Chapter 8

Statistics on International Migration Flows

Beata Nowok, Dorota Kupiszewska and Michel Poulain

Introduction

The provision of statistics on international migration flows is specified in Article 3 of the proposed EU Regulation, as follows:

> 1. Member States shall supply to the Commission (Eurostat) statistics on the numbers of:
> (a) immigrants moving to the territory of the Member State, disaggregated as follows:
> (i) citizenship by age and sex;
> (ii) country of birth by age and sex;
> (iii) country of previous usual residence by age and sex.

The above articles must be read in conjunction with the definitions of the terms they use. These are formulated in Article 2.1 of the proposed EU Regulation in the following way:

> (b) 'immigration' means the action by which a natural person estab-lishes his or her usual residence in the territory of a Member State for a pe-riod that is, or is expected to be, of at least twelve months, having previously been usually resident in another Member State or a third country;
> (c) 'emigration' means the action by which a natural person, having previously been usually resident in the territory of a Member State, ceases to have his usual residence in that Member State for a period that is, or is expected to be, of at least twelve months;
> (d) 'immigrant' means a natural person undertaking an immigration;
> (e) 'emigrant' means a natural person undertaking an emigration;

A clarification is necessary before more detailed analysis of the situation is undertaken. The EU Regulation requests the numbers of immigrants and emigrants, not the numbers of immigrations and emigrations. During a given year a person may be involved in multiple international migrations, as defined in national practice, and therefore the number of international

migrants may be slightly smaller than the number of international migrations. If the twelve-month rule is strictly applied there will of course be no difference in counting migrations or migrants during a given year. But as most countries' data-collection systems consider the number of international migrations and not international migrants, and do not follow the twelve-month rule, the numbers of international migrations in these countries will be higher than the number of international migrants as requested by a strict interpretation of the EU Regulation.

1. Comparison with the UN recommendations

The first point to be assessed is whether the definitions in the EU Regulation are in agreement with the UN recommendations on statistics of international migration (UN, 1998). As already mentioned in Chapter 7, the EU definition corresponds to the UN definition of 'long-term migrant'. Both are based on the condition of establishing the usual place of residence in the destination country for twelve months or more. Such a definition should ensure that statistics collected on international migration flows for the purposes of the EU Regulation are consistent with the statistics on total usually resident population, which should also cover people staying or intending to stay for twelve months or more (Chapter 7).

Short-term migrants (i.e. people changing their usual place of residence for a period of between three and twelve months) do not fall within the scope of the EU Regulation (except for statistics on residence permits, as discussed in Chapter 9). The Member States' main interest is in long-term migrants, but short-term migrants cannot be ignored in policy considerations. As stated in the UN recommendations: "because one of the new features of international population mobility is the increase of short-term international movements of people for purposes other than tourism, it is important to gather information on some of the persons who spend less than a year in a country other than that of their usual residence" (UN, 1998: §37).

If countries are interested in collecting statistics on short-term migrants as well (outside the EU Regulation) it is important for international harmonisation that statistics on the two types of migrants should be reported separately. Further, the term 'international migrant' here carries the meaning specified in the EU Regulation, i.e. a long-term migrant.

The duration of stay is an important variable in data collection on international migrants. According to the EU Regulation, the criterion is a period that is, or is expected to be, of at least twelve months. This definition,

formulated in accordance with the UN recommendations, provides three options:

- to determine the actual duration of stay on an *ex post* basis by waiting a minimum of twelve months after the date of immigration;
- to rely on self-reported information on the intended duration of stay, provided by the migrant at the time of immigration;
- to assume that the duration of stay will be the same as the duration of validity of the residence permit for immigrants who need a residence permit.

The first option provides the most accurate reflection of the actual situation. However it has the disadvantage that complete statistics on people who moved in year t and stayed for twelve months or longer would not be produced until year t+2. It does not allow data suppliers to meet the requirements of the EU Regulation, that statistics be produced within ten months of the end of the reference year. A viable alternative is offered by statistics based on intended duration of stay, which may be delivered in due time. These statistics include, in particular, nationals and foreigners with long-term resident status. For other foreigners who need a residence permit to live in the country, the intended duration of stay in combination with the duration of validity of the residence permit is the most appropriate criterion. Asylum seekers whose applications are pending are a special category of foreigners who should be included in the international migration statistics only after their stay in the country has lasted at least one year (Chapter 10).

