



CNEL REVIEW

HOW ITALIANS SEE EUROPE
The results of CNEL public consultation
on the future of Europe

In the Scientific Journals of the National Council for Economics and Labour, addressed to the scientific community and citizens, studies presented by Council experts, i.e. external researchers and scholars are published, in the context of collaboration agreements or seminars at the 'Body.

We thus intend to contribute to the scientific debate, also in order to obtain useful contributions to the enrichment of the debate on the issues under discussion at the Council itself.

The publication of the documents is carried out pursuant to article 8, section 12, of the Organizational Regulations approved by the CNEL Assembly on September 13, 2018. The choice of topics and methods of investigation reflects the interests of the researchers. The opinions expressed and the conclusions are attributable exclusively to the authors and do not in any way engage the responsibility of the Council.

Scientific Committee

President: Prof. Lawyer Tiziano Treu

Members

Prof. Maurizio Ambrosini
Prof. Emilio Barucci
Prof.ssa Silvia Ciucciovino
Prof. Efsio Gonario Espa
Prof.ssa Maria Malatesta
Prof.ssa Annamaria Simonazzi
Prof.ssa Cecilia Tomassini
Prof. Giovanni Vecchi
Prof. Michele Faioli
Prof. Claudio Lucifora

Managing Director

Couns. Paolo Peluffo



CNEL REVIEW

HOW ITALIANS SEE EUROPE
The results of CNEL public consultation
on the future of Europe



SUMMARY

Introduction	9
Tiziano Treu	11
Romano Prodi	15
Paolo Peluffo	23
Consultations in other European countries	29
Results	35
Tables	43

Cnel Review n. 4
April 2019

Cnel Review
Periodic publication
attached to the Labor Market Newsletter

Journal waiting for registration

ISSN 2611-5948



In collaboration with



Centro Europe Direct at the CNEL

Introduction

From 28 January to 21 March 2019 the first public consultation was held based on Article 10 (*reinforced procedures*) of the new Regulations of the Bodies of the National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL), approved by the Assembly of 12 July 2018, which in paragraph 1, letter c) provides for “*public consultation open to all citizens, through the institutional website*” to obtain the opinion of citizens on a topic of general interest.

The procedure was activated “*upon proposal of the President after hearing the Presidential Council*” at the meeting of 30 January 2019, with the consequent acceptance of the Assembly on the same date. The consultation questionnaire was defined at the Bureau meeting of 18 December 2018 and approved by the Board of Directors on 30 January 2019.

Article 10 of the Regulation of CNEL Bodies states that upon conclusion of the consultation “*the General Secretary will prepare reviews of the observations received, in the framework of the preliminary documentation to be submitted to the Assembly*”. It must therefore be considered from the outset that the public consultation, which in itself has a high citizen participation value, assumes for the Board the nature of a preliminary investigation of particular importance, as an element of evaluation for subsequent resolutions of the Assembly.



Tiziano Treu

President of the National Council for Economics and Labour

Good afternoon. Thanks for your presence.

In this meeting room we often find ourselves discussing topical issues with various speakers. Today's meeting is particularly significant for me and for CNEL as we are here to comment on the results of a public consultation on the future of Europe, launched just over two months ago, on the advice of the European authorities and the EESC. This type of consultation takes place in various countries. In reality, it should take place in all member states of the European Union on the initiative also of public authorities.

In the case of Italy, CNEL has decided to take the initiative by using as the channels for spreading the questionnaire the social organizations that are our *constituency*, that is the associations of the world of business and labour and those of the tertiary sector. We had the support of the Ministry of Public Education to reach the schools and for this we are grateful to them because one of our goals was to raise awareness among young people in particular and to inform them about the problems of Europe. We have the pleasure of having with us, in addition to many of our Directors, Beatrice Covassi, who is the Representative in Italy of the European Commission and prof. Romano Prodi, guest of honor for many reasons, not least the fact that he was president of the European Commission. We also have students from two Roman schools, who also take part in our school/work alternation programs.

Here I will only make a brief introduction. Afterwards, the comment of the results will be presented, as planned, by the people present who organized the consultation. What makes us particularly proud and gives us cause for hope is that the response was very significant. We had over 13,000 answers to the questionnaires, an expression of keen interest and many expectations for the European Union.

We are all aware that Europe is today facing one of the most crucial steps in its political and institutional history. The forthcoming parliamentary elections can represent a decisive watershed for the future of the European project. It is essential that the implications of this appointment are made known and discussed as widely as possible among all European citizens, starting with the youngest who have not experienced the original events and motivations of the Community as some of us less young. I use the term Community because it is that of the origins and it remains significant of the spirit of the founding fathers.

Many of CNEL's initiatives are inspired by this objective, in addition to the one presented today, to respond to its institutional mission, which is to stimulate the participation of the social partners and of the productive categories in decisions relating to the formation of European Union acts (art. 28 of the law 234/2012).

Furthermore, the program of activities of CNEL for the 2019-2020 two-year period underlines the need for Italy's active participation in the definition of the economic policies of the Union, which must urgently return to support the growth and investments of the Member States "in the community spirit that is based on the principles

of equality and solidarity among all member countries and that Italy can testify well since 1957 as a founding country of the European Union”.

We are convinced that the reasons behind the European project are still valid: starting with the objective of guaranteeing a prospect of lasting peace to those European countries that had just emerged from the war; to which the belief was added from the beginning that only a common project of those same countries could ensure, in addition to peace as an essential good, also a future of economic prosperity and individual and collective well-being.

We are convinced that the strengthening of the European project and the unity among the member states is necessary to strive towards the objectives upon which the Union is founded, and it can guarantee both well-being and sustainable development and the values of solidarity and democracy.

These values are at the base of our civil and social model, but they need to be supported by the conviction and participation of all citizens; because they are not secured once and for all and indeed appear today threatened in Europe and in other parts of the world by social tensions and inequalities, which feed fear, nationalistic impulses and anti-European feelings. The questions asked in our consultation want to stimulate a collective reflection on the current state of European policies and relations, on their strengths and critical points, as they are experienced by citizens, on the expectations for the next future, starting with the next election date. As regards the outcomes of the consultation, I want to emphasize how they indicate that, despite everything, citizens continue to consider Europe as a reference point for the search for effective solutions to the problems of the economy, labour, welfare, environmental protection and personal rights. It is no coincidence that the greatest expectations are concerned with support for employment, welfare benefits, health care, equal opportunities for access to the world of work, attention to environmental protection and the waste cycle. In short, Italians expect Europe to be effective first and foremost in terms of protecting individual and collective rights.

I believe that these answers are significant because they remind us of one of the major urgencies for the future of the policies of the stability of the European project itself. As I was able to reiterate at the meeting organized by the EESC in Brussels on 21 February 2019, in order to do justice to the social dimension of Europe, more than has been done so far, it is essential to restore confidence to European citizens in the common future and to counter the populist and disruptive forces of the social fabric. It is not enough to revise individual institutes of our traditional work system here and there. We need to invest more in social infrastructure (education, health, housing), reversing the trend that has seen them dramatically fall during the crisis. Investing in social Europe and its social institutions is particularly important at this time for Europe, and for Italy as well, given the negative demographic projections – declining birth rates and aging of the population – and to face the radical changes that have occurred in the job market.

The indications coming from this consultation offer us precious elements to enrich our reflection and to better respond to the expectations expressed by many citizens.

The CNEL intends to finalize this reflection by preparing a document-manifest containing a reasoned analysis on the current situation and on the economic-social and institutional prospects of Europe in view of the Parliamentary elections. In it we would like to indicate what we believe are the priority proposals useful for strengthening the growth capacity of the European project and increasing the involvement of citizens. Other political and social organizations are reflecting and producing documents on these issues. Finally, a joint appeal was launched for Europe by Confindustria, CGIL, CISL and UIL.

In my opinion, this is a positive sign that shows the increased awareness of the importance of the stake these elections represent for our common destinies.

The document we are elaborating also on the basis of the results of the consultation, will receive the contributions of all the components present at the CNEL, which represent a large part of the productive as well as social world of the country.

Furthermore, we intend to gather on this document the widest possible consensus among the various economic, civil and social components of the country, even outside those present at the CNEL, but which, like us, are interested in making known the problems and prospects of Europe without partisanship and apart from the contingencies. Together with them we want to work to strengthen the economic, social and political unity of Europe, so as to make it our common home, more welcoming and useful for its citizens.



Lectio magistralis on the future of Europe

Romano Prodi

I am very pleased to be here with you, especially for the presence of young people, to reason about the extremely interesting results that emerged from the “Public consultation on the future of Europe” prepared by the National Council of Economics and Labour.

The first reflection is that Europe has guaranteed peace for over 70 years. A fact that today is taken for granted but which remains absolutely unparalleled since the fall of the Roman Empire. When I remember this incontrovertible historical truth, boys look at me like a dinosaur, and it is understandable, because I belong to another generation, the one that has seen the war! Fortunately, for most of you, and especially for the younger ones, peace is instead the natural state of things, but if we look at what happened just outside Europe, we understand that it was not the case for everyone: we had bloody wars and ethnic persecutions in the neighbouring former Yugoslavia and in Ukraine. The same is happening in the countries from which the migrants who land on our shores come. I say this especially to younger people: wars are part of history and can arise suddenly. When Adenauer, De Gasperi and Schuman began to work to build our Union, the political will was to close forever with the tragedies of the two world wars and put the conditions for a lasting peace, conditions that had instead proved impossible after the First World War because of the tensions and difficulties among the nations that the war had not solved at all. Their objective was to join together to give stability to Europe.

An objective that has been completely achieved. Nevertheless, this one, which is the first and true reason that led to the European Union, has been underestimated over the years and has been almost forgotten today. We joined together for the desire to live in peace, in a free and democratic space, where we can grow by cooperating. De Gasperi, Adenauer and Schuman, who had a vivid memory of the war, wanted a united Europe to ward off other wars and ensure a better future for the new generations. It was not just economic calculation and it was not the action of bureaucrats: the founding fathers were not even economists! There is a part of randomness in the history of Europe: the three founding fathers found themselves sharing deeply rooted values. They were, for example, all three Catholics and all three spoke German. It should not be forgotten that De Gasperi had been a parliamentarian in the Austrian Parliament, while Schuman was bilingual because he was from the French side of Alsace. The process of building Europe has been long, complex and tiring, and is still ongoing. In 1954, economic cooperation agreements were initiated which led to the formation of the ECSC, the Coal and Steel Community. Having failed the first attempt of an army in common, with the rejection by the French Parliament, and failing to face the constitutive elements of the modern State, we proceeded with less political questions but which marked the start of a common work.

Today we laugh if we think of coal and steel. There is almost no coal mine in all of

Europe! Yet during the Second World War coal and steel had been the most valuable resources for the production of armaments. Having placed their industries under supranational control produced the first major changes, the first results. Suddenly, a devastated continent began to walk together and gradually made progress: the common denominator remained the desire to prevent Europe from rearming. Many years after the ECSC, starting from the provisions of the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, the single currency began to be considered. It was a fundamental process for Europe, but not without difficulties. I remember when the German industrialists and bankers made a corrective declaration against the euro. I was in politics then and I asked German Chancellor Helmut Kohl why, in the face of all the German establishment that did not want the Euro, he instead pronounced himself in favour of the single currency. I clearly remember the response that he gave me instinctively: "I want the Euro because my brother died in the war". He didn't talk to me about bankers, interest rates or economic issues. The German Chancellor was aware that if Germany had not adopted the Euro, no country would have done so and understood that money, like the army, is one of the foundations of the modern state. His answer makes us understand that what was evident back then today we are not capable of grasping: nations united by the same currency would no longer go to war with each other. In this way, a market was gradually established that expanded to new countries. Originally there were Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. Then many others were added: first 9, then 12, up to the current 28 member countries of the Union.

Enlargement to the East

Another successive step marked the history of Europe: the enlargement to the East. Today that process is perceived as a problem and certainly has radically changed the nature and identity of the European Union. It is clear that the wider Europe is, the less homogeneity is guaranteed within the Union itself and many have criticized the enlargement, judging it to be excessive. It must however be taken into account that, after so many years in which Europe had been divided into two parts, between the countries that orbited in the area of the Soviet Union and the others located in Western Europe, i.e. in that Atlantic area of liberal democratic tradition, the countries of the East, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, were in disarray. So I ask myself and propose a reflection to you: if there had not been the enlargement, if Poland or Hungary were today in the same conditions as Ukraine, what would be the advantages for Europe? The lesson I get from it is that when "the train of history" passes, and usually only passes once, one must have the courage to catch it, even when there are elements of uncertainty. At that crucial moment, when a choice had to be made, since I was president of the European Commission, a position I held from 1999 to 2005, I contributed to the decision to enlarge. I have been, and still am, strongly accused of having wanted it, but the more I think about the past and analyze it, the more I believe that today's fragmented Europe would be in a disastrous situation from all points of view.

All in all the diversities manage to stay together, we have no clashes and the enlargement has been achieved thanks to a common sense of belonging to Europe. A common feeling that the subsequent wrong policies have greatly reduced, but not cancelled. Regarding the importance of being together, I remember when we started discussing the entry of Romania, a country which had so many relations with Italy, first of all for immigration. During the discussion in Parliament, a tall, big man stood up asking for the floor and calling himself “a member of the non-Hungarian minority of the Romanian parliament”. His speech was very passionate and favourable to Romania’s entry into the EU. To my question about the reasons for so much involvement he replied: “*My grandfather was killed because he was a member of the minority; my father was sent into exile because he was a member of the minority; I want to enter Europe because Europe is a union of minorities*”. This remains the most beautiful definition I have ever heard of Europe. It was and it is indeed so. Through Europe everyone could have a voice, a role, albeit minor, in the choices of the Continent, be represented in Parliament and be able to express a Commissioner. The idea suggested by the definition “union of minorities” and the supranational aspect, as a guarantee of all Member States, were those that more than others have led to the construction of Europe. As I said before, the creation of the common market and many actions carried out together in the field of science, social policy, energy, ecology ... have allowed us to make progress in the direction of a united Europe. The proposal of the European Constitution that would have somehow consolidated the European structure was fundamental. Instead, in 2005 the Constitution was rejected by the French National Assembly. However, if we analyse that vote, we find that Europe had very little to do with it. The French position was the expression of an internal rebellion against President Chirac’s national policy. Therefore, a small domestic political game has stopped the greatest institutional innovation in contemporary history. The evidence of this fact, which perhaps the older people will remember, is that the whole electoral campaign in France was carried out with a manifesto of the so-called “Polish plumber” which aimed to show how immigration from other European countries would have taken other jobs from the French. Some time later, thanks to a journalistic investigation, it was discovered that there was not a single Polish plumber in the whole French Republic !!! But the damage had already been done.

The political immobility of the Union.

The rejection of the European Constitution has led to the political immobility of the Union. The nature and distribution of power has changed. It has increasingly passed from the Commission, a supranational body, to the Council, which is not the set of commissioners who swear loyalty to Europe, but it is the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the various European countries.

Europe has thus ceased to be a union of minorities. When states decide, the strongest state prevails. Thus began the tensions, which gradually became more acute and aggravated by the economic crisis. An economic crisis that, with the complicity of the

new internal power dynamics, has sacrificed and weakened the achievements attained and the entire European system. Just think of the history of the Euro. If we reread the newspaper accounts at the time of its introduction, we can realize the enthusiasm with which the single currency was accepted. It was really a triumph and for a few years everything went well. With the economic crisis, the process of fragmentation caused by the new financial dynamics began. The fear of the deficit prevented us from facing the crisis that came from the United States and that immediately required, as Obama did, a substantial supply of liquidity. Europe, on the other hand, was not able to decide quickly. A battle has opened up between countries, between the strongest and those with less solid economies. Since, as it has been said, the decision-making power of the Commission was passed to the Council, the austerity line, namely that expressed by Germany, the strongest State, prevailed over the need to express a leadership, firmly in the hands of the virtuous Germany that no one could ever challenge, capable of a greater sense of solidarity. While all the responsibilities of the difficulties that the crisis has brought with them have been attributed, by public opinion, to the Euro!

