

**UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW**  
**ITALY**

**JOINT STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSION**

*submitted by*

**Franciscans International (FI)**

(NGO in Consultative Status with ECOSOC)

**Antigone**

**20<sup>th</sup> Session of the Working Group on the UPR**

**Human Rights Council**

**(27 October – 7 November 2014)**

Geneva

14 March 2014

## Introduction

1. The organizations listed below present this joint submission of written comments concerning the human rights situation in Italy for consideration by the UPR Working Group at its 20<sup>th</sup> session from 27 October to 7 November 2014.
2. Franciscans International ([www.franciscansinternational.org](http://www.franciscansinternational.org)) was founded in 1989 and has had General Consultative Status with the ECOSOC since 1995. FI supports Franciscans and partners working at the local and national levels and assists in bringing their concerns and expertise to the UN to address structural causes of human rights violations.
3. Antigone is an Italian NGO founded in 1991 dealing with human rights protection in penal and penitentiary system. Antigone works in justice and prison system and is also involved in migrant issues. The organisation carries on a cultural work on public opinion through campaigns, conferences, education, information, media, publications and its academic review “Antigone”. It cooperates in drafting bills and normative texts on penal and penitentiary subjects and has since 1998 an Observatory on Italian prisons that involves around 50 people.
4. This report will comment on the implementation of the recommendations and voluntary pledges assumed in Italy’s previous UPR (2010). The data and information obtained for this submission came from various sources, including first-hand information from Franciscans and partners serving individuals and particular groups affected by human rights abuses.
5. The analysis will address: (I) conditions of detention; (II) rights of migrants; (III) forced labour; (IV) environmental concerns, and (V) violence against women and other gender identity issues

### I. Conditions of detention

#### A. *First-cycle UPR Recommendations*

6. In the first-cycle of the UPR, the Italian Government received several recommendations in relation to its penitentiary system. The recommendations mainly called on Italy to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (OPCAT) and to incorporate the crime of torture in its national legislation, as well as to intensify efforts in relation to reducing overcrowding in detention centres. In its voluntary pledges, Italy committed to ratifying the OPCAT “once a relevant independent national preventive mechanism will be put in place”<sup>1</sup>.

#### B. *Legal and Institutional Framework*

7. Overcrowding in detention centres and the violation of the human rights of detainees are amongst the most outstanding issues of the Italian penitentiary system. Italy has the highest percentage of overcrowding among the EU countries. There are 205

---

<sup>1</sup> A/HRC/14/4/Add.1, 31 May 2010, p. 2.

prisons in Italy, hosting 64.758 detainees<sup>2</sup>. According to the Ministry of Justice, the Italian penitentiary system can officially accommodate 47.615 prisoners<sup>3</sup>. However, the real available space is for a much lower number of prisoners, since the official accommodation capacity includes also the jail sections which are now closed. According to Antigone's survey based on the work of its Observatory on prison conditions, the actual space available should only accommodate 37.000 detainees, with a rate of overcrowding of 175 per cent.

8. On this basis, up to now there are approximately 3.000 detainees<sup>4</sup> who have filed actions against Italy at the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). In order to avert this lamentable situation, where Italy is at risk of being convicted thousands of times, only a short time before the beginning of the Italian EU presidency (June-December 2014), all the highest institutional authorities of the country have intervened, urging for reforms, both to lower the number of detainees and to guarantee them better life conditions. The situation is felt to be so dramatic that, on 8 October 2013, the President of the Republic, Giorgio Napolitano, sent a formal written message to Parliament to report on the tragic living conditions in detention centres and requested for the adoption of effective measures to remedy the situation.
9. The crime of torture has not yet been codified in the Italian Penal Code, despite the fact that Italy has signed and ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Italy has only recently (3 April 2013), notably 10 years after its signature, ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (OPCAT), and has established by Decree-Law 146 of 23 December 2013 a national body for the prevention of torture and other forms of ill-treatment in prisons, "*Il Garante nazionale delle persone detenute*", as provided for in the OPCAT.