2. Sources of data on international migration flows

The availability of statistics on international migration flows is conditioned by the existence of a data-collection system that can yield meaningful statistical information on changes of place of usual residence. The major types of data sources used to produce statistics on international migration flows may be summarised as follows:

- population registration systems, including local and centralised population registers;
- statistical forms completed for all changes of residence;
- other administrative registers related to foreigners (e.g. aliens registers, residence permit databases and asylum seekers databases);
- data collection on border crossings and other sample surveys;
- population censuses.

Detailed information on sources used to produce international migration statistics across the EU are presented in Comparative Table 14. To be comprehensive, statistics should cover immigrants and emigrants,

irrespective of their citizenship. However, governments are usually more interested in controlling the migration, particularly immigration, of foreigners than of their own citizens. This priority is reflected in their administrative procedures and data-collection systems. Therefore, data sources for statistics on immigration of nationals, immigration of foreigners, emigration of nationals and emigration of foreigners are presented separately below. In practice in all the countries (except the Czech Republic, Hungary, Portugal, Slovenia and the Slovak Republic) which produce statistics on both nationals and non-nationals, the data are derived from the same source, usually population registers (thirteen countries) and statistical surveys (four countries). As a consequence of the recent EU Directive on the right of residence for all EU citizens in other EU MS[1] an additional distinction between foreigners who are EU citizens and third-country nationals will be needed in future (as proposed in Comparative Table 16).

Centralised population registers

Centralised population registers are used to produce statistics on international migration flows for both nationals and non-nationals in eight countries (Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Finland). In all these countries the National Statistical Institute (NSI) receives from the centralised population register, on a periodic basis, a copy of all registrations and de-registrations. Registrations of migrants coming from abroad are considered as international immigrations while de-registrations of migrants moving abroad are counted as international emigrations. In Austria Spain and Sweden the NSI keeps, for statistical purposes, a centralised population register that includes information on changes of residence received monthly (in Spain) or daily (in Sweden) from local population registers (Spain[2]) or the Tax Authority (Sweden). The Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia also derive their statistics on international migration from their centralised population registers, but only for nationals[3].

[1] Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29th April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

[2] Apart from statistical purposes, the INE central population register is used to coordinate the operation of local population registers.

[3] In Hungary the population register includes only foreigners with permanent residence permits, while in the Czech Republic and Slovenia the population registers theoretically cover both nationals and non-nationals. However the data are considered to be less reliable than those extracted from the aliens registers.

Local population registers

Local population registers are used to derive statistics on international migration flows in three EU MS: Germany, Italy and the Netherlands. The details of the preparation of migration statistics in these three countries vary[4]. In some countries (Poland and Slovak Republic), centralised population registers are in operation, but are not yet systematically used for statistical purposes because of the lack, or poor quality, of some crucial information[5]. In these two countries data on international migration for nationals and non-nationals are still collected through statistical forms filled in when a person is registered or deregistered[6].

Aliens registers and residence permit databases

Aliens registers and residence permit databases constitute a valuable source of data on international migration in countries where the population register does not cover the whole target foreign population (Hungary), the development of the population register is not yet complete (Czech Republic, Slovenia and Slovak Republic), or where there is no population register (France, Greece and Portugal). It is worth noting that in countries where no

[4] In Germany statistics are based on data from the administrative forms for local registration of arrivals and departures. They are anonymised and aggregated by the statistical offices of each *Länder* on a monthly basis and then transmitted to the Federal Statistical Office. It must be noted that there may be small discrepancies between registration rules in operation in various *Länder*. In the Netherlands all local registers send details of changes of residence and administrative corrections to Statistics Netherlands by electronic mail on a daily basis. In Italy the preparation of migration flow statistics is based on two different data-collection questionnaires sent by ISTAT to all municipalities. In the first questionnaire each municipality is obliged to deliver aggregated data on the demographic balance of the resident population, and in the second one individual data on changes of residence are requested. However statistics based on the two sources are not compatible.