The case of Greece

At the same time, the case of Greece broke out, a country that we all certainly love, even if it should not be forgotten that it hid from Europe the true data of its budget. Anyway, it was a case that took on dimensions much larger than the real ones: the deficit of 30 billion was very manageable by Europe, a continent with 500 million inhabitants, while the export of Greece corresponds approximately to that of the Province of Vicenza! Thirty billion is not an entirely insignificant sum, but modest compared to the European budget. However, the elections in North Rhine-Westphalia were taking place at the same time and the German Chancellor did not want to take decisions that could prove to her voters as a favour granted to Mediterranean countries! Germany, and Europe with it, thus postponed the decision, taken only after the outcome of the electoral consultation, and I remember that the outcome was strongly negative for the Chancellor's party! Meanwhile, the 30 billion Greek debt had become 300 due to speculation that intervened while in Europe the German decision was expected. The strongest political tension we had to face wasn't therefore decided between Brussels and Athens, but between Berlin and Athens. These are the most obvious examples of the change that has taken place in recent years and which has caused a sense of disaffection for Europe in a large part of public opinion. The European Union has a great destiny and it is indispensable for our future needs.

Be careful though, Europe must once again become a "union of minorities".

In these years the economic crises would certainly have caused a total disaster had the ECB not intervened, the European Central Bank, led by our Mario Draghi who - very interestingly - managed to do, even if in longer times, what Obama had done in one fell swoop, that is to insert liquidity in the system and avoid that the economy precipitated tragically. In the great crisis of these years it is therefore Europe that

has saved us! Nevertheless, it is clear that if the remedy to the great crisis has come from a non-democratic organ by definition, such as the European Central Bank, it means that the democratic institutions are strongly in crisis. What is needed now is to recover the democratic dimension to recover the growing gap between citizens and European institutions.

Europe has become necessary

At the same time, Europe has become increasingly necessary because in the world the two giants (USA and CHINA) have grown immensely and the relationship between the two powers has totally changed. At school, when you studied the Renaissance, you will not have missed that the Italian states at the time were dominant all over the world. It is not rhetoric, it is a historical fact that I repeat above all when I am abroad. Venice and Genoa, Florence and Naples, had the primacy in the art of war, in finance, in accounting, in philosophy, in optics, in technology, in the arts... However, at the arrival of the first great globalization, namely the discovery of America, they were all divided, unable to express a unified policy, unlike the Kingdoms of Spain, England, France. Today we are in the same situation with the European countries: Germany, France, Italy and all the European nations facing the United States and China are like the Italian states struggling with the first globalization. Either we will be able to express a unitary policy, a common policy, or we will disappear from the map as, for four centuries, the Italian states of the Renaissance have disappeared. In this regard, I just want to remind you that there are 22 Chinese and 6 Americans for every Italian in the world. The calculations are very simple and intuitive are the reflections that follow. However, we must note that from an economic point of view, we Europeans are still giants: we are the number one in industrial production, even if not with a big gap from second place, and number one in export, even if not for long, as in the meantime China is growing but, at least, we will remain the number two, not far from the Celestial Empire. Unfortunately, we have not completed our political cycle, without which it is absolutely impossible to develop and express choices in the social, economic and in any other sector. This Europe, deprived of its political role, is like a half-cooked and half-raw bread. As it is, nobody likes it, and our duty is to cook it completely and not to throw it away because it is indispensable for our life today and for our future. In addition to China and the USA, let's also think about Russia: the largest country in the world per surface has a per capita income like Italy, but it has a very important political role, despite its economic weakness. I will just give you one last figure that is quite striking. In 2018, China grew by 6-6.5%, a high figure for the European standard and that corresponds to the entire Russian gross national product. In essence, China *"grows by a Russia every year"*.

There are also other indicators that can be taken into consideration, but they all tell us the same thing: no European nation, however powerful it may be, will be able to do anything economically or politically in the challenge that is already underway

with the great powers, Russia included. Either we really join, or we will end up like the Italian Renaissance states.

The awakening of the European sentiment

In recent months there has been an awakening of European sentiment, due to two facts that in themselves are negative: Brexit and Trump's hostile attitude towards Europe. It is clear to everyone that English politics is not capable of managing the exit from an economic and political system that allowed Great Britain to make great progress. Brexit has turned out to be such a tragedy for Britain that today no country intends to leave Europe and renounce the euro. As for the American sentiment towards Europe, of which President Trump is the interpreter, we can say that he has profoundly changed with respect to previous administrations. The Bush family was very European and so was President Clinton who had studied at Oxford where he became passionate about Europe. As for Obama, on the other hand, Europe was like any other place in the world but he had great respect for our history. I am convinced that the Atlantic Alliance is still fundamental and that not only has it saved us in the past, but it is still a guarantee for international stability, whereas for Trump Europe represents a competitor, an opponent. These two elements help Europeans understand that it is increasingly necessary to be together. The dimension in the international scenario counts and will count more and more. Remaining isolated, without being able to rely on anyone, would be catastrophic for European countries. There is also another element that is awakening the conscience of many Europeans. Among the big companies that are rewriting the history of the world through interconnection there is not even one European: the first big companies of the digital revolution, Google, Apple, Amazon and Facebook on the one hand and Alibaba, Baidu and Tencent from the others are American or Chinese. The United States on one hand and China on the other are accumulating wealth, unlike Europe, which in history has favored the wealth of all.

These organizations and the countries where they reside are accumulating more and more wealth and more and more power. Europe, if it does not know how to react, will suffer more and more the consequences. The first, which we are already experimenting on our skin, is the widening gap between the richest and the poorest. Europe needs to put in place political solutions because if this difference continues to grow it could reach a level that is no longer recoverable. In this sense the new equilibriums that are being determined are a huge problem. Right here in Rome, these days, I met a colleague of mine from the University of Berkeley, where we studied together. He was interested in knowing what we are doing to rebalance relations in society and he told me that he, as well as many economists and politicians, appreciated Europe's economic policy activity and the actions implemented to curb the power of American corporations. He was referring to the provision approved at European level which, with the protection of copyright, restrains the overwhelming power of the multinationals of information. No country alone would have been able

to make a decision and oppose the overwhelming power of a company like those mentioned above. In fact, a whole economic system has changed, so it is really difficult for a State, on its own, to have a key player status at the international level. A united continent, on the other hand, can do it, but there is still a long way to go

Towards the completion of the Union

The failure to complete the Union has also led to the non-coordination of economic policy. We must absolutely progress in this direction if we do not want to lose all that has been done, with difficulty, until today. For example, tax issues are a priority. It is known that large companies move their offices where they are tax-free. Ireland is essentially the country that attracts more multinational companies because it has very low taxation, almost nothing. The European Commission has finally forced Apple to pay the tax due to Ireland. This is around 13 billion euros, which corresponds to just 6% of Apple's liquidity. Obviously, the first reaction from the company was that of not wanting to pay. The paradox was that not even Ireland wanted to receive that sum because for Dublin it was much more convenient to ensure the presence of the large multinational than to force it to pay what it owed. Europe, however, by requiring Dublin to request unpaid taxes and arrears, has restored a principle of fairness towards taxpayers, competing companies and other European nations. Who could have done it but Europe? It is essential for the member countries to strengthen and, where necessary, rebuild the Union, moving forward in the European process. It is complicated to do it but it is urgent because the world has changed. Even the very important European elections that await us in a few days are not yet an expression of our unity. There will only be a united and strong Europe when the people are called to vote by choosing between a French or Spanish socialist, a German or Italian Christian Democrat. Voting in national constituencies does not convey the sense of a single electoral campaign across the continent. However, these elections are still fundamental in order to safeguard and preserve Europe, which remains our only possibility for the future.



Paolo Peluffo

Secretary General of the National Council for Economics and Labour

The choice of the theme: the future of Europe

The decision to dedicate the first public consultation of the CNEL to the future of the European Union and European policies stemmed from an invitation by the Government of the Republic to participate in the initiative recommended by the European Council in February 2018, in analogy with what was done by the European Commission, that has carried out its own public consultation on the same subject with the help of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) which made use of a group of 80 EU citizens randomly chosen in the preparation of the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 12 questions prepared by the European Commission and the EESC and it obtained about 80 thousand compilations in all 28 member countries. The specific initiative of the CNEL, with the intense collaboration of the organizations representative of the productive and social forces, was to create a simple questionnaire in the language but articulated on multiple guidelines, so as to induce reflection in the act of compiling it. The questionnaire consists of 44 questions, divided into 4 main areas (A. *fundamental values*; B. *economic policies*; C. *social policies*; D. *digitalization*) further divided into 16 conceptual groupings - attributes - of second level¹. Each question asked the compiler for an evaluation (from 1 to 10) as a measure of the adhesion or appreciation of each person for the indicated policies and therefore of the desirability and meritoriousness, or not, of their promotion and pursuit by the Union. The consultation was made available on the *homepage* of the institutional website www.cnel.it on 28 January 2019, with the use of an appropriate technological platform².

The promotion of the participation of citizens and interested parties in the consultation took place following three channels: first of all that of the associations and organizations represented at the CNEL, which actively contributed to the promotion of the consultation with their institutional communication tools; through the involvement of the respective communication managers involved through a specific meeting at the CNEL; that of the Ministry of University, Education and Research, which actively supported the consultation with a circular in the schools, in particular the secondary level, and finally an intense communication activity developed through the institutional website, *social networks* and a constant presence in the media, through the activity of the Press Office.

In the two months during which the consultation remained online on the CNEL website accessible to all citizens, 13,500 questionnaires were completed in full, of which 13,417 were suitable for the evaluation of the answers. As a reminder, it is clear that the participants gave valid answers to 590,348 individual questions. This

1. Principles; 2. Institutional Frameworks; 3. Single market; 4. Monetary union; 5. Foreign policy and defence; 6. Taxation; 7. Labour; 8. Health; 9. Education and training; 10 Welfare; 11. Asylum and immigration; 12. Young people; 13. Sustainable development; 14. Privacy and copyright; 15. Digital identity; 16 Single cross-border administrative system.

2. Performed by "Noto Sondaggi".

consultation therefore turned out to have achieved a significant adhesion, also considering the complexity of the questionnaire itself. Just over 6,000 respondents (44% of the total) also filled in the fields with some extra information, including the *e-mail* address to receive the results of the consultation.

Analysis of the results

In general, the results found have shown a good level of interest in European Union policies. Using the scale from 1 to 10 to express one's own interest with regards to crucial issues, the votes expressed by the participants in the consultation reached an average of 8.3/10.

Below the average, there are 11 specific policies out of 44. Among them, with important differences, we note:

1. the *"strengthening of the functions of the European Parliament"* collects a total score of 7.4/10, with 58.1%, and therefore still a majority, of the participants who cast votes in the maximum bracket (8-10) ;
2. the *"strengthening of the political groups transversal to the country of origin"* collects only the vote of 6.6/10, with the percentage of participants in the consultation that expresses votes of the maximum band (8-10) which falls below 50% (42.8%), peaks at the bottom are recorded in the 35-54 age group (6/10) and among housewives (5.8/10);
3. the *"fine tuning of transnational political lists"* also ranks at a mediocre 6.6/10, with only 44.5% of participants with grades 8-10. It is clear that the low trust towards European institutions becomes mistrust towards the development of groups and political forces outside of the national context.

Leaving the institutional dimension and moving to the second area, that of the functioning of the single market, we find below average the answers to questions relating to:

4. *"support the investments for the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN)"* with a score just below the average or 8.2/10, which in any case has a share of 70.8% of respondents in favour of very high votes (8-10);
5. the idea of developing *"full competition between member state operators"* with an overall grade of 7.8/10.

Rather weak are the answers regarding the *"level of agreement on the need for Europe, in order to strengthen the monetary union, to support ..."*. In particular:

6. *"Single supervisory instruments on banks"* reaches a score only slightly below the average (8.2/10);
7. *"Common insurance on deposits"* (vote 8/10, with 68.2% of respondents concentrated on votes 8-10).

In these cases, they are not particularly acute critical points, which are also found in the individual instances proposed to the participants regarding the organization of the common European defence.

8. *"planning common military capabilities"* registered a score of 7.8/10, with 63.8%

- of high votes, but with over 16% of insufficient votes;
9. *“adopting a shared defense policy”* obtains a greater score (average score 8.2 / 10). It is not surprising that critical issues emerge in the general reception of the *immigration* issue. The two questions dedicated to it were intended to integrate each other. The premise proposed to the respondents was: *“what is the level of agreement with the principle that, with regard to immigration and the right to asylum, it is important for Europe ...”*. The first of the two hypothesized policies reported adhesions below the average:
 10. *“Guaranteeing the free movement of people on the internal borders of the Union”* recorded an average vote of 7.7/10, but with a percentage of negative votes (1-5) of almost 20%. The second of the hypothesized policies, *“to guarantee an effective control in crossing the external borders”*, records a vote higher than the average with a total of 8.8/10. One of the proposed policies to the attention of the participants in the matter of strengthening youth policies is also slightly below average:

11. *“developing active citizenship of young people”* with an average grade of 8.2 / 10.

In general, by observing the socio-demographic breakdown of respondents, we note that systematically below the average are the responses of the age group between 35 and 64, that is, the generations directly affected by the long economic crisis; housewives, the unemployed and the non-employed. Specific criticalities emerge for example on the theme of competition and the younger cohorts (16-17 years); the idea of a common deposit insurance appeals less to people between the ages of 18-24 and 25-34; among the 25-34 years the hypothesis of strengthening the *“common military capabilities”* is of less interest.

The differences between the great geographical divisions do not appear significant. There is therefore a sort of *“national opinion”* on European policies. The opposition to the creation of transnational political formations seems more acute. We point out that in the three questions on the institutional and political dimension of the Union there is the only socio-demographic component, the housewives, that do not reach sufficiency (5.8/10) in relation to the question on *“the strengthening of groups policies transversal to the country of origin”*. With regard to these institutional-political questions, the strongly opposed component must also be noticed, that is to say the participants who attributed grades 1-5. These latter add up to a non-negligible 20.9% on the question related to the agreement on the idea of *“strengthening the functions of the European Parliament”*, a percentage that rises to 31.8% in relation to the *“strengthening of transversal political groups compared to the country of ‘origin’”*; and 30.6% of negative votes for *“the development of transnational political lists”*.

These are significant consistencies, diverging from all other questions. It should therefore be borne in mind that, given the overwhelming adherence to the 5 questions concerning the fundamental principles of the Union, there is a criticality in the sphere of the development of a transnational political personality. The national political dimension seems to be looming to a significant share of the participants in the public consultation, although favourable to European policies, as a strong guar-

antee of political and democratic rights. Some further criticalities can be found in the sphere of the monetary union - particularly if applied to the banking system - in the military sphere of the Union and in that relating to immigration policies. With reference, instead, to those instances that are accepted with high adhesion, we observe that they are distributed among the fundamental principles of the Union, the economic, social, health and environmental policies.

There are 9 policies that receive a value equal to or greater than the 9/10 vote:

1. The level of agreement on the importance that Europe undertakes to guarantee *"freedom of thought, conscience, religion"* (9/10), with 84.1% of the votes concentrated between 8-10
2. *"right to freedom and security of citizens"* (9.4/10) with a 92% concentration on the maximum votes and a percentage of 3.5% concentration on the votes less than 5)
3. *"right to respect for private and family life"* (9.3 / 10);
4. Level of agreement on the principle that within the single market Europe should *"guarantee the free movement of people for study, work, volunteering"* (9.1 / 10);
5. *"pursuing the goal of full employment"* with a vote of 9/10. It is interesting to note that within Area B, the *"single market"* attribute, we find two policies below the average, two above and three in line with the average
6. In the sphere of social policies, with a vote 9/10 we find the adhesion to *"creating equal opportunities for access to work and support for employment"*. There is a strong demand that Europe should aim to improve the quality of health services and for this matter that it should:
7. *"ensure essential levels of health care and assistance"* (9.1/10), with 88.5% of maximum votes and 3.9% of negative votes. With regard to the measures concerning policies for sustainability and environmental protection, adhesions for the following are as follows:
8. *"supporting the use of environmentally friendly materials"* (9/10) and
9. *"managing the waste cycle"* (9.1/10, with a concentration of 88.1% in the maximum votes, and 4.2% in the negative votes).