### *C. Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on the Ground*

10. Overcrowding in Italian detention centers is caused by three anomalies distinguishing the country from other European partners. Although official figures show that the rates of imprisonment are approximately in line with the average European rates, namely 108,96 prisoners per 100.000 inhabitants<sup>5</sup> (based on the last census, dated December 2011), anomalies are found in the repressive apparatus and in the conditions of detention. The first Italian anomaly pertains to the rate of non-Italians held in custody. In total, on 30 September 2013, they accounted for 22.770 out of 64.758 prisoners, namely 35,16%<sup>6</sup>. The high rate of incarceration is the outcome of immigration laws of 2002 (Bossi-Fini law) which forced many migrants into illegality, including potential asylum seekers, on the one hand, and of their impossibility to access the official labour market, on the other. The following are the nationalities represented: Moroccans (4.249), Rumanians (3.674), Albanians (2.789), Tunisians (2.774), and Nigerians (927)<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the Ministry of Justice official statistics (as of 30 November 2013), available at [www.giustizia.it](http://www.giustizia.it).

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>4</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>5</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>6</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem* (as of 30 September 2013).

11. The second Italian anomaly is the treatment of crimes related to the use or possession of drugs. The percentage of inmates sentenced or charged with drug-related offences is 40.21 %<sup>8</sup>. This is the effect of an extremely harsh legislation which neutralized the attempts to implement harm reduction strategies at the local level. In addition, as a result of the reduction of services for drug users, many of them are left on the streets, where they are targeted by law enforcement officers
12. The third anomaly concerns figures related to remandees. In Italy 38,04% of prisoners<sup>9</sup> are in pre-trial detention. The prison system is losing rehabilitative philosophy becoming a mere container of bodies. Remandees do not have access to rehabilitative activities. This principle is widely interpreted by prison governors as a justification to exclude these prisoners from all social programmes and to restrain them in crowded cells for twenty hours a day.
13. The maximum length of remand custody is particularly high as it is related to the unreasonable length of penal proceedings. The average length of a penal proceeding, which consists in three levels, is of as much as 1.351 days<sup>10</sup>. For this reason, Italy was condemned by the European Court of Human Rights many times, and was obliged to provide by law for a system of economic compensation<sup>11</sup>. The Italian Criminal Procedural Code provides for cases of compulsory remand custody according to the type of criminal indictment. The Constitutional Court has intervened many times on the subject, stating that compulsory remand custody is unlawful for most types of crimes.
14. Torture and other practices of ill-treatment are prevalent in the Italian prisons. On 8 January 2013 the Strasbourg judges unanimously convicted Italy on the *Torreggiani* case<sup>12</sup> which recognizes the systemic and non-occasional character of the degrading life conditions in the Italian jails. In fact, the Court clearly stated that the inhuman treatment due to prison overcrowding is a flaw of the whole Italian jail system. The sentence imposes that Italy should solve the problem within one year and binds Italy to pay a compensation to the seven victims with almost 100.000 Euros. The Italian Government filed an appeal against the sentence which was rejected on 28 May 2013. Thus, before the end of May 2014 Italy must solve the systemic problem of prison overcrowding.

#### *D. Recommendations*

15. Our organizations recommend to the Government of Italy to:
  - a) Introduce the crime of torture in the Penal Code in compliance with the provisions of the UN Convention against Torture.
  - b) Intensify efforts to appoint the “*Garante nazionale delle persone detenute*” and ensure the effective exercise of its functions.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Idem*(as of 30 June 2013).

<sup>9</sup> *Idem* (as of 30 September 2013).

<sup>10</sup> Report on Justice of the Italian Senate, May 2013.

<sup>11</sup> The law is known under the name of its first proponent, Mr. Pinto (24.03.2001 n° 89, G.U. 03.04.2001.)

<sup>12</sup> Case *Torreggiani and others v. Italy*, 8 January 2013.

- c) Take all necessary steps to overcome overcrowding in prisons, by – *inter alia* - the adoption of alternative forms of punishment to imprisonment and ensure adequate living conditions of persons deprived of their liberty.
- d) Introduce new penitentiary law only for minors in order to give more space to re-educational programs and to reduce the impact of disciplinary measures.
- e) Introduce mechanisms to guarantee parity of treatment in the health care system in prison compared to the rest of society.