[5] For instance, in the Polish central population register there is no indication of the previous place of residence. In the Slovak population register there are a number of persons whose former Czechoslovak citizenship has not yet been replaced by the new Czech or Slovak citizenship, so statistics on migration flows by citizenship cannot be produced. Fortunately in both countries the centralised population register is currently being improved and will be used for statistical purposes in the future.

[6] In Poland the statistical parts of the registration forms and copies of the administrative deregistration forms are sent to the Ministry of the Interior, where the data are input into a computer text file and then sent to the Central Statistical Office. In the Slovak Republic special statistical forms are filled in and they are sent directly to the statistical office. Identical forms, inherited from the time when Czechoslovakia existed, were used in the Czech Republic to produce statistics on international migration of nationals until the reference year 2004 (inclusive).

statistics on international migration can be produced using population registers, the residence permit databases could be an alternative data source as far as immigration of third-country nationals is concerned.

Border crossing forms

Border crossing forms are no longer used for producing statistics on international migration in EU MS. Sample migration surveys are used to produce statistics on international immigration and emigration flows in four countries: through household surveys carried out within the country in Portugal and Ireland and through sample surveys of border crossers in Cyprus and the United Kingdom. In addition, the United Kingdom uses supplementary data sources to adjust statistics derived from surveys, namely data on asylum seekers, removals and long-term visitor switchers (visitors who became migrants) from the Home Office, plus data on migration flows from and to Ireland provided by the Irish Central Statistical Office. In France, as already mentioned, the newly introduced rolling census is to be used to produce statistics on international immigration of EEA citizens (including French citizens). Finally, a specific data collection is carried out in Malta. People who intend to settle in Malta have to declare at Customs goods that are taken into Malta unless these items are deemed to be their personal effects. An additional form is completed at that time, which is transferred to the Statistical Office for producing statistics on international immigrations.

Best source of reliable statistics on migration flows

A centralised, computerised, comprehensive and complete population registration system providing for the continuous recording of information on each member of the target population seems to be the best source of reliable statistics on migration flows, providing the rules related to registration are followed by migrants. The same statistics can usually be derived from local population registers or based on forms (administrative or statistical) filled in when changes of residence are registered. However the use of local population registers or statistical forms is much more complex and may have a negative impact on the overall reliability of the data collected. If there is no administrative data source covering the whole population, or the available data on some population categories are considered unreliable, other registers may be used that contain only subsets of the population, e.g. aliens registers or residence permit databases. Combining different administrative registers is an appropriate alternative

method of meeting the EU Regulation's requirements. In the absence of administrative data sources, some countries rely on statistical surveys carried out during border crossings or among households inside the country. Some information on international migration flows can also be derived from population censuses, but this source has a number of well-known limitations. For instance, it is carried out only at long intervals, accommodates only a small number of questions and is not able to capture all migration events that occur between enumerations. Therefore it cannot constitute a source of annual statistics on international migration. Moreover, only international immigrants can be identified; international emigrants no longer form part of the population being enumerated.

3. Availability of statistics requested by the EU Regulation

The scope of international migration statistics produced by each NSI, based on the data sources described above, varies considerably. The delivery of some statistical tables is constrained by factors such as the lack of relevant and appropriate characteristics in a data-collection system, the low reliability of the data and the existence of legal restrictions on the dissemination of some personal information. Comparative Table 15 gives details of the availability of the data requested by the EU Regulation.

The figures on total immigration and emigration flows are available, with only a few exceptions where there is no source for the data or its reliability is considered to be very low. For example, there are no statistics on immigrants or emigrants in Greece, while in Estonia the NSI decided not to publish international migration statistics due to the low quality of the data. In addition, France does not have any statistics on emigration. Emigration statistics in Malta refer only to the emigration of nationals to the United Kingdom. Immigration statistics in France and Portugal do not cover nationals. Statistics derived from surveys (in Ireland and the United Kingdom) are affected by high estimation errors due to small samples. This refers more specifically to disaggregations by citizenship, country of birth and country of previous/next residence, and in the United Kingdom, by age.

The most widely available tabulation of international migration statistics is that of immigrants by citizenship. The large majority of EU MS, with the exception of Estonia and Poland, produce this table. In Estonia the problem of the very low quality of the data affects all the information on international migration and no tables are produced. In Poland, for the same reason, data on international migration by citizenship is not produced. Statistics on immigrants by citizenship are not currently available in Greece, although they will be produced from the residence permit database in the near future.