In general, women participating in the consultation and people over the age of 54 appear to be slightly more *"pro-European"*.

The monetary union collects less adhesion among young people, both those between 18-24 and those between 25-43 years; common defence policies have lower adherence, specifically between the ages of 25 and 34; while tax harmonization records results that are lower than the average among the youngest and those with lower educational qualifications.

In general, all labour and employment policies and social policies stand above the average, even if below the 9/10 mark: work, sustainable development, health, education and training, young people, asylum and immigration, welfare. The proposal for a common insurance against unemployment is higher than average among the female

public and among people over 54, but lower than the average among young people aged 25 to 34. Active citizenship for young people finds less adhesion among those aged between 24 and 34, while it arouses interest above the average among women.

The hypothesis of *“defining the producer responsibility on the activity test waste”* raises an above-average interest among people over 54 years. It was a peculiar choice of CNEL to investigate the issues of digitalization and privacy. In general, the three questions on the subject have received broad support. In particular, the idea that regulation on the processing of personal data (*privacy*), the protection of copyright (*copyright*) and the deletion of obsolete data from content providers (*right to be forgotten*) should be single and uniform it has received adhesions over the average by the female participants (8.7/10) and mature cohorts. The idea that the European Union should develop an integrated digital identity system and that for this purpose we need *“a single European digital identity system to access the services of public administrations in all EU countries”* has received a total of 8,4/10 votes, with a peak among the age groups over 54; the same demographic cohorts that have welcomed with great support the hypothesis of a *“single administrative system that simplifies movement of goods and people”*.

Conclusions

A first general datum that emerges from the consultation carried out is that Italian citizens do not seem to have failed to favour European Union policies, a favour that has characterized them for decades and that indeed emerges a strong will of participation and involvement in public decision-making processes. Public consultation by its nature is an exercise in voluntary participation. Therefore, it does not give rise to a representative sample. However, the large adhesion to the compilation of the questionnaire appears significant in itself. To this is added a general greater favour for the development of fundamental rights connected with the development of the Union, for a social Europe, with policies more targeted to social needs, equal opportunities, free movement for study and work. Less enthusiasm is found for the political-institutional dimension, for a common defence, for competition and monetary union. Finally, it should be emphasized that, with the consultation covered by this Report, CNEL has been able to interpret the traditional role of listening to citizens through the social parts represented in it, also taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the new forms of communication that characterize our times, in order to maximize the effectiveness of its action



THE IDEA OF CITIZENS' CONSULTATIONS AND ITS DIFFUSION IN MEMBER COUNTRIES

Premise

Following the high abstention rates in almost all EU countries during the last European elections of 2014¹ and the subsequent advance of the EU-opposed movements in some member countries, many felt it necessary to re-establish the link between the citizens and the construction of the "European Union" project trying to investigate the reasons for the dissatisfaction. The problems that afflict the EU do not only concern technical choices that must be made by administrative experts but also value choices that involve the interests and concerns of European citizens.

Thanks to the Presidency of the French Republic, the first announcement was made in a speech at the Sorbonne (September 26, 2017) of the idea of launching a great consultation on the future of Europe, hoping that other member state governments would launch an analogous initiative.

Then on 17 April 2018, President Macron officially launched the first "citizens' consultation" on the European Union. Following the French initiative, many EU member states have activated consultations with the aim of involving a significant number of citizens to detect concerns, hopes and expectations. In many Member States, through consultations, it has emerged that there are thematic areas in which Europeans would like a greater presence of Europe and areas where it is reported that the Union does not intervene appropriately. The tool proved to be effective in questioning people about the European project they would like and to involve them by trying to adequately connect the EU's problems with its citizens and ensure that they contribute significantly to the decision-making process without the governments should fear of being deprived of their sovereignty.

The European Commission itself has taken this opportunity and it wanted to involve the citizens themselves in a public consultation on the future of Europe. This was not a consultation aimed at drawing up European rules and regulations. Its goal was to collect and transmit to the EU leaders the opinions gathered, in an attempt to identify the issues to be prioritized in the coming years and it was conceived as a complementary activity to other Commission initiatives.

The 12 questions of the survey, published online last 9 May 2018 - Europe Day - were formulated by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) with the contribution of a group of 80 citizens from the 27 Member States, selected randomly

1. In Slovakia and the Czech Republic more than 80% of abstention from voting was registered. Of the 28 member countries, only eight had a participation rate of over 50%.

and invited to take part in the work. According to the EESC, this was a “*unique exercise in participatory democracy*” which “saw citizens shape the debate on the future of Europe in view of the European Parliament elections in May 2019”.

Therefore, from April to October 2018² in many European countries (with the exception of the United Kingdom, which had already announced that it did not want to adhere to the proposal), alongside the online consultations, debates and in-depth discussions were launched on various topics such as European values, social Europe, the single market, economic convergence, migration, Europe in the world, sustainable development, the youth, mobility, innovation.

The ideas that emerged from the consultations were the subject of national reports and summaries (November 2018) and European ones (December 2018). The discussions that ensued and the final results were taken into account in the summary sent to the European Council of 13-14 December 2018³.

Among the main requests the simplification of the language used to communicate with citizens and a greater and constant involvement emerge.

In the conclusions of the European Council meeting on 14 December (EUCO 17/18 - CO EUR 22 of 14.12.18), the Council welcomes the holding of dialogues with citizens and citizens’ consultations, which “*constituted an unprecedented opportunity in involving European citizens and could serve as a source of inspiration for further consultations and dialogues*”. The joint report drawn up by the incumbent presidency and the incoming one, together with the various national reports and the contributions of the other European institutions, highlights a series of concerns and expectations that the participating citizens have in terms of concrete results from the EU. At the informal meeting scheduled for 9 May 2019 in Sibiu, the heads of state or government will discuss the priorities of the next institutional cycle, in order to agree on the next strategic agenda in June 2019.

2. 19 countries out of 27 have started consultations during the same period suggested by the European Commission: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain.

3. In the Joint Report of the Council of the European Union (n. 14535 of 3.12.2018) it is stated that “the consultations of the citizens have been welcomed by civil society and numerous voices have expressed appreciation for this activity of evaluation of the opinions of the citizens. (...) This exercise contributes to responding to a request for involvement by civil society, which has emerged systematically in the dialogues. The dialogue appears particularly important in view of the citizens’ wish (...) to gain a better understanding of the functioning of the EU and the meaning of EU membership. There have been numerous invitations to intensify efforts to promote better education about the EU”. Finally, the report “does not claim to be a definitive synthesis of the dialogue with citizens at a national level, which will continue in various forms. Rather, it wants to be a contribution to the current efforts to involve more civil society” in defining the next strategic agenda discussed by European leaders

France⁴

In France, 1,082 citizen consultations were organized which attracted over 70,000 participants. 97 of the 101 French departments took part in the initiative. All departments and overseas regions have organized consultations. The largest number of consultations within a single region took place in Île-de-France (the largest Paris region) and the largest number of people was reached in the Paris department. Nevertheless, three quarters of citizens' consultations took place outside the Paris region, a distribution relatively faithful to that of the population of mainland France. 400 municipalities organized one or more consultations.

Small urban communities (villages and small towns with 20,000 inhabitants or less) accounted for 54% of the total, demonstrating that the exercise mobilized the smaller communities first. The diversity of the organizers, the participants and the format of the debates at national level have guaranteed the achievement of the government's goal of presenting an extended and reasoned vision, after a broad and transparent comparison, on what citizens really think about today's Europe and what they expect from Europe in the future. The results bear the imprint of those who sponsored and took part in the consultations. The decision to have open meetings helped to democratize access to the places where the debates took place. Although the people who attended these types of events had a tendency to express strong opinions, the innovative initiatives undertaken managed to mobilize a great variety of participants. With this tool we did not want to "map the sentiment of the French but to facilitate the decision-making process of politicians".

Four themes were dominant: 1) Communication: many participants deplored the lack of visibility of European actions; 2) Citizenship/belonging/European identity; 3) Governance and democracy; 4) Environment.

Analysts in the French survey have found that the "Euro-sceptical" public seems to have moved little and the proposals/objections represent, for the most part, the opinion of a pro-European population.

As for the timing (as regards to France, but in fact adopted by the member countries that have joined), the consultations started on April 17 and ended on October 31, 2018⁵.

4. *"In this panel of citizens, we discussed for 4 half days, in order to arrive at the proposals of this opinion. We have very different opinions. We have experienced a way to discuss among ourselves about Europe and to compare our points of view. We discovered things we didn't know about Europe. Our perception of Europe has changed. We intend to talk about this rewarding experience. We recommend that these workshops be created regularly. By inviting us, you have opened a path, and this path is promising for us citizens and for you, decision makers".* (Excerpt from the opinion of the citizens adopted by the panel held from 25 to 27 October 2018 in Paris)

5. "The United Kingdom has not been invited to participate, Italy has withdrawn and Hungary has been content with a handful of institutional debates" - according to the French Minister for European Affairs Nathalie Loiseau

The first results were announced on 30 October at the Economic, Social and Environmental Council of France.

On 8 November 2018, the European Affairs Committee of the National Assembly met with several MEPs from various member countries for a first European evaluation of this initiative (consultations for citizens were held in 25 member countries out of 27).

The national reports were to be sent to the Presidency of the Council of the European Union (Austria) by 19 November 2018. The Austrian Presidency was later to present the report on 11 December 2018 to the Council of the European Union and on 13 December to the European Council. The final conclusions of the process initiated are expected at the new summit that will take place in Sibiu (Romania) on 9 May 2019, European holiday.

Spain

In addition to the online consultation of the European Commission, “Citizens’ Dialogues on the Future of Europe” have been launched in Spain, coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which were attended by about 6,000 Spaniards. In all, around 100 citizen dialogue events were held in 48 cities, spread across 14 of the 17 autonomous regions of Spain. Citizens’ consultations were organized by civil society participants, the European Commission Representation and the European Parliament Office in Spain, and other Spanish institutions that voluntarily joined the initiative. Among the issues that emerged: greater expectations on social policies; a more effective fight against poverty; greater citizen participation in the decision-making process; defense of human rights inside and outside Europe (greater North-South solidarity). The criticism of European migration policy and of the Europe “of merchants” has been constant, perceived as “far from the citizens”.

Nevertheless, according to the *Eurobarometer*, as of September 2018, 75% of Spaniards felt that being part of the European Union was positive for Spain. The percentage of Spaniards who considered Spain’s accession to the EU useful increased by 15 points in the last year alone. All citizens’ consultations held in Spain clearly show a strong desire for a more integrated, harmonized, active and united Europe.

Spain’s participation rate in the online survey on the future of Europe was the fourth highest overall. The results of the survey show that the Spanish population supports the strengthening of the social pillar and indicates as priorities of the EU the themes of renewable energy, health care, equitable access to education and the creation of a true government for the whole EU.

The Spanish emphasize the achievements of the Union, in particular the free movement of persons, the single currency, the structural funds, the international leadership in environmental protection, the Erasmus program, and the perception of the EU as a quality seal.

Citizens are aware of the limits of the European Union; their main concerns therefore focus on the need to redesign the migration policy at European level, to consolidate the economy and monetary union, to improve the accountability of the EU institutions towards citizens, to tackle Euro-scepticism and populism and to strengthen EU competences to make the Union more effective.

For large sectors of the population, there are still some thematic areas which, although perceived as results achieved, require further reformulation. Noteworthy among these are: the common agricultural policy and its relationship with the rural depopulation; the financing policies (and their monitoring); the Bologna Process for universities (and the consequent increase in paperwork); the management of the consequences of the 2008 crisis (the attempts for a multi-speed Europe); finally, the EU enlargement processes (and the EU instrumental vision adopted by many Member States).

Most of the participants, especially the most pro-European, are familiar with the main failures of the EU and its weaknesses. On the one hand, they highlight the impossibility of achieving a European Constitution and the current absence of political leadership (both inside and outside the EU). These two aspects, even if perceived as failures, are the clear sign of a desire for more Europe. On the other hand, as weaknesses, they highlight the perception of a lack of democratic transparency and the image of the members of the European parliament as privileged positions that respond exclusively to the interests of national political parties. Finally, there is the perception that the only political opposition in the EU is exercised by the Eurosceptic Parties, while traditional parties are defensive and do not offer real alternatives.

Poland

In Poland, until November 2018, 15 meetings with citizens took place and the process continued in the following period. If 87% of Poles have a positive opinion of the European Union, it is above all thanks to the cohesion funds, the opening of borders and the protection of consumers. On the other hand, there are strong concerns about “the discrimination of Polish employees in the European labour market”, the possible “reduction of cohesion funds”, “the distance of Europe from its Christian roots” or “the emergence of a two-speed Europe”.

Portugal

In Portugal, two main instruments were used: the website of the European Commission, which collected about 1000 contributions and forty “meetings with citizens” organized by national, regional and civil society authorities. 78% of Portuguese support the European project but at the same time express pre-occupations related to Brexit, the youth, migration, agriculture, institutions and the fate of the euro.

Estonia

The consultations saw the participation of 70,000 Estonians and the recurring themes concerned the values of Europe and the gap between the promises of the leaders and the effectiveness of European policies.

Sweden

Sweden is traditionally engaged in the free market and the principle of subsidiarity. The Swedes would like the EU to focus “on what it does best” and be less present in other sectors.

Austria

Austria collected 4,000 contributions on the online questionnaire and last November was organizing a European conference on subsidiarity issues. “These consultations with the citizens are not a closed chapter”, said the Austrian ambassador at the November meeting, insisting that this initiative had a real impact upstream and beyond the European elections.

THE RESULTS

The public consultation on the future of Europe, promoted by CNEL, was carried out between January and 2019 and received the opinion of 13,417 respondents who were able to complete the online questionnaire by accessing the site www.cnel.it.

The Methodology

The methodology used was developed with the aim of detecting the quality and perceived image of the European institution. To this end, therefore, a questionnaire formulated "ad hoc" on the topic was proposed to the interviewees. The interlocutors, that is the SEGMENTS to which the questionnaire was addressed, were:

- citizens (with particular reference to young people);
- members of the social partners represented at the CNEL;
- members of Consumer Associations.

With respect to the SUBJECT AREAS to be investigated, second level conceptual groupings have been defined, called ATTRIBUTES. Each attribute was associated with a QUESTION to which the respondents had to answer using a vote from 1 - which implies an absolutely negative evaluation of the topic - to 10 - which represents an absolutely positive evaluation. Here, therefore, is a summary of the methodological structure and the topics studied in depth with the research.

The evaluations expressed by the interviewees have generally shown a good level of interest for the issues that concern Europe as an institution. Using a scale of 1 to 10 to show their agreement with key issues concerning European competences, the votes expressed by the respondents reached 8.3/10 on average, a sign of a good level of involvement among the participants in the consultation with respect to these topics. Therefore, without prejudice to the strong interest recorded for all subjects valued by the respondents, 8.3/10 is therefore the average reference value with respect to which a classification was created, in which the involvement of the participants is defined higher or lower than the average based on the feedback recorded in the public opinion.

A area: Fundamental Aspects

In this section the level of interest of the interviewees with respect to the definition of the fundamental principles and institutional structures of the European Union was tested. In the context of the fundamental aspects, the issue of principles has been the subject of a strong level of interest. In fact, all the issues that concern Europe's need to define and guarantee the principles underlying the union between countries have obtained values between 8.8 and 9 on average. In particular, the need to see the right to freedom and security of European citizens protected, followed by respect for private and family life and the guarantee of freedom of thought, conscience and religion for all, is the most felt.

Still on the subject of fundamentals, the issue of European institutional structures that registered a level of interest equal to 6.9/10 was less important for the interviewees.