## II. Rights of migrants

### A. First-cycle UPR Recommendations

16. During the first review of Italy, issues related to the rights of migrants were the most raised by the Member States. A particular emphasis during the interactive dialogue was put on its “push-back” policy and the criminalization of illegal migration which were reflected on a considerable number of recommendations.

### B. Legal and Institutional Framework

17. Since the first UPR, the legal and institutional framework governing immigration in Italy has been subject to marginal changes, especially with regard to the search and rescue at sea of migrants.

18. Italy started to implement its policy of interception and pushing-back of migrants in May 2009 pursuant bilateral agreements between Italy and Libya, in particular the bilateral cooperation agreement signed in Tripoli on 29 December 2007 and the Additional Protocol signed in Tripoli on 4 February 2009<sup>13</sup>. Recently, Italy has been condemned<sup>14</sup> by the European Court of Human Rights (on 23 February 2012) on the basis of the violation of articles 3 and 13 of the European Convention of Human Rights and the article 4 of the Protocol No. 4 of the Convention due to its “push-back” policy of migrants.

19. The Consolidated Act of measures governing immigration and norms on the condition of foreign citizens (*Testo Unico sull’immigrazione*<sup>15</sup>), as amended by the Bossi-Fini Law<sup>16</sup>, Law 125/2008, and Law 94/2009 (the so-called “*Security Package*”) still provide the legal framework regulating immigration in Italy. These legislative measures combined with the bilateral agreements to which Italy is party, set the legal basis for the “push-back” of migrant boats found in international waters to their countries of origin.

20. The Senate of the Italian Parliament has recently<sup>17</sup> passed a project of law on illegal migration. It provides for the elimination of the crime of illegal entry in Italy of foreigners as provided for in the “*Security Package*” transforming it into an administrative offence, except for cases of recidivism. It remains however a criminal

<sup>13</sup> *Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy* available at [://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-109231](http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-109231)

<sup>14</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>15</sup> Legislative Decree No. 286 of 25 July 1998.

<sup>16</sup> Law No. 189/2002.

<sup>17</sup> Project of Law No. 110, 21/01/2014, available at <http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Resaula&leg=17&id=736223>

offense in all other cases, including the breach of the obligation to repatriate to their respective countries.

21. A provision that is still in place and that merits further consideration is Article 11 of the Bossi-Fini Law, which provides for the reclusion of up to three years and the payment of a fee for anyone who supports the undocumented entry of migrants in the national territory. This provision, which aims to tighten the consequences for individuals involved in smuggling of migrants, has had the effect of discouraging the rescue at sea of migrant boats in distress for fear of being accused of complicity.
22. On 3 April 2012, the Ministries of Internal Affairs of Italy and Libya signed in Tripoli a new agreement of cooperation between the two countries<sup>18</sup>. The Treaty does not contain the expression “push-back”, however, it provides for “activities in international waters” without explaining what these activities should consist of. On 4 July 2013, the Italian Minister of Internal Affairs had a bilateral meeting with the Ministry of Foreign Relations and International Cooperation of Libya and reached an agreement which aimed at strengthening the already existing relations of cooperation between the two countries “in full respect of human rights”<sup>19</sup>.
23. As the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants highlighted in his report following his visit to Italy from 21 September to 8 October 2012, the texts of such bilateral agreements, which are often the result of private consultations, are not always of public domain or easily accessible through official channels. Accordingly, the Special Rapporteur noted a “lack of transparency surrounding such agreements”<sup>20</sup>.

### C. Promotion and protection of human rights on the ground

24. Notwithstanding, the legal and institutional framework that Italy set up to address the global challenge of migration, are measures still far from fully implementing the recommendations made during the first-cycle UPR to Italy with regard to the rescue at sea of migrants.
25. On the occasion of a communication rendered by the Italian delegation to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 26 July 2012, Italy declared that collective “push-back” of migrants at sea is not part of the national strategy to combat irregular migration<sup>21</sup>. However, credible information reveals reported cases of *de facto* operations of “push-back” of migrants to Libya, which could amount to a breach of the principle of *non-refoulement*<sup>22</sup>. On 5 August 2013, the cargo ship Adakent rescued at sea 96 migrants and took them to Libya following an order issued by the Italian authority<sup>23</sup>. *De facto* “push-back” operations cannot be used by Italy to overcome its

