41 of the Additional protocol? According to the *Soysal* judgment should Italy change the visa policy towards Turkey?” Italy has not answered yet, even if the EU pressures all of the members to implement the *Soysal* judgment in their legislation, since 2009.

The only consequence was a parliamentary question,<sup>39</sup> directed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, which says:

*considering*

- the *Soysal* judgment;
- the history of relations between Europe and Turkey;
- that Italy is, among the EU Member State, the second largest trade partner with Turkey and the number of Italian visa applications are exponentially increasing;
- that Turkey has abolished visa for Italian citizens in 2007;
- that the approach to Turkey has been different to the Balkan States on the abolition of the visa;

*does* the visa obligation hamper trade and services between Italy and Turkey? Should Italy take the initiative with the other Member States to amend the EU visa Regulation and fully implement the *Soysal* Judgment?

The government answered that only the European Union has the exclusive competence in amending the Regulation 539/2001<sup>40</sup>. What Italy can do is just to continue contributing and supporting the dialogue and negotiation between Turkey and Europe: if they will reconcile on the readmission agreement, it would be the first step to open a high level dialogue in order to facilitate the issuance of visas to selected groups of people.

However, Italy has never checked the compatibility of its legislation to the *Soysal* judgment so, nowadays, there are still no answers to those questions.

Italy, as all of the other member states, should not consider the guidelines given by the EU in the *Handbook for the processing of visa applications and the modification of issued visas* as a substitution of the analysis, which each country has to do, because it is just a temporary regulation in order to prevent failure of implementation of the related judgment.

As a matter of fact, the European Commission considered necessary to amend the Regulation 539/2001 to highlight the need to respect the sentence ruled, with the following proposal:

“[...] the introduction in Article 4 of a provision allowing Member States to exempt service providers from the visa requirement, to the extent necessary to respect international

---

<sup>38</sup> Regulation n. 539, 15.03.2001

<sup>39</sup> [http://banchedati.camera.it/sindacatoispettivo\\_16/showXhtml.Asp?idAtto=26773&stile=6&highLight=1](http://banchedati.camera.it/sindacatoispettivo_16/showXhtml.Asp?idAtto=26773&stile=6&highLight=1)

<sup>40</sup> The Italian visa policy towards Turkish citizens is on implementation of the regulation 539/2001. Every modification of the national legislation should be respectful to the Schengen visa policy guide lines. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:081:0001:0007:IT:PDF>

obligations concluded by the Community before the entry into force of Regulation (EC) No 539/2001.”<sup>41</sup>

The modification will consist in adding, to Article 4 of the Regulation, a new paragraph, which will say:

" c) To the extent imposed by the application of Article 41(1) of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement between Turkey and the EC, a Member State may provide for exceptions from the visa requirement provided for by Article 1(1), as regards Turkish citizens providing services during their stay.<sup>42</sup>"

Does this new paragraph really respect the *Soysal* judgment and guarantee its implementation in each State which signed the Additional Protocol? The Schengen agreement policy, completed by the Regulation n. 539/2001, was the reason for the introduction of a mandatory visa towards Turkish citizens in the Schengen Countries, even for the Turkish service providers, despite the Additional Protocol. Once the *Soysal* judgment was given, it should have been also an EU's duty to implement it properly through its legislation, other than leaving this responsibility just to each States.

In conclusion, focusing on the Italian role, there is still a failure of implementation of the *Soysal* judgment. The reason why it should be done is not just because it is a European obligation but moreover because it concerns an agreement establishing rights for Turkish citizens, signed almost forty years ago, which still constitutes a primary source of EU law and it has being violated. Therefore, as a Member State that signed the Additional Protocol in 1970, Italy should assume its responsibilities.

Annex 1:

### Turkish citizens in Italy

Year	Residents in Italy	%Male	Number of Municipality	Variation compared to the previous year
2006	13.532	59,4%	963	
2007	14.562	59,3%	1.009	7,6%
2008	16.225	58,9%	1.045	11,4%
2009	17.651	58,7%	1.093	8,8%

### Region Distribution (2009)

Region	Residents	%Total	%Male	Variation compared to the previous year	Municipality
<a href="#">Abruzzo</a>	79	0,4%	62,0%	12,9%	23
<a href="#">Basilicata</a>	28	0,2%	64,3%	7,7%	3
<a href="#">Calabria</a>	295	1,7%	57,6%	9,7%	42

<sup>41</sup> This proposal is considered coherent with the ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 19 February 2009 in Case C-228/06, Mehmet Soysal and Ibrahim Savatli, in which the Court ruled that "Article 41(1) of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement with Turkey, signed on 23 November 1970 in Brussels, is to be interpreted as meaning that it precludes the introduction, as from the entry into force of that protocol, of a requirement that Turkish nationals such as the appellants in the main proceedings must have a visa to enter the territory of a Member State in order to provide services there on behalf of an undertaking established in Turkey, since, on that date, such a visa was not required". [...] ; COM(2011)290, p. 8-9, [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v10.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1_EN_ACT_part1_v10.pdf)