As in France and Portugal, these statistics will cover only third-country nationals.

There are more problems related to data on international immigration by country of birth and country of previous residence. Statistics on immigrants by country of birth are neither currently produced nor planned for the near future in Greece, France, Cyprus, Germany and Poland. In Greece, Cyprus and France this information is not gathered. However in Cyprus the inclusion of an appropriate question in the passenger survey should not present any difficulties. In Poland, only information on the place of birth is collected, but the derivation of the country of birth is not straightforward due to numerous historical changes in the national territory. In Germany, information on the country of birth is available in the population register, but the data are of insufficient quality and the coding scheme varies between different local population registers. In compliance with the national regulation on population statistics, they are not transmitted to the NSI. In Portugal, statistics on immigration by country of birth are produced only for foreigners. Although statistics on immigrants by country of birth are not currently available in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Slovenia and the Slovak Republic, these countries intend to produce them in the near future. In Austria, where the Central Population Register has recently been created, the country of birth variable needs to be collected from local population registers because this information was not available in electronic format in all municipalities when the local registers were centralised. In Belgium, statistics on immigration by country of birth are not currently produced although the data are available and are considered to be of good quality.

Information on the country of previous residence is not collected at all or is incomplete in several countries. In particular, it is missing in Greece and France for both nationals and non-nationals, in Slovenia for non-nationals and in Hungary for nationals (information is gathered on non-nationals in Hungary, but is incomplete). Luxembourg does not publish these statistics due to incomplete registration of information on the country of previous residence. In Belgium, the country of previous residence is considered a sensitive topic and is not included in the so-called legal variables that are the only characteristics allowed to be disseminated by the NSI.

The availability of statistics on international emigration by citizenship, country of birth and country of next residence in EU MS is generally similar to that on international immigration. However, some countries that produce immigration data based on residence permits, namely Greece and France, do not have emigration statistics. Portugal overcomes this problem by conducting a special survey.

Statistics on flows of foreigners (and therefore total flows as well) by country of previous/next residence need special attention. Some general assumptions are often made by NSI: emigration statistics are derived from the dates of expiry of residence permits and when information on country of origin or destination of foreign migrants is missing the country of citizenship is considered. In Lithuania the country of next residence when a residence permit expires is taken to be the country from which the foreigner came.

In addition to registered emigration, some countries (e.g. Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands) include a special category called administrative corrections for the emigrations of both nationals and non-nationals that are either declared *ex post* or are discovered not to have been declared (when the individual is administratively deregistered). This category relates to emigrations that often occurred during a previous year, and therefore should not be considered as emigrations for the current year of observation. Most of these administrative corrections, by their very nature, cannot be disaggregated by country of next residence; in practice they are usually included in the emigration statistics and the country of destination is left unknown.

4. Reliability of data on international migration flows

The availability of statistics is not an end in itself. Even if data are available, their poor quality may render them useless. In this section one key aspect of data quality is addressed, namely reliability or compliance with the national definition (which is itself not necessarily in agreement with the internationally recommended definition). If a non-harmonised definition is applied, but the data collection is meticulous, the data are classified as reliable. In such a situation data users can trust the available statistics and there is an exact correspondence between concepts underlying the data and the statistics produced.

There are two main factors that make international migration statistics unreliable. The first is the under-registration of migrations, which applies in particular to countries where data-collection systems rely on self-declarations of international movements. The second relates to data coverage: the data-collection system used in a country may not cover the whole target population and so some subsets may be excluded from the statistics. This does not refer to a situation in which, for example, data are collected on foreigners only, but to one in which some of the people included in the definition are excluded from the data-collection procedure

(see below). In addition, data may be unreliable if a lot of errors arise during their processing.

As discussed above when dealing with availability problems, the majority of international migration statistics in EU MS are derived from population registers. No doubt, deficiencies in registration have the most significant influence on data reliability. People do not register or deregister because there is no such requirement, or even if there is, the administrative rules are not strictly applied. The willingness to report changes of place of residence varies from one country to another, but everywhere people take into account the advantages and disadvantages of being or not being registered. In general, there is more interest in registering arrivals than departures. There-fore, in any given country, immigration statistics are generally more reliable than emigration statistics.