1. Principles

The evaluations expressed by the participants in the consultation are homogeneous among the different categories, a sign of a perception of the topic that is not conditioned by the age, the level of education or the area of residence of the interviewees. However, there is a slightly greater sensitivity of women than men in attributing importance to the fundamental principles on which to base the European Union.

2. Institutional arrangements

The interest shown by the interviewees for the European institutional arrangements obtained on average 6.9/10, and this is the lowest vote among all the sectors tested. In this case, the evaluations are also quite aligned between the different targets. It is worth noting the slightly higher than average grades expressed by women and lower than the average among 35-54 year olds who are the least interested in this topic.

AREA	SECTOR	LEVEL OF INTEREST	
		Average rates (1-10)	
- A - Fundamental aspects	Principles	9,1	Above average
	Institutional assets	6,9	Below average

B Area: Economic policies

In this section the level of interest of the interviewees with respect to the economic policies of the European Union was tested. In this context, among the interviewees there is a level of interest above the average for the creation of a single European market or even for the EU fiscal policy. On the other hand, on the issues concerning the monetary union are registered levels of interest lower than 8.3/10, and the European foreign and defense policy considered urgent to be addressed collected votes lower than 8.3

1. Single Market

A higher than average interest is registered for the different aspects concerning the single European market. The assessments are fairly stable among the targets, although it should be noted that those over 54 are slightly over-average affected by the theme.

2. Monetary Union

For the issues concerning the monetary union, a level of interest is recorded among the respondents lower than average. In particular, young people between 18 and 34 years of age, as well as those with lower educational qualifications, are less involved.

3. Foreign policy and defence

With regard to foreign policy and defense, there is also a lower than average interest among the respondents to the consultation. The over-54s are more concerned while the 25-34s are the age group that is less involved by the issue.

4. Taxation

The breakdowns show that the tax theme attracts the interest above all of the respondents belonging to the highest age bracket (over 54 years) while the least interested are the younger (under 18) and those with a degree of lower studies.

AREA	SECTOR	LEVEL OF INTEREST	
		(Average rates)	
- B - Economic policies	Single market	8,6	Above average
	Taxation	8,4	
	Monetary union	8,1	Below average
	Foreign policy and defence	8,0	

Area C: Social policies

In this section the level of interest of the interviewees with respect to the social policies of the European Union was tested. In general, the theme of social policies, declined in its various aspects (work, environment, social assistance...) has aroused the highest level of attention among the participants in the consultation. Work and the need to commit Europe to guarantee sustainable development have obtained an 8.9/10, followed by the need to guarantee the right to health, which has been assigned an urgency vote of 8.8. The commitment to training and youth policies also obtains a high level of satisfaction and the interest shown by the respondents for the themes of asylum and immigration rights is also above the average.

1. Labour

The usefulness for Europe of supporting policies that regulate the world of labour is expressed by respondents with above-average votes. In particular, a 9/10 is assigned to the need to create equal opportunities for access to work and to support employment, while an opportunity to balance the rights and duties of the worker and the employer is assessed with an 8.8/10. The breakdowns show a greater sensitivity of women to these issues. In fact, this target express higher grades, as compared to the others, in evaluating these factors.

2. Health

Europe's commitment to improving the quality of health services is also felt as a priority by respondents who assign grades of between 8.6 and 9.1 to the importance of acting in the regulation of this sector. It should be noted that women and the over-54s are once again the most generous targets in expressing their assessments.

3. Education and Training

Europe's commitment to supporting education and training is assessed as being important by respondents in an above-average way (8.6/10) and once again women are the targets that more than others reward the importance of promoting interventions on this sector.

4. Social care

The interest shown for the issues concerning social assistance is more or less on average among the respondents who especially hope that Europe will support the creation of a sustainable social protection system. A little less interesting is the need to create a common insurance system against unemployment or even the opportunity to proceed with the harmonization of social systems between EU states. In any case, women and over-54s are confirmed as the targets most prone to these initiatives, while the greatest resistance is found among 25-34 year olds.

5. Asylum and immigration

The role of Europe in the field of asylum and immigration is considered important

by the respondents, who assign to the various aspects related to this theme a level of importance above the average for what concerns both the control and the management of shared asylum policies. On the contrary, it is lower the level of agreement towards guaranteeing free movement within the borders of the union, which gets a 7.7/10.

Apart from the over 54s, among whom the highest marks of the average are recorded, the evaluations are fairly homogeneous among the different targets, indicating a common sensibility that by now tends to assign Europe the role of institution of reference, the highest authority for this sector.

6. The young

The need for strengthening youth policies is shared more than the average by respondents. The initiative to realize the socio-professional integration of young people within the European market is rewarded with an 8.7/10, while an average of 8.2 is achieved to develop the active citizenship of young people. Women confirm their enthusiasm in evaluating these projects, while the 25-34 year olds confirm to be the most difficult target.

7. Sustainable development

Strong interest is found among respondents for issues concerning sustainable development, for which a strong expectation emerges with respect to European intervention. In fact, the level of agreement that Europe should intervene in this area is expressed with above-average marks. The over 54s are confirmed as the most generous category in the evaluations, although it should be noted the high level of agreement expressed by all respondents.

AREA	SECTOR	LEVEL OF INTEREST	
		<i>Average rates(1-10)</i>	
- C - Social policies	Work	8,9	Above average
	Sustainable development	8,9	
	Health	8,8	
	Education and training	8,6	
	The Young	8,5	
	Asylum and immigration	8,4	
	Welfare	8,3	

D Area: Digitalization

In this section the level of interest of the interviewees is tested with respect to the problems posed by the progress of the digitalization process, which increasingly needs to be governed by a perspective that goes beyond national borders.

The level of attention of the interviewees for the aspects related to digitization was found to be on average.

Privacy, copyright, digital identity and the single cross-border administrative system. Given the current relevance, these topics attract the interest of the participants in the consultation, who evaluate with an overall 8.4/10 the urgency of intervention of Europe to regulate these sectors. The opportunity of creating a single cross-border system was evaluated of average importance with an 8.3/10.

1. Privacy and copyright

In this case women and over 54s are also the most convinced categories with respect to the need to set common standards at European level to defend the right to privacy, the rights of authors as well as the right to be forgotten.

2. Digital identity

With regard to the issue of digital identity, the over 54s show a higher sensitivity than the average and assign an 8.8/10 to the importance of establishing a single system at European level of digital identity in order to access the services of the public administrations in all the countries of the Union.

With regard to the need to set up a single administrative system to simplify the movement of goods and people, the over 54s prove to be the most sensitive target and evaluate with an 8.7/10 the need to finalize this provision.

AREA	ATTRIBUTE	LEVEL OF INTEREST	
		<i>Average rates(1-10)</i>	
- D - Digitalization	1. Privacy and copyright	8,4	Above average
	2. Digital identity	8,4	
	3. Administrative single cross-border system	8,3	

Conclusions

Therefore, in conclusion, the data shows first and foremost a good level of interest and involvement with respect to the future of Europe, a subject that gets a fairly homogeneously attention among all the targets.

The data highlights the profile of Europe that Italians would like: a Europe that is above all socially concerned and that questions its own principles and the founding values of being together.

In fact, in imagining the areas in which to intervene more urgently, the participants in the consultation showed a strong sensitivity for the above factors as opposed to issues of a purely economic and/or technical nature.

It is also interesting to note that it was above all women and over 54s who carried the interest and expressed enthusiasm and participation with respect to the proposed themes. They are therefore the most “Europeanist” targets, while greater coldness was noted among men and middle age groups (25-54), who were the least inclined to express positive evaluations.



A AREA - FUNDAMENTAL ASPECTS

1a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE IMPORTANCE THAT EUROPE IS COMMITTED TO GUARANTEE:

	ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS		
	AVERAGE																				
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, OF CONSCIENCE, OF RELIGION																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	9,0	8,8	9,3	9,0	9,1	8,8	8,8	9,1	8,8	8,8	9,1	8,8	8,8	9,1	9,0	8,9	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,9	8,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,7	3,2	1,6	2,6	2,0	2,8	3,3	2,5	2,8	3,3	2,5	2,8	3,3	2,5	2,3	2,8	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,8	2,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	3,9	4,7	2,3	3,6	3,2	4,2	4,9	3,6	3,6	4,2	4,9	3,6	4,2	4,9	3,1	4,3	3,1	3,1	3,1	4,3	4,3
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	9,3	10,7	6,4	8,7	7,6	12,0	11,9	6,6	7,6	12,0	11,9	6,6	7,6	12,0	8,5	9,6	8,5	8,5	8,5	9,6	9,6
TOTAL	100,0	81,4	89,7	85,1	87,2	81,0	79,9	87,3	81,0	87,2	81,0	79,9	87,3	81,0	86,1	83,3	86,1	86,1	86,1	83,3	83,3
FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION, MEETING AND ASSOCIATION																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,8	8,7	9,0	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,8	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,0	2,4	1,3	1,8	1,7	2,2	2,2	2,6	2,2	2,2	2,6	2,2	2,2	2,6	1,8	2,1	1,8	1,8	1,8	2,1	2,1
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	4,4	4,8	3,5	4,8	3,9	3,6	3,6	3,4	3,6	3,6	3,4	3,6	3,6	3,4	4,0	4,5	4,0	4,0	4,0	4,5	4,5
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	11,3	12,8	8,5	11,2	10,1	12,3	13,9	8,4	10,1	12,3	13,9	8,4	10,1	12,3	10,3	11,8	10,3	10,3	10,3	11,8	11,8
TOTAL	100,0	80,0	86,7	82,2	84,3	81,9	78,8	85,6	84,3	84,3	81,9	78,8	85,6	83,9	83,9	81,6	83,9	83,9	83,9	81,6	81,6
RIGHT TO FREEDOM AND SECURITY OF CITIZENS																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	9,4	9,3	9,5	9,4	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,4	9,3	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	1,6	1,8	1,0	1,7	1,4	1,3	1,5	1,6	1,4	1,3	1,5	1,6	1,5	1,6	1,6	1,5	1,6	1,6	1,6	1,5	1,5
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	4,5	5,0	3,6	4,4	3,7	5,8	5,3	3,9	4,4	3,7	5,8	5,3	3,9	4,2	4,2	4,7	4,2	4,2	4,2	4,7	4,7
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	92,0	91,2	93,7	91,8	92,4	91,9	91,3	93,1	92,4	91,9	91,3	93,1	92,2	92,2	92,2	91,9	92,2	92,2	92,2	91,9	91,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
RIGHT TO RESPECT PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	1,5	1,7	1,0	1,4	1,3	1,0	1,5	1,8	1,4	1,3	1,0	1,5	1,8	1,8	1,2	1,6	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,6	1,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	2,3	2,2	2,4	2,3	2,9	1,7	2,4	1,6	2,3	2,9	1,7	2,4	1,6	1,6	2,3	2,2	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,2	2,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	91,1	90,7	92,3	91,6	90,9	90,9	90,0	92,8	90,9	90,9	90,0	90,0	92,8	92,8	92,2	90,8	92,2	92,2	92,2	90,8	90,8
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,9	8,7	9,3	8,8	9,0	8,7	8,8	9,0	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,8	9,0	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	4,6	5,3	3,2	5,0	4,5	4,5	4,8	4,0	4,5	4,5	4,8	4,0	4,0	4,8	4,8	4,6	4,8	4,8	4,8	4,6	4,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	8,2	9,5	5,7	7,2	6,1	12,3	10,7	6,5	6,1	12,3	10,7	6,5	6,5	6,6	6,6	8,9	6,6	6,6	6,6	8,9	8,9
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	83,2	80,2	89,0	83,0	85,7	79,4	80,8	85,7	85,7	79,4	80,8	85,7	84,2	84,2	84,2	82,6	84,2	84,2	84,2	82,6	82,6
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



1b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE IMPORTANCE THAT EUROPE IS COMMITTED TO GUARANTEE:

		ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION					SELF-EMPLOYED EMPLOYEES /NON-EMPLOYED					RETIRED HOUSEWIVES STUDENTS					NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, OF CONSCIENCE, OF RELIGION																					
AVERAGE		9,0	8,8	9,3	8,7	8,8	8,8	8,8	9,1	9,1	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,7	9,0	8,8	8,8	9,1	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		2,7	3,3	1,7	6,6	7,5	7,1	2,1	2,0	2,6	2,4	3,5	4,0	4,0	4,0	4,1	3,5	4,0	4,0	4,0	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		3,9	4,8	2,3	3,9	4,1	3,6	3,4	3,3	4,0	3,7	5,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		9,3	11,3	6,0	9,2	4,8	7,1	8,2	8,5	11,0	9,6	8,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	6,8	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		84,1	80,6	90,0	80,3	83,6	82,2	86,3	86,2	82,4	84,3	82,5	87,0	87,0	87,0	87,0	87,0	87,0	87,0	87,0	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION, MEETING AND ASSOCIATION																					
AVERAGE		8,8	8,7	9,2	8,6	8,7	8,4	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,7	8,9	8,7	8,9	8,7	8,9	8,9	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		2,0	2,5	1,0	6,6	5,4	7,1	1,6	1,3	1,9	2,0	2,9	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		4,4	4,9	2,6	3,9	4,1	7,1	4,3	3,8	3,8	4,0	5,9	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		11,3	13,3	7,1	7,9	9,5	7,1	10,5	10,5	13,3	10,2	11,9	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,4	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		82,3	79,3	89,3	81,6	81,0	78,7	83,6	84,4	81,0	83,8	79,3	83,8	83,8	83,8	83,8	83,8	83,8	83,8	83,8	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
RIGHT TO FREEDOM AND SECURITY OF CITIZENS																					
AVERAGE		9,4	9,4	9,4	9,3	9,1	9,3	9,4	9,5	9,4	9,4	9,2	9,4	9,4	9,4	9,2	9,4	9,2	9,4	9,4	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		1,6	1,7	1,4	3,9	6,1	6,1	1,3	1,1	1,3	1,7	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,2	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		1,9	1,7	1,2	1,3	2,7	7,1	2,2	1,5	1,6	1,3	3,5	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		4,5	5,1	4,9	1,3	2,0	3,6	4,1	4,5	4,7	4,0	5,1	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		92,0	91,5	92,5	93,5	89,2	89,3	92,4	92,9	92,4	93,0	89,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	93,2	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
RIGHT TO RESPECT PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE																					
AVERAGE		9,3	9,3	9,3	9,0	8,9	9,5	9,3	9,4	9,3	9,3	9,1	9,4	9,4	9,3	9,1	9,4	9,1	9,4	9,4	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		1,5	1,6	1,1	5,3	5,4	5,4	1,2	1,0	1,2	1,5	2,2	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,8	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		2,3	2,1	2,6	2,6	3,4	7,1	2,3	1,9	1,8	1,9	3,5	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		5,1	5,2	6,3	7,9	5,4	3,6	4,6	4,4	5,5	5,3	5,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,6	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		91,1	91,1	90,0	84,2	85,8	89,3	91,9	92,7	91,5	91,3	88,7	92,6	92,6	92,6	92,6	92,6	92,6	92,6	92,6	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION																					
AVERAGE		8,9	8,7	9,3	8,6	8,7	8,0	8,9	8,9	8,7	9,0	8,8	9,2	9,2	9,2	9,2	9,2	9,2	9,2	9,2	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		4,0	4,2	2,0	7,9	7,5	17,9	4,0	3,5	4,7	3,9	4,3	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		4,6	5,0	2,9	7,9	5,4	3,6	4,6	4,0	5,1	4,1	5,8	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		8,2	10,5	5,4	2,6	4,1	7,1	6,8	8,2	10,2	7,0	8,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		83,2	80,3	89,7	81,6	83,0	71,4	84,6	84,3	80,0	85,0	81,9	89,0	89,0	89,0	89,0	89,0	89,0	89,0	89,0	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

2a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE USEFULNESS THAT EUROPE SHOULD FAVOR:

	ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS		
	ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS										
THE STRENGTHENING OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,4	7,2	7,8	7,6	6,9	7,8	6,9	7,8	7,6	7,6	7,3	7,6	7,6	7,3	7,6	7,6	7,3	7,6	7,6	7,3	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	9,4	11,8	4,6	5,4	6,6	12,3	14,7	9,8	10,4	6,6	12,3	14,7	9,8	10,4	6,6	12,3	14,7	9,8	10,4	11,0	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	11,5	12,6	9,5	10,2	10,2	15,2	14,3	9,0	10,4	10,2	15,2	14,3	9,0	10,4	10,2	15,2	14,3	9,0	10,4	12,0	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	21,0	20,5	22,0	23,8	21,3	23,9	20,7	15,3	23,8	21,3	23,9	20,7	15,3	23,8	21,3	23,9	20,7	15,3	23,8	20,2	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	58,1	55,1	63,9	60,4	61,9	48,6	50,3	65,9	60,4	61,9	48,6	50,3	65,9	60,4	61,9	48,6	50,3	65,9	60,9	56,8	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
THE STRENGTHENING OF TRANSVERSAL POLITICAL GROUPS COMPARED TO THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	6,6	6,3	7,1	7,1	6,9	6,4	6,0	6,3	7,0	6,3	6,4	6,0	6,3	7,0	6,3	6,4	6,0	6,3	7,0	6,4	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	14,6	17,9	7,9	8,9	10,6	14,6	20,6	13,3	13,9	14,4	21,4	17,5	15,1	15,1	14,4	21,4	17,5	15,1	15,1	18,2	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	25,4	24,9	26,5	26,2	26,9	26,4	23,5	26,5	26,2	26,9	26,4	23,5	26,5	26,2	26,9	26,4	23,5	26,5	26,2	24,9	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	42,8	39,0	50,2	51,0	48,1	37,6	33,3	39,7	48,1	48,1	37,6	33,3	39,7	48,1	48,1	37,6	33,3	39,7	48,1	39,9	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
THE SET-UP OF TRANSNATIONAL POLITICAL LISTS																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	6,6	6,4	7,1	7,0	6,9	6,4	6,2	6,6	6,9	6,4	6,2	6,6	6,9	6,4	6,9	6,4	6,2	6,6	6,9	6,5	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	14,4	17,6	8,0	9,3	10,5	16,8	20,1	17,4	14,7	14,8	18,8	18,9	15,1	15,0	14,7	14,8	18,8	18,9	15,1	16,8	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	23,7	23,7	27,4	27,7	26,8	25,9	23,4	20,2	27,4	26,8	25,9	23,4	20,2	27,4	26,8	25,9	23,4	20,2	27,4	23,5	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	44,5	41,8	49,7	48,3	47,9	38,5	37,6	47,3	48,3	47,9	38,5	37,6	47,3	48,3	47,9	38,5	37,6	47,3	48,3	43,3	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

2b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE USEFULNESS THAT EUROPE SHOULD FAVOR:

	ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEHOLDS		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS	
	ITALIANS TAKING PART IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEHOLDS	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS										
THE STRENGTHENING OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT																						
AVERAGE																						
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,4	7,0	7,9	6,8	8,0	7,0	7,7	7,3	7,3	7,4	7,6	7,7	7,3	7,3	7,4	7,6	7,7	7,3	7,4	7,6	7,7	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	9,4	14,3	6,3	17,1	12,2	14,3	5,3	9,9	10,7	10,7	7,6	8,4	11,5	12,8	12,5	10,4	8,0	11,5	12,8	12,5	10,4	8,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	11,5	13,7	9,8	10,5	7,5	14,3	10,1	21,9	21,8	18,8	21,5	19,2	21,9	21,8	18,8	21,5	19,2	21,9	21,8	18,8	21,5	19,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	58,1	52,0	66,1	48,7	74,9	42,8	61,6	56,7	55,7	58,0	60,5	64,4	56,7	55,7	58,0	60,5	64,4	56,7	55,7	58,0	60,5	64,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
THE STRENGTHENING OF TRANSVERSAL POLITICAL GROUPS COMPARED TO THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN																						
AVERAGE																						
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	6,6	6,0	6,7	6,3	6,4	5,8	7,1	6,5	6,4	6,4	6,8	6,8	6,5	6,4	6,4	6,8	6,8	6,5	6,4	6,8	6,8	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	14,6	21,1	12,3	17,1	21,8	17,9	8,9	15,0	16,0	16,0	12,0	13,0	16,8	18,4	19,0	15,9	14,8	16,8	18,4	19,0	15,9	14,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	25,4	20,3	19,5	21,1	12,2	35,7	14,1	25,8	25,0	21,4	26,6	24,6	25,8	25,0	25,0	25,8	24,6	25,8	25,0	25,0	25,8	24,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	42,8	33,7	45,8	36,8	44,2	25,0	50,4	42,4	40,6	40,0	46,3	47,6	42,4	40,6	40,0	46,3	47,6	42,4	40,6	40,0	46,3	47,6
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
THE SET-UP OF TRANSNATIONAL POLITICAL LISTS																						
AVERAGE																						
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	6,6	6,2	7,0	6,2	6,9	6,2	7,0	6,6	6,5	6,6	6,8	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,6	6,8	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,6	6,8	6,7
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	14,4	20,3	11,3	19,7	22,4	14,3	9,3	14,2	16,8	14,2	12,7	13,6	15,9	15,9	17,6	16,3	14,6	14,2	16,8	14,2	12,7	13,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,2	18,2	16,7	19,7	7,5	32,1	14,5	25,7	23,5	24,9	27,4	24,4	25,7	23,5	24,9	27,4	24,4	25,7	23,5	24,9	27,4	24,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	44,5	38,5	49,6	40,9	54,5	28,6	48,7	44,2	43,8	43,3	46,3	44,4	44,2	43,8	43,3	46,3	44,4	44,2	43,8	43,3	46,3	44,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

B AREA - ECONOMIC POLICIES

3a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT INSIDE THE SINGLE MARKET EUROPE SHOULD:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
	AVERAGE	TOTAL									
SUPPORT INVESTMENT FOR THE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT NETWORKS (TEN)											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,1	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,1	8,3
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	2,8	3,3	1,7	2,7	2,7	2,0	2,0	3,0	2,9	2,6	2,8
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	6,0	6,1	5,7	6,7	5,0	5,8	6,5	4,9	4,9	5,8	6,0
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	20,4	20,0	21,1	20,7	20,7	24,5	20,8	20,8	17,0	21,0	20,1
TOTAL	70,8	70,6	71,5	69,9	71,6	67,7	69,7	75,2	75,2	70,6	71,1
SUPPORT INNOVATION INVESTMENTS											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,9	9,0	8,9	9,0	8,8	8,9
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	1,4	1,7	0,9	1,0	1,0	0,6	0,6	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,3
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	2,6	2,5	2,8	3,4	2,6	2,6	1,4	2,2	2,5	3,1	2,4
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	11,2	10,9	11,7	12,4	9,1	9,7	12,1	10,3	11,0	11,0	11,2
TOTAL	84,8	84,9	84,6	82,6	86,7	88,3	84,5	85,6	84,3	84,3	85,1
STRENGTHEN ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	2,2	2,2	1,5	2,2	3,5	8,7	8,7	8,8	8,9	8,5	8,8
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	3,5	3,5	3,4	4,8	1,9	1,4	2,2	1,8	2,3	2,1	1,9
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	12,5	12,6	12,4	14,4	10,3	14,6	13,5	9,3	9,3	13,1	12,3
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	82,0	81,7	82,7	78,6	84,5	81,5	81,8	85,8	80,5	80,5	82,7
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
ENSURE THE FULL COMPETITION AMONG THE OPERATORS OF ALL MEMBER STATES											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	7,8	7,9	7,8	7,4	7,7	7,8	8,1	8,3	8,3	7,4	8,0
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	6,0	6,6	4,9	6,9	5,5	6,8	5,6	5,2	5,2	6,9	5,6
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	9,5	9,0	10,4	12,0	9,9	8,8	8,5	6,4	6,4	11,6	8,5
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	20,3	19,5	22,0	25,1	22,4	21,4	16,8	14,8	24,4	24,4	18,5
TOTAL	64,2	64,9	62,7	56,0	62,2	63,0	69,1	73,6	57,1	67,4	67,4
FOLLOW THE MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF THE REGULATED PROFESSIONALITIES											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	2,4	2,7	1,8	3,2	1,8	1,4	2,1	2,4	2,4	2,8	2,2
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	5,2	5,2	5,2	7,7	5,8	3,8	3,5	3,4	3,4	7,2	4,3
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	16,2	16,0	16,5	22,4	18,2	15,9	12,5	9,1	9,1	21,0	14,1
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	76,1	76,1	76,5	66,7	74,2	78,9	81,9	85,1	85,1	69,0	79,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
GUARANTEE FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT TO PEOPLE FOR STUDYING, WORKING AND VOLUNTEERING											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	9,1	9,0	9,3	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,0	9,3	9,3	9,1	9,1
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	2,2	2,7	1,1	2,0	1,8	1,6	2,8	2,2	2,2	2,1	2,2
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	2,9	3,2	2,3	3,7	2,7	1,9	3,1	2,1	2,1	3,0	2,9
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	7,0	7,9	5,3	6,8	5,6	8,7	9,1	4,9	4,9	6,0	7,4
TOTAL	87,9	86,2	91,3	87,5	89,9	87,8	85,0	90,8	88,9	88,9	87,5
PURSUDE THE OBJECTIVE OF FULL EMPLOYMENT											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	9,0	9,0	9,0	8,6	9,0	9,1	9,2	9,4	9,4	8,7	9,1
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	2,2	2,4	1,7	3,4	2,2	1,3	1,6	1,6	1,6	2,9	1,8
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	3,2	3,0	3,7	5,4	3,1	2,0	2,3	1,3	1,3	4,7	2,5
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	9,0	9,2	8,5	13,2	7,9	9,3	8,0	4,0	4,0	11,4	7,9
TOTAL	85,6	85,4	86,1	78,0	86,8	87,4	88,4	93,1	93,1	81,0	87,8

3b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE PRINCIPLE THAT INSIDE THE SINGLE MARKET EUROPE SHOULD:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
SUPPORT INVESTMENT FOR THE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT NETWORKS (TEN)												
	8.2	8.3	8.3	7.6	8.2	8.1	8.2	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.1	8.2
AVERAGE	2.8	1.7	1.7	11.8	7.5	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6.0	5.9	7.9	5.4	10.7	5.9	5.9	5.3	5.3	7.1	6.6	5.6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	20.4	20.2	20.9	18.4	12.9	28.6	20.7	18.2	20.2	22.3	21.4	22.4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	70.8	70.7	71.5	61.9	74.2	60.7	71.1	74.4	71.7	67.8	68.5	69.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
SUPPORT INNOVATION INVESTMENTS												
	8.9	8.9	9.0	8.3	8.6	8.5	8.8	8.9	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.7
AVERAGE	1.4	0.9	0.9	9.2	6.8	4.3	4.3	1.3	1.3	0.8	2.1	2.0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2.6	1.6	3.9	2.7	7.1	2.9	2.9	2.0	2.6	2.4	3.5	2.8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	11.2	10.9	11.7	5.3	8.8	21.4	11.4	10.1	11.1	11.9	11.5	13.2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	84.8	85.2	85.8	81.6	81.7	71.5	84.4	86.6	85.0	84.9	82.9	82.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
STRENGTHEN ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT												
	8.7	8.9	8.3	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.8	8.7	8.8	8.6	8.6
AVERAGE	2.0	1.4	7.9	7.5	3.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.4	2.7	3.2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3.0	2.1	5.3	3.4	7.1	4.0	4.0	2.5	3.4	3.4	4.7	3.4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	12.5	11.4	9.2	10.9	10.7	12.9	12.9	11.4	13.9	12.0	12.7	14.4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82.0	85.1	77.6	78.2	78.6	81.3	81.3	84.3	81.0	83.2	79.9	79.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ENSURE THE FULL COMPETITION AMONG THE OPERATORS OF ALL MEMBER STATES												
	7.8	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.5	7.5	8.0	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.7
AVERAGE	5.6	5.4	9.2	11.6	10.7	6.2	6.2	4.7	6.0	7.3	6.3	7.0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	9.5	8.0	7.6	7.9	7.5	14.3	11.2	8.4	8.5	10.1	11.2	9.4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	20.3	17.0	17.8	17.1	12.9	14.3	24.1	19.9	20.1	19.1	21.2	24.0
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	64.2	69.4	69.2	65.8	68.0	60.7	58.5	67.0	65.4	63.5	61.3	59.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
FOLLOW THE MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF THE REGULATED PROFESSIONALITIES												
	8.5	8.7	7.8	7.8	8.4	7.8	8.2	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.2	8.4
AVERAGE	2.4	2.3	1.2	10.5	6.1	2.4	2.4	1.8	2.1	2.4	3.2	3.2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5.2	3.5	4.2	5.3	4.8	7.1	6.9	4.5	4.4	5.1	7.0	4.4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16.2	11.4	15.2	15.8	8.8	28.6	20.8	14.0	14.7	16.2	20.2	16.4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	76.2	82.8	79.4	68.4	80.3	57.2	69.9	79.7	78.8	76.3	69.6	76.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
GUARANTEE FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT TO PEOPLE FOR STUDYING, WORKING AND VOLUNTEERING												
	9.1	9.0	9.4	8.4	8.9	9.1	9.2	9.2	9.0	9.1	9.0	9.3
AVERAGE	2.2	2.7	1.4	10.5	4.8	3.6	3.6	1.8	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2.9	3.1	0.9	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.1	2.5	3.2	2.8	3.5	2.2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	7.0	8.4	6.3	2.6	6.1	3.6	6.0	6.6	7.4	7.4	7.6	4.2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	87.9	85.8	91.4	83.0	85.0	89.2	89.3	89.1	87.0	87.4	86.6	91.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
PURSUDE THE OBJECTIVE OF FULL EMPLOYMENT												
	9.0	9.2	9.4	8.5	9.0	9.0	8.7	9.1	9.0	9.1	8.8	8.9
AVERAGE	2.2	1.6	0.9	9.2	4.8	3.6	2.7	1.5	1.7	2.0	3.0	4.4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3.2	2.2	1.4	3.9	4.8	7.1	4.4	2.5	3.1	2.9	4.6	2.2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	9.0	7.5	4.7	3.9	5.4	3.6	11.3	7.6	9.8	7.6	11.0	9.2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	85.6	88.7	93.0	83.0	85.0	85.7	81.6	88.4	85.4	87.5	81.4	84.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0



4a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE NEED THAT EUROPE, IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN THE MONETARY UNION, SHOULD SUSTAIN:

		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	
SINGLE MONITORING TOOLS ON BANKS																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,2	6,4	3,4	8,1	4,7	6,2	4,9	8,4	8,7	7,9	5,5	5,4	8,3							
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,4	6,6	6,5	6,7	7,1	8,6	7,7	5,9	4,3	7,7	5,5	6,1	6,1	5,4							
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,5	14,2	18,2	18,2	18,8	19,5	19,3	12,9	8,2	19,5	19,5	13,8	13,8								
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	72,5	72,9	71,7	71,7	69,4	65,7	68,1	75,6	81,6	81,6	67,3	74,7	74,7								
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0							
A COMMON INSURANCE ON DEPOSITS																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,0	8,1	7,9	7,9	7,9	7,7	7,7	7,7	8,2	8,6	7,8	5,3	8,1								
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,5	6,1	4,3	4,3	4,7	5,8	6,8	5,9	5,4	5,4	5,3	5,6	5,6								
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	8,0	7,5	8,9	8,9	8,3	10,7	10,6	7,8	3,8	7,7	8,7	7,7	7,7								
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	18,3	16,9	21,2	21,2	22,0	21,9	21,9	16,0	10,5	10,5	22,2	22,2	16,7								
TOTAL	68,2	69,5	65,6	65,6	65,0	61,6	60,7	70,3	80,3	80,3	63,8	63,8	70,0								
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0							

4b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT ON THE NEED THAT EUROPE, IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN THE MONETARY UNION, SHOULD SUSTAIN:

		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		EMPLOYERS		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEWIVES		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS		
SINGLE MONITORING TOOLS ON BANKS																										
AVERAGE																										
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,4	8,5	7,8	8,2	7,6	8,0	8,3	8,3	8,3	7,4	7,8	8,1	8,4	8,7	7,9	8,2	8,1	8,1	7,9	7,9	7,9	8,2	8,1	8,1	8,1
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,4	5,8	4,1	9,2	9,5	10,7	5,1	4,7	4,5	4,5	7,6	5,3	5,6	6,4												
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	6,6	5,7	5,4	10,5	8,8	7,1	7,5	6,2	7,1	7,1	6,6	6,6	6,4	6,4												
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	15,5	12,5	12,9	14,5	6,1	21,4	19,0	15,7	15,5	13,5	16,4	17,8	17,8													
TOTAL	72,5	76,0	77,6	65,8	75,6	60,8	68,4	73,4	72,9	72,2	71,7	70,2	70,2													
A COMMON INSURANCE ON DEPOSITS																										
AVERAGE																										
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,0	8,3	8,1	7,7	8,3	7,4	7,8	8,1	8,1	8,1	7,9	7,9	8,0													
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,5	6,6	5,0	9,2	6,1	10,7	5,1	5,0	5,1	5,1	6,9	5,4	5,6													
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	8,0	6,6	8,2	8,2	8,2	10,7	9,2	7,7	7,8	7,8	8,3	8,4	7,6													
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	18,3	14,2	19,9	18,4	10,9	21,4	22,0	19,0	16,0	10,5	17,4	20,3	19,8													
TOTAL	68,2	73,3	66,9	63,2	74,8	57,2	63,7	68,3	71,1	67,4	65,9	67,0	67,0													
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0												

5a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO ORGANIZE THE COMMON DEFENSE OF EUROPE, IT IS USEFUL FOR THE FUTURE OF THE UNION:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS		
TO PLAN THE COMMON MILITARY CAPABILITIES																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,8	7,7	7,8	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,2	7,7	7,7	8,2	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,8	7,8	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	7,2	5,2	8,2	5,2	6,4	6,4	6,4	6,4	10,3	8,5	5,9	7,3	8,2	6,1	6,1	6,1	6,1	6,1	7,6	7,6	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	9,1	9,5	9,0	9,5	8,8	9,1	11,7	10,0	7,3	8,9	8,9	7,3	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,9	9,2	9,2	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	19,9	23,0	18,3	23,0	21,5	21,9	26,2	18,7	14,0	22,2	22,2	18,9	22,2	22,2	22,2	22,2	22,2	22,2	18,9	18,9	
	63,8	62,3	64,5	62,3	63,3	62,6	51,8	72,8	62,8	62,8	62,8	64,3	62,8	62,8	62,8	62,8	62,8	62,8	64,3	64,3	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
TO ADOPT SHARED DEFENSE POLICIES																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,3	8,1	8,3	8,1	8,0	7,8	8,3	8,6	8,0	8,6	8,3	8,6	8,0	8,0	8,0	8,0	8,0	8,3	8,3	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,4	4,1	6,0	4,1	4,8	6,0	7,7	5,7	4,2	5,5	5,5	5,3	4,2	5,5	5,5	5,5	5,5	5,5	5,3	5,3	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	6,4	6,0	7,3	6,0	7,3	6,4	7,0	6,7	4,3	6,9	6,9	6,2	4,3	6,9	6,9	6,9	6,9	6,9	6,2	6,2	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	15,7	16,0	17,8	16,0	17,8	17,0	21,4	13,9	10,9	17,5	17,5	14,9	10,9	17,5	17,5	17,5	17,5	17,5	14,9	14,9	
	72,5	73,9	71,8	73,9	70,1	70,6	63,9	73,7	80,6	70,1	70,1	73,6	80,6	70,1	70,1	70,1	70,1	70,1	73,6	73,6	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

5b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO ORGANIZE THE COMMON DEFENSE OF EUROPE, IT IS USEFUL FOR THE FUTURE OF THE UNION:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		EMPLOYEES		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEWIVES		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS	
TO PLAN THE COMMON MILITARY CAPABILITIES																								
AVERAGE																								
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,8	7,8	7,8	7,8	7,9	7,3	7,7	7,7	7,9	7,9	7,3	7,7	7,7	7,7	7,8	7,8	7,7	7,7	7,6	7,6	7,9	7,9	7,8	7,8
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	7,2	7,2	8,2	6,5	6,6	11,6	14,3	6,2	6,7	6,7	14,3	6,2	6,2	6,9	6,9	6,7	6,7	6,7	9,6	9,6	6,0	6,0	7,2	7,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,6	8,8	14,3	9,0	9,0	8,8	8,8	14,3	9,0	9,0	9,4	9,4	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,3	9,3	9,3	9,3	6,6	6,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	19,9	18,5	18,5	18,4	18,4	6,1	10,7	21,9	20,2	21,9	10,7	21,9	21,9	20,2	21,9	21,9	19,1	19,1	17,9	17,9	19,1	19,1	19,6	19,6
	63,8	64,2	64,2	65,5	61,8	73,5	60,7	62,9	73,5	73,5	60,7	62,9	62,9	63,5	63,5	62,3	62,3	63,2	63,2	63,2	65,6	65,6	66,6	66,6
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO ADOPT SHARED DEFENSE POLICIES																								
AVERAGE																								
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,2	8,3	8,5	7,9	8,2	8,1	8,1	8,2	8,2	7,8	8,1	8,1	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,2	8,1	8,1	8,3	8,3
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,4	5,4	5,6	4,9	7,9	8,8	7,1	5,1	8,8	8,8	7,1	5,1	5,1	5,5	5,5	4,7	4,7	4,7	6,8	6,8	5,0	5,0	4,2	4,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,7	14,3	14,3	12,9	19,7	10,9	21,4	17,5	10,9	10,9	21,4	17,5	17,5	14,5	14,5	17,4	17,4	17,4	14,2	14,2	16,6	16,6	16,6	16,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	72,5	73,8	73,8	77,0	65,8	74,9	60,8	70,6	74,9	74,9	60,8	70,6	70,6	73,8	73,8	72,0	72,0	72,2	72,2	72,2	71,2	71,2	74,4	74,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



6a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, FOR THE TAX STABILITY OF EUROPE, IT IS USEFUL:

TO CONTRAST THE CROSS-BORDER TAX EVASION	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	
											A FULL FISCAL HARMONIZATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES
AVERAGE	8,3	8,4	8,2	7,7	8,1	8,4	8,7	9,0	7,8	8,5	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,5	4,9	3,7	5,4	5,3	4,1	3,8	3,5	5,7	4,0	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	6,1	7,6	9,8	7,5	5,7	4,7	3,5	8,7	5,7	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,0	14,4	19,3	23,9	18,3	16,8	11,3	7,3	22,4	13,3	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	72,9	74,6	69,4	60,9	68,9	73,4	80,2	85,7	63,2	77,0	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
A FULL FISCAL HARMONIZATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES											
AVERAGE	8,4	8,5	8,4	8,0	8,1	8,3	8,8	9,0	8,0	8,6	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,3	4,9	3,0	4,9	5,2	4,3	3,4	3,7	5,0	4,0	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,3	5,0	5,9	6,6	6,5	6,2	4,6	2,4	6,4	4,8	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	14,6	13,4	16,9	19,7	18,4	16,2	10,8	6,9	18,7	12,8	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	75,8	76,7	74,2	68,8	69,9	73,3	81,2	87,0	69,9	78,4	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

6b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, FOR THE TAX STABILITY OF EUROPE, IT IS USEFUL:

TO CONTRAST THE CROSS-BORDER TAX EVASION	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
AVERAGE	8,3	8,7	9,0	7,6	8,6	8,1	7,9	8,5	8,4	8,5	7,9	8,2
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,5	4,0	2,6	14,5	6,8	14,3	5,0	3,8	4,6	4,1	5,5	5,0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	4,8	3,8	7,9	5,4	8,8	8,8	5,3	6,3	6,9	8,6	5,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,0	11,5	8,1	11,8	6,8	10,7	22,1	14,4	14,7	13,0	21,1	19,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	72,9	79,7	85,5	65,8	81,0	75,0	64,1	76,5	74,4	76,0	64,8	70,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
A FULL FISCAL HARMONIZATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES												
AVERAGE	8,4	8,8	8,8	7,7	8,7	7,9	8,0	8,5	8,5	8,5	8,2	8,5
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,3	3,8	2,9	13,2	8,8	14,3	4,6	4,1	4,3	4,0	5,0	3,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,3	4,1	4,4	6,6	4,1	3,6	6,6	3,9	5,7	5,9	5,8	6,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	14,6	10,7	9,3	17,1	5,4	10,7	19,3	14,1	12,6	13,0	18,4	14,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	75,8	81,4	83,4	63,1	81,7	71,4	69,5	77,9	77,4	77,1	70,8	76,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

AREA C - SOCIAL POLICIES

7a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO SUPPORT THE WORK, IT IS USEFUL FOR EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
		MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES							
TO BALANCE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE WORKER AND THE EMPLOYER												
AVERAGE	8,8	8,6	9,0	8,9	8,9	8,6	8,9	8,6	8,6	8,8	8,9	8,7
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,4	2,9	1,5	2,6	2,6	2,0	2,2	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,3	4,0	2,1	2,9	2,9	2,5	4,2	3,7	2,6	3,7	2,6	3,7
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	11,5	12,9	8,8	9,6	8,9	15,4	15,4	10,1	9,4	9,4	12,5	12,5
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,8	80,2	87,6	84,9	85,6	80,1	78,2	83,7	85,5	85,5	81,4	81,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO CREATE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES OF ACCESS TO WORK AND SUPPORT FOR EMPLOYMENT												
AVERAGE	9,0	8,8	9,3	8,9	9,1	8,9	8,9	9,1	9,0	9,1	9,0	9,0
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,2	2,6	1,4	2,9	2,5	1,4	1,8	1,6	2,7	2,0	2,7	2,0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,7	3,4	1,3	2,5	2,6	2,3	3,3	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,7
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	8,9	10,3	6,1	8,9	6,3	12,9	10,7	6,9	7,7	9,4	7,7	9,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	86,2	83,7	91,2	85,7	88,6	83,4	84,2	89,0	86,9	86,9	85,9	85,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

7b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO SUPPORT THE WORK, IT IS USEFUL FOR EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
			EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYED									
TO BALANCE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE WORKER AND THE EMPLOYER													
AVERAGE	8,8	8,5	8,8	8,2	8,6	8,5	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,6	8,8	8,9	8,9
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,4	2,7	1,6	7,9	7,5	3,6	2,1	2,1	2,3	2,6	2,6	2,6	3,4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,3	3,6	4,2	3,9	4,8	10,7	2,9	3,0	3,8	3,8	3,2	3,2	2,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	11,5	13,8	11,7	13,2	6,1	14,3	9,6	11,4	13,8	11,6	10,4	10,4	7,8
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,8	79,9	82,5	75,0	81,6	71,4	85,4	83,5	80,1	82,0	83,8	86,4	86,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO CREATE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES OF ACCESS TO WORK AND SUPPORT FOR EMPLOYMENT													
AVERAGE	9,0	8,9	9,2	8,6	8,9	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	8,8	9,1	9,0	9,1
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,2	2,1	0,9	7,9	4,8	3,6	2,3	1,9	2,1	1,9	1,9	2,6	3,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,7	3,1	1,7	3,9	4,1	7,1	2,5	2,6	3,3	2,0	3,2	3,2	1,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	8,9	10,3	7,6	7,9	4,1	3,6	8,0	8,8	11,2	8,1	8,0	8,0	5,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	86,2	84,5	89,8	80,3	87,0	85,7	87,2	86,7	83,4	88,0	86,2	86,2	89,6
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



8a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES, EUROPE SHOULD:

INVEST TO REDUCE HEALTH INEQUALITIES		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	
INVEST TO REDUCE HEALTH INEQUALITIES																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	8,8	8,7	9,0	8,8	8,9	8,6	8,8	9,0	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	9,0	8,9	8,8	8,8	
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	2,4	2,8	1,6	2,7	1,6	2,2	2,5	2,0	2,2	2,5	2,2	2,5	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,0	2,6	2,6	2,6	2,6	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	10,6	11,5	8,8	10,6	8,8	11,2	11,0	11,7	9,5	11,7	7,9	9,5	11,1	11,0	11,0	9,5	7,9	9,5	11,1	11,1	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	83,6	82,0	86,9	83,6	86,9	79,1	82,9	82,1	85,1	79,1	82,1	82,1	82,1	82,1	82,1	87,4	87,4	84,7	83,2	83,2	
TOTAL																					
100,0																					
PROMOTE THE STATE OF HEALTH IN AN AGING EUROPE																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	8,6	8,5	8,7	8,4	8,5	8,3	8,4	8,5	8,5	8,3	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,7	9,0	8,5	8,5	8,6	8,6	
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	2,7	3,1	1,9	3,3	1,9	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,3	2,3	2,9	2,9	2,6	2,6	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	4,7	4,7	4,8	4,7	4,8	5,7	5,5	5,3	5,3	5,7	4,0	4,0	4,0	4,0	3,4	3,4	5,1	5,1	4,5	4,5	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	13,2	14,1	11,2	14,5	13,0	19,0	14,5	13,0	13,0	19,0	13,8	13,8	13,8	13,8	13,8	7,6	13,6	13,6	13,0	13,0	
TOTAL																					
79,4																					
100,0																					
ENSURE ESSENTIAL LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH PERFORMANCE																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	9,1	9,0	9,3	9,1	9,2	9,0	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	3,3	4,3	3,1	4,3	3,6	3,2	3,8	4,0	3,8	4,0	4,1	4,1	4,1	4,1	3,9	3,9	4,1	4,1	3,9	3,9	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	7,6	8,3	6,1	8,3	6,4	8,9	6,4	8,9	6,4	8,9	7,4	7,4	7,4	7,4	7,7	7,7	7,4	7,4	7,7	7,7	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	88,5	87,4	90,8	87,5	90,0	86,4	87,3	91,2	88,5	87,3	91,2	88,5	88,4	88,4	88,4	88,4	88,5	88,5	88,4	88,4	
TOTAL																					
100,0																					

8b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES, EUROPE SHOULD:

INVEST TO REDUCE HEALTH INEQUALITIES		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	
INVEST TO REDUCE HEALTH INEQUALITIES																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-5 (ln%)	8,8	8,7	9,0	8,8	8,9	8,6	8,8	9,0	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	9,0	8,9	8,8	8,8	8,8	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	5,8	6,5	4,3	6,1	5,6	5,7	6,2	4,7	5,8	5,8	5,7	6,2	4,7	5,8	5,8	5,7	5,8	5,8	5,7	5,7	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	10,6	11,5	8,8	11,0	9,3	15,2	11,7	7,9	9,5	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	11,1	
TOTAL																					
83,6																					
100,0																					
PROMOTE THE STATE OF HEALTH IN AN AGING EUROPE																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-5 (ln%)	8,6	8,5	8,7	8,4	8,5	8,3	8,7	9,0	8,5	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,7	9,0	8,5	8,5	8,6	8,6	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	7,4	7,8	6,7	8,8	7,8	8,2	6,4	5,7	6,4	5,7	7,6	7,6	7,6	7,6	7,6	7,6	8,0	8,0	7,1	7,1	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	79,4	78,1	82,1	76,7	79,2	72,8	79,8	86,7	78,4	79,8	86,7	78,4	79,9	78,4	79,9	78,4	78,4	78,4	79,9	79,9	
TOTAL																					
100,0																					
ENSURE ESSENTIAL LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH PERFORMANCE																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (ln%)	9,1	9,0	9,3	9,1	9,2	9,0	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,1	9,1	9,1	
VOTE 4-5 (ln%)	3,3	4,3	3,1	4,3	3,6	3,2	3,8	4,0	3,8	4,0	4,1	4,1	4,1	4,1	3,9	3,9	4,1	4,1	3,9	3,9	
VOTE 6-7 (ln%)	7,6	8,3	6,1	8,3	6,4	8,9	6,4	8,9	6,4	8,9	7,4	7,4	7,4	7,4	7,7	7,7	7,4	7,4	7,7	7,7	
VOTE 8-10 (ln%)	88,5	87,4	90,8	87,5	90,0	86,4	87,3	91,2	88,5	87,3	91,2	88,5	88,4	88,4	88,4	88,4	88,5	88,5	88,4	88,4	
TOTAL																					
100,0																					