<sup>42</sup> COM(2011)290, p. 18, [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v10.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/malmstrom/archive/1_EN_ACT_part1_v10.pdf)

<a href="#">Campania</a>	52	0,3%	55,8%	-1,9%	20
<a href="#">Emilia-Romagna</a>	4.169	23,6%	58,1%	8,7%	128
<a href="#">Friuli-Venezia Giulia</a>	385	2,2%	62,3%	21,8%	25
<a href="#">Lazio</a>	832	4,7%	69,0%	8,5%	54
<a href="#">Liguria</a>	1.709	9,7%	62,3%	15,2%	43
<a href="#">Lombardia</a>	6.585	37,3%	56,4%	6,2%	390
<a href="#">Marche</a>	126	0,7%	57,9%	21,2%	28
<a href="#">Molise</a>	4	0,0%	50,0%	100,0%	2
<a href="#">Piemonte</a>	932	5,3%	58,8%	23,6%	67
<a href="#">Puglia</a>	137	0,8%	64,2%	18,1%	23
<a href="#">Sardegna</a>	14	0,1%	64,3%	-22,2%	7
<a href="#">Sicilia</a>	73	0,4%	53,4%	-12,0%	26
<a href="#">Toscana</a>	1.149	6,5%	59,1%	8,0%	88
<a href="#">Trentino-Alto Adige</a>	278	1,6%	64,7%	6,5%	28
<a href="#">Umbria</a>	61	0,3%	60,7%	17,3%	15
<a href="#">Valle d'Aosta</a>	13	0,1%	38,5%	0,0%	4
<a href="#">Veneto</a>	730	4,1%	57,9%	-1,1%	77

#### Municipality with the highest percentage of Turkish people (2009)

Pos	Municipality	Residents	%male	Variation compared to the previous year
1	<a href="#">Milano</a>	1.063	58,1%	2,5%
2	<a href="#">Modena</a>	1.036	64,7%	13,5%
3	<a href="#">Como</a>	1.027	59,4%	4,3%
4	<a href="#">Imperia</a>	1.023	62,5%	20,2%
5	<a href="#">Roma</a>	600	72,0%	2,7%
6	<a href="#">Novara</a>	389	57,8%	28,8%
7	<a href="#">Carpi</a>	288	55,9%	13,4%
8	<a href="#">Trieste</a>	238	68,5%	30,1%
9	<a href="#">Venezia</a>	226	60,6%	-1,7%
10	<a href="#">Rio Saliceto</a>	212	59,9%	1,0%
11	<a href="#">Grosseto</a>	203	50,7%	4,6%
12	<a href="#">Castelfranco Emilia</a>	178	51,7%	12,7%
13	<a href="#">Torino</a>	164	69,5%	22,4%
14	<a href="#">Piolto</a>	142	61,3%	6,8%
15	<a href="#">Bastiglia</a>	141	58,9%	2,9%
16	<a href="#">Fino Mornasco</a>	139	49,6%	11,2%
17	<a href="#">Trecate</a>	137	51,1%	28,0%
18	<a href="#">Porlezza</a>	125	53,6%	4,2%

19	<a href="#">Limbiate</a>	113	59,3%	1,8%
20	<a href="#">Bomporto</a>	111	49,5%	6,7%

<http://www.comuni-italiani.it/statistiche/stranieri/tr.html>

Annex 2:

**Foreigners that are residents in Italy: Top list of the first 16 States. It is divided by sex and origin country. (Dated the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010 and 2011)**

Citizenships	1st of January 2010		Citizenships	1st of January 2011	
	Total	M/F*100		Total	M/F*100
Romania	887.763	85,6	Romania	968.576	83,0
Albania	466.684	118,4	Albania	482.627	116,2
Morocco	431.529	131,6	Morocco	452.424	129,1
People's Republic of China	188.352	107,3	People's Republic of China	209.934	106,8
Ukraine	174.129	25,9	Ukraine	200.730	25,4
Philippines	123.584	72,5	Philippines	134.154	72,9
India	105.863	146,5	Moldova	130.948	48,9
Poland	105.608	41,6	India	121.036	154,3
Moldova	105.600	52,1	Poland	109.018	40,5
Tunisia	103.678	176,3	Tunisia	106.291	173,6
Republic of Macedonia	92.847	129,8	Peru'	98.603	66,3
Peru'	87.747	66,6	Ecuador	91.625	70,8
Ecuador	85.940	70,3	Egypt	90.365	228,3
Egypt	82.064	225,3	Republic of Macedonia	89.900	127,2
Sri Lanka	75.343	125,4	Bangladesh	82.451	207,5
Bangladesh	73.965	204,3	Sri Lanka	81.094	124,7
<b>Total of the 16<sup>th</sup> Countries</b>	<b>3.190.696</b>	<b>95,7</b>	<b>Total of the 16<sup>th</sup> Countries</b>	<b>3.449.715</b>	<b>93,4</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.235.059</b>	<b>95,0</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.570.317</b>	<b>92,9</b>

<http://www.istat.it/it/archivio/39726>