Data based on sample surveys are insufficiently reliable because of estimation errors and the generally high volatility observed in the time series. Statistics on international migration flows based on the issue or expiry of residence permits should be reliable, because the fact of issuing a permit is usually well documented in the residence permit database. However residence permit data refer only to third-country nationals. Moreover emigration statistics based on the expiry of residence permits cover only people with temporary residence permits, and the timing of their emigration may be earlier than the expiry of the residence permit. Finally, it should be noted that everybody who effectively immigrates or emigrates should be taken into consideration (including accompanying children), not only the family members who possess residence permits.

As regards data coverage, flows of undocumented migrants are not included. Only Spain includes some illegal migrants in their official statistics on international immigration when these persons present themselves to be registered in the local *Padrón*. Theoretically, some illegal migrants may also be covered by the international passenger surveys carried out in Cyprus and the United Kingdom. In general, asylum seekers are included only when they have been granted refugee status and received a temporary or permanent residence permit. In Germany, Spain, Austria and the Netherlands asylum seekers are recorded in the population register at an earlier stage of the asylum procedure, and at the same time they are included in immigration statistics (after six months of legal stay in the Netherlands, and immediately in the three other countries). In Cyprus and Ireland they are covered by statistics based on surveys but this is not true of the 'International Passenger Survey' in the United Kingdom. This problem is solved by using Home Office estimates to correct the survey and produce immigration statistics. By contrast, asylum seekers are never included in

migration statistics in Hungary and Portugal, even after they have been granted refugee status.

Students are another group of people who are in a grey area of the registration of international migrations. Not all EU students are included in the population registers of the receiving country and deregistered from those of the sending country. Those who do not report their emigration or immigration will not appear in the related statistics. For students originating from third countries the information is more reliable, as all these students need to acquire a specific residence permit. Bilateral agreements between EU MS or a new EU directive may help to clarify this situation by stipulating explicitly when a student does and does not have to be registered in his or her place of study.

In some cases over-coverage, rather than under-coverage, can be observed. For instance, foreigners born in Portugal are included in the immigration statistics. Nevertheless, the most important problem remains under-coverage. This may reduce all migration flows by a factor of ten and, in some cases one hundred, as will be shown later in this chapter.

The consistency of international migration statistics available in different databases and publications is a separate concern. When different figures are published in different statistical databases for a given country, doubts are raised about the quality of the data. The THESIM project compared the figures in the Eurostat database, the DG JLS Annual Reports on Asylum and Migration, the 'Joint Questionnaire Eurostat-UNSD-UNECE-CoE-ILO Questionnaires on International Migration Statistics', the CoE publications 'Recent demographic developments in Europe', figures from official websites of NSI, SOPEMI reports and the EUROSTAT project 'Quality review of MIGRAT in New Cronos' for total immigration and emigration 1999-2002 in for each country. The total flow statistics were highly consistent across time and across all the sources inspected in the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden. However significant problems were noted in Latvia, Portugal, Ireland and Italy. More or less frequent inconsistencies were detected in other countries, or the figures were missing. According to this investigation the most frequent sources of inconsistencies were:

- differences between provisional and final data;
- differences in coverage as data were provided by different bodies and some misunderstanding of the content of the request occurred, mainly when the NSI was not involved;
- the occasional use of the wrong reference date for the data. Adequate metadata are clearly essential, including information on the

provisional or definitive status of the information, the name of the provider, the data source and the definitions used.

5. Comparability of data on international migration flows

Despite existing recommendations from the UN and the EU, the definitions of international migrants vary significantly between countries, within countries over time, and between different sources of statistical information. Moreover, the definitions of immigration and emigration that are applied in a particular country do not necessarily match in terms of the time criterion (Comparative Table 16). As discussed above, the reliability of the data collection also varies between countries, and within countries between immigration and emigration according to the population concerned. The most important comparability problems are discussed here, with respect to the application of the EU Regulation.

The main sources of variation in definitions used in EU MS are the differences in the concepts of 'place of residence' and 'duration of stay' that are applied to determine who is an international migrant. Because the datasets are usually not accompanied by detailed methodological information these concepts remain a relatively uncharted area for most data users.