---

<sup>18</sup>The agreement can be found at <http://www.stranieriinitalia.it/images/accordolibia18giu2012.pdf>

<sup>19</sup>The press release can be found at

[http://www.interno.gov.it/mininterno/export/sites/default/it/sezioni/sala\\_stamp/comunicati/comunicati\\_2013/2013\\_07\\_04\\_immigrazione.html](http://www.interno.gov.it/mininterno/export/sites/default/it/sezioni/sala_stamp/comunicati/comunicati_2013/2013_07_04_immigrazione.html)

<sup>20</sup>A/HRC/23/46/Add.3, p. 11.

<sup>21</sup>See “Communication Du gouvernement de l’Italie relative à l’affaire Hirsi Jamaa contre l’Italie”, available at : <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2126716&SecMode=1&DocId=1895722&Usage=2>

<sup>22</sup>See the submission by Amnesty International to the Council of Europe, 11 February 2014, available at [http://www.amnesty.eu/content/assets/Doc2014/B1525\\_-\\_second\\_submission\\_Hirsi\\_-\\_11\\_Feb\\_2014.pdf](http://www.amnesty.eu/content/assets/Doc2014/B1525_-_second_submission_Hirsi_-_11_Feb_2014.pdf)

<sup>23</sup>*Idem*.

legal duties to disembark migrants rescued at sea in safe locations and allow them to seek international protection.

26. Four years after the first-cycle UPR recommendations, a human-right based framework, which can be able to effectively address the challenges of migration flows coming from the Mediterranean Sea, in consistency with the international obligations to which Italy has freely decided to adhere, is yet to be envisaged. Still, a security approach to the issue of migration seems to be the rule instead of the exception.
27. A clear and self-explanatory case is the emergency-based approach underpinning the recent military and humanitarian operation *Mare nostrum*<sup>24</sup>, which was put in place following the recent shipwrecks of migrant boats off the coasts of Lampedusa of October 2013. The operation aims to control the migration flows coming from the south of the Mediterranean Sea and prevent further tragedies at sea.

#### *D. Recommendations*

28. Our organizations recommend to the Government of Italy to:
  - a) Adopt all legislative and administrative measures to ensure that the so-called “push-back” policy is no longer implemented and that rescue at sea of migrants is performed in full compliance with international human rights and refugee law.

### **III. Forced labour: The practice of *caporalato***

#### *A. Legal and Institutional Framework*

29. Four years after the first UPR, Italy has adopted important legal provisions to combat labor exploitation, including by criminalizing the practice of *caporalato*. Article 603bis of the Italian Criminal Code, introduced by Law No. 148 of 14 September 2011, provides a narrow definition of *caporalato* and identifies it as a practice of “conducting an organized activity of intermediation, recruiting manpower or organizing its work, characterized by exploitation, through violence, threat or intimidation, taking advantage of the workers’ situation of need or want”.
30. On 16 July 2012, Italy adopted the Legislative Decree No.109, the so-called “Rosarno Law”, which provided for the granting of a residence permit for humanitarian reasons for migrant workers exposed to particularly exploitative working conditions. However, in order to be eligible to obtain such a permit, migrant workers are required to take active part in reporting the situation of labor exploitation and cooperate with authorities in the criminal proceedings against their employers (Article 1.b).

#### *B. Promotion and protection of human rights on the ground*

31. Available sources identify *caporalato* as an illegal practice of exploitation of migrant workers in various segments of the labour market, from agriculture to construction which is widespread across the whole Italian territory, and by no means limited to Southern regions of the country. In the agriculture sector only, the phenomenon

---

<sup>24</sup>More details about the mission are available at:  
<http://www.marina.difesa.it/attivita/operativa/Pagine/MareNostrum.aspx>

involves around 400.000 people, including 100.000 of migrant workers, who are subject to forms of labour exploitation and to degrading living conditions<sup>25</sup>.

32. The phenomenon of labour exploitation in Italy, including the practice of *caporalato*, is mainly linked to the absence of effective regular migration channels that can allow migrant workers to emerge from a situation of illegal stay in the country. The criminalization of “illegal entry and stay” in Italy, introduced by the 2009 *Security Package*, have had the effect of facilitating the exploitation of migrant workers by *de facto* preventing them from having access to official channels where they could report a situation of exploitation. This is because, according to the Italian legislation<sup>26</sup>, any public officer has the legal duty to report all suspected criminal acts to the police or judicial authorities.