9a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO SUPPORT EDUCATION AND TRAINING, EUROPE MUST ENSURE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	
	MALES	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS					
THE MOBILITY OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ON THE EUROPEAN TERRITORY																		
AVERAGE																		
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,5	8,6	8,5	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,2	8,4	8,9	8,8	8,6	8,9	8,8	8,6	8,8	8,6	8,6	8,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	4,2	3,5	4,2	2,1	2,8	2,7	3,9	4,7	3,4	2,7	3,8	3,4	2,7	3,8	2,7	3,8	3,8	3,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	5,3	4,4	5,3	2,7	3,6	3,6	7,1	5,8	3,4	3,6	4,8	3,4	3,4	4,8	3,4	4,8	4,8	4,8
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	14,2	12,4	14,2	8,9	11,1	10,6	18,8	15,5	9,0	11,1	13,0	9,0	11,1	13,0	11,1	13,0	13,0	13,0
TOTAL	76,3	79,7	76,3	86,3	82,5	83,1	70,2	74,0	84,2	82,8	78,4	84,2	82,8	78,4	82,8	78,4	78,4	78,4
PERMANENT TRAINING, EVEN FOR THE REINTEGRATION IN THE LABOR MARKET																		
AVERAGE																		
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,5	8,6	8,5	8,8	8,5	8,7	8,5	8,6	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,4	2,8	3,4	1,7	2,4	2,0	2,3	3,3	3,9	2,3	3,0	3,9	2,3	3,0	2,3	3,0	3,0	3,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	5,2	4,5	5,2	3,2	4,9	3,9	5,8	4,7	3,6	4,2	4,7	3,6	4,2	4,7	4,2	4,7	4,7	4,7
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	14,5	13,4	14,5	11,1	14,0	12,9	17,8	13,9	10,4	13,2	13,5	10,4	13,2	13,5	13,2	13,5	13,5	13,5
TOTAL	76,9	79,3	76,9	84,0	78,7	81,2	74,1	78,1	82,1	80,3	78,8	82,1	80,3	78,8	80,3	78,8	78,8	78,8
TOTAL																		
100,0																		

9b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO SUPPORT EDUCATION AND TRAINING, EUROPE MUST ENSURE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEWIVES		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS	
	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS					
THE MOBILITY OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ON THE EUROPEAN TERRITORY																						
AVERAGE																						
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,6	8,4	9,0	7,8	8,6	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,5	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,7	8,5	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,5	4,7	2,7	11,8	6,1	7,1	2,3	3,2	3,5	3,9	3,3	4,2	3,2	3,5	3,9	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	4,4	5,6	3,3	7,9	5,4	7,1	3,5	3,7	4,7	5,0	4,4	5,0	3,7	4,7	5,0	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4	4,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	12,4	14,9	8,8	13,2	8,8	3,6	11,0	12,0	14,1	11,4	12,6	10,8	12,0	14,1	11,4	12,6	10,8	12,6	10,8	10,8	10,8	10,8
TOTAL	79,7	74,8	85,2	67,1	79,7	82,2	83,2	81,1	77,7	79,7	79,7	80,0	81,1	77,7	79,7	79,7	79,7	79,7	79,7	79,7	79,7	79,7
TOTAL																						
100,0																						
PERMANENT TRAINING, EVEN FOR THE REINTEGRATION IN THE LABOR MARKET																						
AVERAGE																						
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,6	8,5	9,1	8,0	8,6	8,4	8,6	8,6	8,4	8,4	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,4	8,7	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6	8,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,8	3,9	1,2	10,5	4,8	7,1	1,9	2,7	3,1	2,7	2,5	4,0	2,7	3,1	2,7	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,5
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	4,5	5,0	2,5	5,3	4,1	3,6	4,4	3,8	5,3	4,0	5,3	3,4	3,8	5,3	4,0	5,3	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	13,4	14,3	9,5	11,8	10,2	10,7	13,5	13,5	15,4	11,6	13,5	10,6	13,5	15,4	11,6	13,5	10,6	13,5	10,6	10,6	10,6	10,6
TOTAL	79,3	76,8	86,8	72,4	80,9	78,6	80,2	80,0	76,2	81,7	78,7	82,0	80,0	76,2	81,7	78,7	82,0	81,7	78,7	78,7	78,7	78,7
TOTAL																						
100,0																						



10a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, ABOUT SOCIAL ASSISTANCE, IT IS APPROPRIATE THAT EUROPE SUPPORTS:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
A SUSTAINABLE SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEM WITH QUALITY SOCIAL SERVICES										
AVERAGE	8,5	8,3	8,8	8,5	8,6	8,1	8,4	8,8	8,5	8,5
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,5	3,1	1,3	2,3	2,0	2,8	2,8	2,7	2,5	2,5
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	4,5	5,2	3,3	3,8	4,0	6,4	5,7	4,0	3,8	4,9
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,0	17,8	12,6	16,4	14,8	23,5	17,3	11,6	15,9	16,1
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	77,0	73,9	82,8	77,5	79,2	67,3	74,2	81,7	77,8	76,5
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
THE HARMONIZATION OF THE SOCIAL SYSTEMS OF THE UNION STATES										
AVERAGE	8,1	8,0	8,4	8,1	8,1	7,8	8,1	8,6	8,1	8,2
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,8	4,5	2,2	3,5	3,3	5,1	4,0	3,7	3,5	3,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	7,3	5,4	6,0	6,8	8,7	7,8	4,8	6,2	6,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	19,0	19,8	17,5	20,5	18,9	25,2	19,7	13,0	20,2	18,5
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	70,6	68,4	74,9	70,0	71,0	61,0	68,5	78,5	70,1	70,8
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
A COMMON INSURANCE SYSTEM AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT										
AVERAGE	8,3	8,2	8,6	8,6	8,4	7,7	8,1	8,4	8,5	8,2
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,5	5,5	2,4	3,5	4,2	6,2	5,3	4,6	3,6	4,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	7,2	5,6	5,0	5,6	12,0	7,7	6,6	5,1	7,3
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,0	15,9	13,1	12,1	13,2	20,7	18,5	13,8	11,9	16,3
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,9	71,4	78,9	79,4	77,0	61,1	68,5	75,0	79,4	71,5
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

10b.LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, ABOUT SOCIAL ASSISTANCE, IT IS APPROPRIATE THAT EUROPE SUPPORTS:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
A SUSTAINABLE SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEM WITH QUALITY SOCIAL SERVICES												
AVERAGE	8,5	8,4	9,0	7,8	8,5	8,4	8,5	8,5	8,3	8,6	8,5	8,6
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,5	3,2	0,7	13,2	6,1	7,1	1,8	2,3	2,5	2,2	2,7	3,4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	4,5	5,7	2,9	6,6	4,1	7,1	3,8	4,5	5,3	4,9	3,9	3,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,0	17,9	11,4	10,5	8,8	14,3	15,6	15,6	17,9	13,7	17,3	13,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	77,0	73,2	85,0	69,7	81,0	71,5	78,8	77,6	74,3	79,2	76,1	80,2
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
THE HARMONIZATION OF THE SOCIAL SYSTEMS OF THE UNION STATES												
AVERAGE	8,1	8,1	8,5	7,6	8,3	7,8	8,1	8,1	8,0	8,2	8,2	8,4
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,8	4,6	2,0	9,2	6,8	10,7	3,1	3,7	3,8	3,9	3,8	3,4
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	7,4	5,5	13,2	4,1	7,1	6,1	7,1	7,4	6,6	6,0	4,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	19,0	19,3	15,6	15,8	13,6	14,3	19,8	18,2	21,6	17,9	19,4	15,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	70,6	68,7	76,9	61,8	75,5	67,9	71,0	71,0	67,2	71,6	70,8	77,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
A COMMON INSURANCE SYSTEM AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT												
AVERAGE	8,3	8,0	8,5	7,9	8,3	7,9	8,5	8,2	8,1	8,4	8,6	8,6
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,5	6,0	2,3	11,8	6,1	7,1	3,3	4,6	5,2	4,4	3,7	4,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	6,6	8,3	5,9	5,3	6,8	10,7	5,2	6,6	8,7	6,9	5,1	4,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,0	17,8	16,5	14,5	12,2	17,9	12,2	17,1	16,8	14,1	12,2	10,8
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,9	67,9	75,3	68,4	74,9	64,3	79,3	71,7	69,3	74,6	79,0	80,6
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



11a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, AS REGARDS IMMIGRATION AND ASYLUM RIGHT, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
TO GUARANTEE THE FREE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE IN THE INTERNAL BORDERS TO THE UNION											
AVERAGE	7,1	7,1	7,1	7,9	7,5	7,7	7,5	7,7	8,4	7,5	7,8
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	10,8	12,1	8,2	11,5	11,4	12,8	11,4	7,3	10,7	11,0	10,7
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	8,7	8,6	8,9	9,9	8,6	9,4	9,1	5,7	5,7	10,1	8,1
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,7	15,3	16,4	19,4	15,1	16,2	15,5	9,8	9,8	18,5	14,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	64,8	64,0	66,5	59,2	64,9	61,6	64,0	77,2	77,2	60,4	66,8
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO GUARANTEE AN EFFECTIVE CONTROL IN THE CROSSING OF THE EXTERNAL BORDERS											
AVERAGE	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,3	8,6	8,3	8,7	8,9	9,0	8,7	8,9
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,5	3,6	3,1	4,2	3,6	2,9	2,8	3,3	3,3	3,9	3,3
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,7	3,6	3,8	4,0	3,3	3,9	3,3	3,9	3,6	3,8	3,6
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,2	10,4	9,8	12,2	9,5	11,7	10,0	7,4	7,4	11,3	9,8
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,6	82,4	83,3	79,6	83,6	81,5	83,9	85,4	85,4	81,0	83,3
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO PERFECT AN INTEGRATED EXTERNAL BORDER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM											
AVERAGE	8,7	8,7	8,7	8,4	8,6	8,7	9,0	9,0	9,0	8,4	8,9
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,6	3,9	3,0	4,8	3,2	2,9	2,9	3,4	3,4	4,6	3,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,4	3,3	3,7	4,3	3,9	4,2	2,6	2,4	2,4	4,1	3,1
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,9	10,6	11,5	14,5	12,3	11,7	8,6	6,5	6,5	13,9	9,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,1	82,2	81,8	76,4	80,6	81,2	85,9	87,7	87,7	77,4	84,1
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO ADOPT SHARED ASYLUM POLICIES											
AVERAGE	8,3	8,2	8,4	7,8	8,0	8,3	8,5	8,8	8,8	7,8	8,4
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,6	8,8	5,1	8,5	8,6	7,8	6,9	5,7	5,7	9,2	6,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,7	5,9	5,2	6,8	6,5	5,4	5,3	3,8	3,8	6,6	5,3
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	12,8	12,4	13,5	18,4	14,4	11,6	10,0	6,2	6,2	17,0	10,9
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,9	72,9	76,2	66,3	70,5	75,2	77,8	84,3	84,3	67,2	76,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

11b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, AS REGARDS IMMIGRATION AND ASYLUM RIGHT, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
TO GUARANTEE THE FREE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE IN INTERNAL BORDERS TO THE UNION												
	7,7	7,8	8,5	7,8	8,1	7,8	7,6	7,7	7,6	7,9	7,7	7,9
AVERAGE												
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	10,8	11,6	6,4	14,5	10,9	10,7	10,9	10,9	12,3	10,5	10,1	8,8
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	8,7	5,0	6,6	10,7	9,4	8,3	9,4	8,3	9,3	8,3	9,3	6,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,7	14,5	12,3	10,5	7,5	7,1	17,7	15,8	15,2	13,9	16,8	18,0
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	64,8	65,2	76,3	68,4	74,8	71,5	62,0	65,0	63,2	67,3	63,8	66,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO GUARANTEE AN EFFECTIVE CONTROL IN THE CROSSING OF THE EXTERNAL BORDERS												
	8,8	8,9	8,8	8,1	8,5	7,9	8,7	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,6	8,7
AVERAGE												
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,5	2,9	3,6	9,2	6,8	10,7	3,6	2,5	3,5	4,4	3,8	3,8
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,7	3,4	4,2	3,9	5,4	7,1	3,7	2,8	4,3	3,9	4,0	3,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,2	9,2	10,6	18,4	7,5	17,9	11,0	8,5	10,2	9,6	12,6	11,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,6	84,5	81,6	68,5	80,3	64,3	81,7	86,2	82,0	82,1	79,6	81,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO PERFECT AN INTEGRATED EXTERNAL BORDER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM												
	8,7	8,9	9,1	8,1	8,5	8,1	8,5	8,9	8,7	8,9	8,5	8,6
AVERAGE												
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	3,6	3,3	2,0	11,8	6,8	7,1	3,9	2,9	4,3	3,8	3,6	4,0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,4	2,8	3,2	2,6	4,8	7,1	4,0	2,9	3,3	3,0	4,7	2,8
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,9	8,4	7,9	9,2	9,5	14,3	13,8	9,1	10,2	9,1	14,7	13,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	82,1	85,5	86,9	76,4	78,9	71,5	78,3	85,1	82,2	84,1	77,0	80,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO ADOPT SHARED ASYLUM POLICIES												
	8,3	8,4	9,3	7,8	8,6	7,7	8,0	8,3	8,1	8,5	8,0	8,4
AVERAGE												
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	7,6	7,6	2,9	17,1	8,8	14,3	8,1	7,8	8,6	6,7	7,5	5,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,7	5,7	2,7	5,3	2,0	3,6	6,4	5,2	6,3	5,2	6,5	4,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	12,8	10,2	5,3	6,6	5,4	14,3	16,8	11,6	11,8	10,6	16,2	15,6
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,9	76,5	89,1	71,0	83,8	67,8	68,7	75,4	73,3	77,5	69,8	74,8
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



12a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF YOUTH POLICIES, IT IS USEFUL FOR EUROPE:

		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
TO DEVELOP ACTIVE YOUTH CITIZENSHIP											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,1	8,5	8,3	8,2	7,9	8,1	8,5	8,3	8,2	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,1	6,1	3,2	3,9	5,7	6,2	5,9	5,1	4,1	5,6	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	6,2	6,8	5,0	5,5	5,7	8,0	7,6	4,9	5,7	6,4	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	16,5	17,7	14,1	16,7	16,2	22,2	17,7	12,1	16,4	16,6	
TOTAL	72,2	69,4	77,7	73,9	72,4	63,6	68,8	77,9	73,8	71,4	
TOTAL											
100,0											
TO CARRY OUT THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE EUROPEAN LABOR MARKET											
AVERAGE											
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,7	8,6	9,0	8,8	8,9	8,5	8,6	8,9	8,8	8,7	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,3	2,8	1,3	1,6	2,0	2,3	3,2	2,6	1,7	2,6	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	3,5	4,0	2,5	3,3	2,6	5,1	4,3	3,0	2,6	3,9	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	11,9	13,3	9,2	11,5	9,6	15,8	14,5	9,3	10,7	12,4	
TOTAL	82,3	79,9	87,0	83,6	85,8	76,8	78,0	85,1	85,0	81,1	
TOTAL											
100,0											

12b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF YOUTH POLICIES, IT IS USEFUL FOR EUROPE:

		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED	EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
TO DEVELOP ACTIVE YOUTH CITIZENSHIP													
AVERAGE													
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,2	8,1	8,6	7,9	8,5	7,5	8,3	8,2	8,0	8,2	8,4	8,4	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,1	6,3	4,1	9,2	6,8	10,7	4,1	5,2	5,6	5,9	3,8	5,8	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	6,2	7,1	4,5	10,5	3,4	14,3	5,6	6,4	7,0	6,3	6,0	2,4	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	16,5	17,7	13,6	10,5	6,1	7,1	16,5	16,3	18,5	16,6	14,9	16,0	
TOTAL	72,2	68,9	77,8	69,8	83,7	67,9	73,8	72,1	68,9	71,2	75,3	75,8	
TOTAL													
100,0													
TO CARRY OUT THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE EUROPEAN LABOR MARKET													
AVERAGE													
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,7	8,6	9,0	8,3	8,7	8,1	8,8	8,8	8,6	8,7	8,9	8,9	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,3	3,2	1,2	6,6	4,8	10,7	1,6	1,9	2,4	3,2	2,0	3,0	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	3,5	4,1	3,1	6,6	5,4	7,1	2,9	3,4	4,5	3,9	2,9	1,2	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	11,9	13,9	9,8	11,8	4,8	7,1	10,8	11,7	15,1	11,5	10,0	9,2	
TOTAL	82,3	78,8	85,9	75,0	85,0	75,1	84,7	83,0	78,0	81,4	85,1	86,6	
TOTAL													
100,0													

13a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR SUSTAINABILITY IN EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
TO COORDINATE THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES										
AVERAGE	8,7	8,7	8,8	8,5	8,6	8,7	8,8	9,0	8,5	8,8
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,9	3,5	1,8	2,8	3,2	2,9	2,7	3,2	2,8	2,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,8	4,0	3,4	4,7	3,7	3,3	3,7	2,6	4,6	3,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	12,4	12,5	12,3	15,5	13,3	16,5	10,8	6,8	14,4	11,5
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	80,9	80,0	82,5	77,0	79,8	77,3	82,8	87,4	78,2	82,2
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO SUPPORT THE USE OF ECO-FRIENDLY MATERIALS										
AVERAGE	9,0	8,9	9,1	8,7	9,0	9,1	9,1	9,2	8,8	9,0
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	1,9	2,1	1,4	2,0	1,7	1,3	1,8	2,3	1,7	1,9
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,4	2,5	2,3	3,3	2,2	2,0	1,8	2,2	2,8	2,3
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,4	10,9	9,5	14,1	10,7	11,4	8,6	6,3	12,8	9,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	85,3	84,5	86,8	80,6	85,4	85,3	87,8	89,2	82,7	86,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO MANAGE THE WASTE CYCLE										
AVERAGE	9,1	9,0	9,3	9,1	9,2	9,0	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,1
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,0	2,4	1,1	1,6	1,9	2,2	2,1	2,5	1,6	2,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	2,2	2,4	1,9	2,2	1,8	2,8	2,6	1,9	1,8	2,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	7,7	8,1	6,9	9,1	7,4	8,3	7,6	5,5	8,3	7,4
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	88,1	87,1	90,1	87,1	88,9	86,7	87,7	90,1	88,3	88,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TO DEFINE THE MANUFACTURER'S RESPONSIBILITY ON WASTE DERIVING FROM ITS OWN ACTIVITY										
AVERAGE	8,9	8,9	9,0	8,7	8,8	8,9	9,0	9,2	8,7	9,0
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	2,1	2,5	1,4	2,3	2,2	2,0	1,8	2,4	2,3	2,1
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	3,2	3,4	2,8	3,7	3,2	3,3	3,3	2,3	3,3	3,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	10,3	10,7	9,6	13,2	11,0	9,7	9,7	5,9	11,6	9,8
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	84,4	83,4	86,2	80,8	83,6	85,0	85,2	89,4	82,8	84,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



13b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR SUSTAINABILITY IN EUROPE:

		ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION										SELF-EMPLOYED EMPLOYEES /NON-EMPLOYED					RETIRED HOUSEWIVES STUDENTS					NORTH WEST					NORTH EAST					CENTRE					SOUTH					ISLANDS				
TO COORDINATE THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICES OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES																																														
AVERAGE																																														
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		8,7	8,7	9,3	8,5	8,8	8,8	8,7	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,6	8,8	8,7	8,6																
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		2,9	3,5	0,9	9,2	6,1	9,2	7,1	2,5	2,5	3,1	4,0	3,4	3,0	3,1	4,0	3,4	4,9	3,0	3,4	4,9	3,0	3,4	4,9	3,0	3,4	4,9	3,0	3,4																	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		3,8	3,8	2,6	2,6	3,4	3,6	4,1	14,6	11,4	12,3	11,1	15,0	11,6	11,4	12,3	11,1	15,0	11,6	11,4	12,3	11,1	15,0	11,6	11,4	12,3	11,1	15,0	11,6																	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		12,4	11,4	7,2	7,9	6,1	3,6	3,6	14,6	80,9	81,3	89,9	80,3	84,4	85,7	78,8	83,0	80,9	82,7	76,9	80,8	80,9	80,9	82,7	76,9	80,8	80,9	80,9	82,7	76,9																
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0																
TO SUPPORT THE USE OF ECO-FRIENDLY MATERIALS																																														
AVERAGE																																														
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		9,0	9,0	9,5	8,8	8,9	8,9	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,9	8,8	8,9	8,9	9,1	9,0	9,1	9,2	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,8	8,7	8,8																
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		1,9	2,2	0,9	3,9	5,4	2,0	3,6	1,6	1,4	1,7	1,9	2,3	3,0	1,7	2,9	2,0	3,1	3,0	3,1	3,0	3,1	3,0	3,1	3,0	3,1	3,0	3,1	3,0																	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		2,4	2,3	0,9	2,6	2,0	2,6	2,9	12,7	9,5	10,2	8,0	13,7	10,4	9,5	10,2	8,0	13,7	10,4	9,5	10,2	8,0	13,7	10,4	9,5	10,2	8,0	13,7	10,4																	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		10,4	9,3	4,2	10,5	6,8	7,1	7,1	12,7	85,3	86,2	94,0	83,0	85,8	85,7	82,8	87,4	85,2	88,1	80,9	83,6	85,3	85,3	86,2	94,0	83,0	85,8	85,7	82,8																	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0																
TO MANAGE THE WASTE CYCLE																																														
AVERAGE																																														
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		9,1	9,1	9,3	8,6	9,0	9,0	9,3	9,1	9,2	9,1	9,2	9,0	9,0	9,2	9,1	9,2	9,2	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0	9,0																
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		2,0	2,6	1,1	5,3	5,4	2,7	7,1	1,5	1,6	1,8	2,2	2,2	3,4	2,1	2,5	1,8	2,5	2,5	1,8	2,2	2,2	3,4	2,1	2,5	1,8	2,2	2,2	3,4																	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		2,2	2,5	2,2	3,9	2,7	2,7	7,1	8,3	6,8	7,8	7,1	9,4	6,6	6,8	7,8	7,1	9,4	6,6	6,8	7,8	7,1	9,4	6,6	6,8	7,8	7,1	9,4	6,6																	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		7,7	7,5	5,8	10,5	4,8	3,6	3,6	8,3	89,5	87,9	90,9	80,3	87,1	89,3	88,3	89,5	87,9	88,9	85,9	88,2	88,3	89,3	88,3	89,5	87,9	88,9	85,9	88,2																	
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0																
TO DEFINE THE MANUFACTURER'S RESPONSIBILITY ON WASTE DERIVING FROM ITS OWN ACTIVITY																																														
AVERAGE																																														
VOTE 1-3 (in%)		8,9	9,0	9,3	8,5	9,0	9,0	9,0	8,8	9,0	9,0	8,8	9,0	8,8	9,0	8,9	9,0	9,0	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8																
VOTE 4-5 (in%)		2,1	2,3	0,9	9,2	3,4	2,7	7,1	2,0	1,7	1,8	2,9	3,0	3,2	2,8	3,5	3,0	3,6	3,2	2,2	2,2	3,4	2,1	2,5	1,8	2,2	2,2	3,4	2,1	2,5																
VOTE 6-7 (in%)		3,2	3,4	1,7	6,8	8,2	8,2	3,6	12,1	9,3	10,2	9,7	12,5	8,8	9,3	10,2	9,7	12,5	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8	8,8																
VOTE 8-10 (in%)		10,3	9,2	6,8	11,8	8,2	3,6	3,6	12,1	86,2	84,5	84,4	81,7	84,6	84,4	84,5	84,4	81,7	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6	84,6																
TOTAL		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0																

D AREA - DIGITALIZATION

14a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE PRIVACY AND COPYRIGHT LAW IN EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS		
IT MUST BE SINGLE AND UNIFORM AT EUROPEAN LEVEL THE REGULATION ON THE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL DATA (PRIVACY), COPYRIGHT PROTECTION, AND ON THE CANCELLATION OF OBSOLETE DATA BY CONTENT SUPPLIERS (RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN)																					
AVERAGE																					
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,4	8,3	8,7	8,2	8,4	8,4	8,5	8,7	8,3	8,4	8,4	8,5	8,7	8,3	8,5	8,5	8,3	8,3	8,5	8,5	
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,3	6,1	3,7	7,1	5,3	3,8	4,5	4,1	6,6	5,4	6,2	5,4	5,2	5,9	5,4	6,6	6,6	4,8	4,8	4,8	
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	5,5	6,4	3,9	5,7	5,4	6,2	5,4	5,2	5,9	5,4	6,2	5,4	5,2	5,9	5,4	6,6	6,6	5,4	5,4	5,4	
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	13,0	13,7	11,6	12,7	12,6	16,4	14,7	9,7	12,6	12,6	16,4	14,7	9,7	12,6	12,6	16,4	12,6	13,2	13,2	13,2	
	76,2	73,8	80,8	74,5	76,7	73,6	75,4	81,0	74,9	76,7	73,6	75,4	81,0	74,9	74,9	74,9	74,9	76,6	76,6	76,6	
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

14b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE PRIVACY AND COPYRIGHT LAW IN EUROPE:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		EMPLOYEES		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEWIVES		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS	
IT MUST BE SINGLE AND UNIFORM AT EUROPEAN LEVEL THE REGULATION ON THE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL DATA (PRIVACY), COPYRIGHT PROTECTION, AND ON THE CANCELLATION OF OBSOLETE DATA BY CONTENT SUPPLIERS (RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN)																								
AVERAGE																								
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	8,4	8,5	8,8	8,0	8,4	8,4	8,2	8,3	8,4	8,4	8,2	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,5	8,4	8,4	8,4	8,4	8,4	8,4	8,4	8,6	8,6
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,3	4,7	2,6	11,8	8,2	7,1	6,2	6,2	8,2	7,1	7,1	6,2	6,2	4,7	4,7	4,8	6,3	5,9	5,9	5,9	5,9	5,4	5,4	5,4
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	5,5	6,1	3,1	5,3	4,8	3,6	5,6	5,6	4,8	3,6	3,6	5,6	5,6	5,3	6,1	6,1	5,0	6,0	6,0	6,0	6,0	4,2	4,2	4,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	13,0	13,9	11,2	13,2	7,5	21,4	12,6	12,6	7,5	21,4	12,6	12,6	12,6	13,5	13,4	13,4	13,2	11,9	11,9	11,9	11,9	12,0	12,0	12,0
	76,2	75,3	83,1	69,7	79,5	67,9	75,6	75,6	79,5	67,9	75,6	75,6	75,6	76,5	75,7	75,7	75,5	76,2	76,2	76,2	76,2	78,4	78,4	78,4
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



15a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO ENCOURAGE AN INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIGITAL IDENTITY IN EUROPE, WE NEED:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	MALES	FEMALES	16-17 YEARS	18-24 YEARS	25-34 YEARS	35-54 YEARS	OVER 54 YEARS	LOWER QUALIFICATIONS	HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS
A SINGLE EUROPEAN DIGITAL IDENTITY SYSTEM, TO ACCESS THE SERVICES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS IN ALL EU COUNTRIES										
AVERAGE	8,4	8,4	8,3	8,1	8,3	8,3	8,5	8,8	8,1	8,5
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,2	4,6	3,3	4,3	4,7	3,9	4,3	3,4	4,3	4,1
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,5	5,5	5,5	7,0	6,0	6,7	4,1	4,0	6,5	5,1
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,8	15,0	17,5	19,6	15,9	18,8	14,7	9,7	18,0	14,9
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	74,5	74,9	73,7	69,1	73,4	70,6	76,9	82,9	71,2	75,9
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

15b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, IN ORDER TO ENCOURAGE AN INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIGITAL IDENTITY IN EUROPE, WE NEED:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION	SELF-EMPLOYED EMPLOYEES	UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOUSEWIVES	STUDENTS	NORTH WEST	NORTH EAST	CENTRE	SOUTH	ISLANDS
A SINGLE EUROPEAN DIGITAL IDENTITY SYSTEM, TO ACCESS THE SERVICES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS IN ALL EU COUNTRIES											
AVERAGE	8,4	8,5	8,7	7,8	8,7	7,9	8,4	8,3	8,4	8,3	8,5
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,2	4,3	3,3	11,8	4,8	14,3	3,9	4,1	4,8	4,1	3,8
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,5	4,7	3,1	7,9	6,1	6,7	4,4	6,1	6,1	5,8	5,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	15,8	13,9	13,3	18,4	8,8	17,9	16,2	16,3	15,4	15,4	15,0
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	74,5	77,1	80,3	61,9	80,3	67,8	75,5	73,5	73,7	74,7	76,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

16a. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO ENCOURAGE THE CROSS-BORDER MOVEMENT:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		MALES		FEMALES		16-17 YEARS		18-24 YEARS		25-34 YEARS		35-54 YEARS		OVER 54 YEARS		LOWER QUALIFICATIONS		HIGHER QUALIFICATIONS			
	IT IS NECESSARY A SINGLE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM TO FACILITATE MOVEMENTS OF GOODS AND PEOPLE	AVERAGE	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,1	8,4	
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,0	4,0	4,4	3,1	3,3	4,3	5,5	4,2	3,7	4,1	3,9	5,5	15,4	19,7	20,0	18,4	14,9	9,9	75,5	81,7	100,0	100,0
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,7	5,7	6,1	5,0	6,5	5,7	5,9	5,4	4,7	6,2	5,5	15,4	19,7	20,0	18,4	14,9	9,9	75,5	81,7	100,0	100,0	100,0
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,7	16,7	15,9	18,2	19,7	20,0	18,4	14,9	9,9	19,7	20,0	18,4	14,9	9,9	75,5	81,7	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,6	73,6	73,6	73,7	70,5	70,0	70,2	75,5	81,7	70,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

16b. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT, TO ENCOURAGE THE CROSS-BORDER MOVEMENT:

	ITALIANS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSULTATION		SELF-EMPLOYED		EMPLOYEES		UNEMPLOYED /NON-EMPLOYED		RETIRED		HOUSEWIVES		STUDENTS		NORTH WEST		NORTH EAST		CENTRE		SOUTH		ISLANDS	
	IT IS NECESSARY A SINGLE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM TO FACILITATE MOVEMENTS OF GOODS AND PEOPLE	AVERAGE	8,3	8,4	8,7	8,7	7,5	8,5	7,9	8,2	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3	8,3
VOTE 1-3 (in%)	4,0	4,0	4,4	2,8	14,5	10,7	3,5	6,1	3,6	6,1	3,6	6,1	19,7	16,4	17,8	16,0	16,4	17,0	74,1	72,8	72,5	74,8	74,2	74,2
VOTE 4-5 (in%)	5,7	5,7	5,7	3,2	9,2	6,1	3,6	6,1	3,6	6,1	3,6	6,1	19,7	16,4	17,8	16,0	16,4	17,0	74,1	72,8	72,5	74,8	74,2	74,2
VOTE 6-7 (in%)	16,7	16,7	14,4	12,4	14,5	12,2	17,9	19,7	17,9	19,7	17,9	19,7	19,7	16,4	17,8	16,0	16,4	17,0	74,1	72,8	72,5	74,8	74,2	74,2
VOTE 8-10 (in%)	73,6	73,6	75,5	81,6	61,8	76,3	67,8	70,7	67,8	70,7	67,8	70,7	70,7	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
TOTAL	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