### *Recommendations*

33. Our organizations recommend to the Government of Italy to:

- a) Ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.
- b) Revise the migration policy and expand the regular migration channels to prevent undocumented migrants from being exposed to labour exploitation.
- c) Take measures to ensure adequate protection and assistance to victims of forced labour, including through granting of a temporary residence permit regardless their will to cooperate with the authorities in criminal proceedings.

## **IV. Environmental concerns**

### *A. First-cycle UPR Recommendations*

34. Our organizations are particularly concerned of the impact of ILVA steel plants, situated in Taranto, on the enjoyment of human rights of local population. This issue was also raised during the first review and Italy accepted a recommendation made by Israel<sup>27</sup> to take adequate steps with respect to reducing pollution emissions from the Cerano coal plant and the Taranto metallurgical plant.

### *B. Legal and Institutional Framework*

35. During the four-year period after the first review, rather than Italy improving the situation in Taranto, it has allowed for the functioning against any principle of precaution of one of the most polluting steel plants in Europe installed at only some meters away from the residential centers.
36. The only institution that has tried to stop the pollution has been the judiciary whose efforts has been hampered by some elements of the political power purported to be involved with ILVA. In 2012, the *Magistratura di Taranto* had confirmed the large scale of pollution provoked by the ILVA steel plants and its dangerous impact on public health and environment. On this basis, the polluting parts of the plants were put

---

<sup>25</sup> See for reference, [http://www.flai.it/attachments/article/783/Scheda\\_Sintesi\\_Rapporto.pdf](http://www.flai.it/attachments/article/783/Scheda_Sintesi_Rapporto.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> Article 331 of the Italian Code of Criminal Procedure.

<sup>27</sup> A/HRC/14/4/Add.1, 31 May 2010.

under sequestration and some elements of ILVA management were put under domiciliary arrest. On 24 December 2012 the Parliament approved an *ad hoc* law 231/2012 (the so-called “law *Save-Ilva*”) that overruled the decision of the judiciary and allowed for putting the plants back into production. The law “*Save-Ilva*” provided for the approval of a protocol under which the plant should have operated, the Environmental Integrated Authorization (*Autorizzazione Integrata Ambientale, AIA*).

37. But ILVA did not comply with the AIA prescriptions as it was also reported by the Guarantor of AIA in July 2013 (established by the law “*Save Ilva*”), whose position was abolished afterwards. On 4 August 2013, the Italian Parliament approved the so-called law “*Save-Ilva 2*” aiming at putting ILVA in the hands of a management operating under the Ministry of Environment. This was followed by a third law on December 2013 providing for *inter alia* a transitional period of three years during which it will not be possible to guarantee the conformity of the plants with the AIA prescriptions. Postponing the application of the AIA protocol means that the local population will have to suffer the effects of the pollution for at least three more years.

### *C. Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on the Ground*

38. The Taranto steel plants are known as amongst the largest in Europe and are installed close to the city centre, causing gross environmental damages and jeopardizing the lives of inhabitants. The high level of pollution is largely contributing to violations of the right to life, the right to health and to a healthy environment, the right to decent living conditions, including the right to food and safe drinking water. According to the group of experts appointed by the judiciary of Taranto to conduct two studies on chemical and epidemiological effects of ILVA plants, about thirty deaths a year are correlated with industrial pollution<sup>28</sup>. The crucial role that ILVA plants play in the Italian economy is largely compromising the health and the future of the Taranto population.

### *D. Recommendations*

39. Our organizations recommend to the Government of Italy to:
- a) Take immediate and effective measures to protect local population from dangerous activities of ILVA steel plants.
  - b) Set a moratorium on the harmful activities of Ilva to prevent environmental damages and fatal diseases caused by its industrial activities.

## **V. Violence against women and other gender identity issues**

### *A. First-cycle UPR Recommendations*

40. Despite the magnitude of gender-based violence in Italy in the past decades, regrettably the issue did not receive significant attention during the first review of Italy, resulting in a poor number of recommendations. Notwithstanding, violence against women, including domestic violence, was largely addressed in the report of the UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women, Ms. Rashida Manjoo, following

---

<sup>28</sup> See for reference, Peacelink, <http://www.peacelink.it/ecologia/a/39437.html>.

her field visit to Italy in January 2012. In her mission report, Ms. Manjoo, emphasized the urgent need to address “the high levels of domestic violence, which are contributing to rising levels of femicide.”<sup>29</sup>

### *B. Legal and Institutional Framework*

41. Italy has recently taken some important steps with regard to the serious and persisting phenomenon of violence against women, including domestic violence and femicide. Our organizations welcome as a positive step in this regard, notably the ratification by Italy in June 2013 of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention) which set the ground for the enactment of a specific legislation on gender-based violence some months later. The approval of the new law by the Senate in October 2013 clearly shows Italy’s recognition of the gravity of the situation and its commitment to combat this ugly phenomenon of the Italian society. The new law sets stricter penalties for the perpetrators of domestic violence and reinforces measures with regard to the protection of victims. Undoubtedly, the new law is a significant step forward in addressing violence against women and femicide, however its implementation remains questionable taking into consideration the cultural context in which violence occurs and the slow Italian justice system.

### *C. Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on the Ground*

#### **Domestic Violence and Harmful stereotypes**

42. Despite advancements in the legal framework, discrimination and violence against women in its various forms remain a serious problem in Italy. Continuous incidents of domestic violence resulting to femicide continue to perturb the Italian society on a daily basis. The new law has been introduced in a context where violence against women is reaching shocking levels and cases of femicide are increasing at an alarming rate with 2200 women being killed between 2000 and 2012<sup>30</sup>, mainly by their current or former partner.
43. The phenomenon of violence against women is linked to the persistence of widespread harmful stereotypes across the country, especially within the family settings. Additionally, this was also highlighted by the UN Special Rapporteur, Ms. Manjoo, in her report stating that “most manifestations of violence are underreported in the context of a patriarchal society where domestic violence is not always perceived as a crime; where victims are largely economically dependent on the perpetrators of violence; and perceptions persist that the state responses will not be appropriate or helpful.”<sup>31</sup> Therefore, in order for the legislative measures to be effective, they should the foremost be accompanied by concrete measures aimed at changing the deeply rooted Italian mentality on the role of women in the family and society to ensure gender-equity.

---

<sup>29</sup> A/HRC/20/16/Add.2, 15 June 2012, p. 22.

<sup>30</sup> Eures, *L’omicidio volontario in Italia*, 2013, available at [http://www.west-info.eu/files/ESTREMA-SINTESI-RAPPORTO-EURES-OMICIDI-2013-\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://www.west-info.eu/files/ESTREMA-SINTESI-RAPPORTO-EURES-OMICIDI-2013-_1_1.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> A/HRC/20/16/Add.2, 15 June 2012, p. 17.

## **Gender identity**

44. In the same line, our organizations are concerned of the persistent violence and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. Cases of abuses against members of sexual minorities are widespread and constitute a growing phenomenon in Italy. Under the domination of an atmosphere of violence and prejudices, they are often obliged to hide their gender identity and sexual orientation for fear of public shame, harassment, bullying, stigmatisation and rejection, which can have stressful and harmful effects on their personality. This become even more alarming when young people are concerned resulting in an increasing number of cases of suicide. For this reason, the issue requires priority attention from the Government. An anti-homophobia bill is currently pending for discussion at the Senate of the Italian Parliament. In this spirit, Italy needs to strengthen measures for countering violence and discrimination on the grounds of gender identity and sexual orientation and contribute to the creation of a culture of human rights, peace, tolerance and diversity appreciation, in which every human being can live in accordance with his/her own identity and personal beliefs.

### *D. Recommendations*

45. Our organizations recommend to the Government of Italy to:

- a) Continue its efforts to curb violence against women and femicide, particularly in domestic context and combat impunity by ensuring the effective implementation of the new law against perpetrators.
- b) Intensify efforts to raise awareness and sensitize all strata of society through education campaigns.
- c) Enhance the protection of victims by increasing shelters and services to victims.