Most countries base their definitions of international migration on a change of country of residence. In some cases this is the only concept underlying the definition. A variety of possible interpretations of and nuances in the term 'country of residence' can result in a lack of clarity in the statistics. As explained in Chapter 3, it can be interpreted from a legal (*de jure*) or an actual (*de facto*) point of view. In the former, the laws and regulations binding in the country in question specify requirements that have to be fulfilled in order to become a resident. The conditions differ between nationals and non-nationals, and within non-nationals there are two distinct groups (namely foreigners with the right to free movement, and others). In fact, nationals have an unconditional right of residence in their country of citizenship, whereas the rights of foreigners are hedged in with conditions. Nationals may still be counted as part of the population of their country of citizenship even after they have been living abroad for a number of years, but having a place of residence in a country does not necessarily mean a physical presence on its territory. Thus in some countries nationals cannot be migrants unless their actual presence and absence are considered. From the *de facto* perspective, residence is directly connected to presence in a country. Usually, presence must be for a specified minimum period of time.

Therefore, time should be considered as a supplementary concept to that of residence. However, the level of concreteness differs across countries. On the one hand, the definitions currently in use often specify that international migration takes place when there is a change in the country of residence for a minimum period of time. Such a period is precisely defined. On the other hand, some countries take only permanent changes of residence into account, although permanent does not necessarily mean the same in different countries. Its meaning can be understood literally, or as equivalent to long-term.

When a precise period is used, another problem arises related to the distinction between intended and actual duration. The use of the actual duration concept means that the production of statistics would be systematically delayed by the period used as the time criterion in the definition of migration. Currently, all countries which specify a precise period use the intended duration[7]. Therefore, an assumption is made that the intended duration will become the actual one. However, for non-nationals the intended duration is usually limited to the period specified in the authorisation to stay. Very often, the statutory length of stay is used instead of the immigrant's real intentions. This approach has some advantages. The legal time is objective and easy to record accurately by the receiving country. However, the actual presence of foreigners in the country often differs from that given by their initial authorisation to stay. Foreigners may leave the country long before their permits expire, or their permits may be renewed and they may stay longer.

Details of the time criterion used in the definitions of international immigrants and emigrants in the twenty-five countries of the EU and information on the compatibility of the statistics with the Regulation are presented in Comparative Table 16. The figures are given separately for nationals and non-nationals, and non-nationals are further subdivided into EU citizens and third-country nationals.

The threshold durations used by countries differ widely. On the one hand, there are countries where the duration of residence is of no relevance because any move in or out of a dwelling should be registered and deregistered and will be directly reflected in the statistics. On the other hand, there are countries where only movements for an 'infinite' duration (i.e. settlement migration) are counted. Within these extremes, the duration of stay criterion applied in migration statistics across the EU is usually set to a period between three months and one year. The one-year criterion is

[7] In the Czech Republic the actual duration of stay was used for the immigration statistics for 2001 and 2002.

requested by the EU Regulation, and only Cyprus and the United Kingdom (which compile their statistics on international migration flows from sample surveys conducted during border controls) currently apply this definition consistently. In Finland and Sweden, where the one-year criterion is applied as a general rule, it is not followed for emigration to other Nordic countries (where the rule of the country of immigration is applied, according to the Nordic Agreement). However these two countries, as well as most other countries using population registers, would be able to deliver statistics using the twelve-month rule on an *ex post* basis.

Related to the different time criteria used by countries, there are different practices concerning the inclusion of short-term migrations in international migration statistics. Practice in this area may differ when statistics on nationals, other EEA citizens and non-EEA citizens are produced. In fact it is frequently difficult to estimate the level of coverage of short-term migrations, as many countries do not specify the duration of stay of migrants into or out of their territory.

Investigations undertaken as part of the THESIM project show that fourteen countries could present statistics on *ex post* actual stays in the country or abroad, and could therefore fully comply with the UN definition on long-term migration. With the addition of two countries that could produce these statistics for all non-nationals, and four that could do so for the immigration of non-EEA citizens, twenty out of twenty-five countries could at least produce immigration statistics for third-country nationals based on the UN's definition of long-term migration. For a variety of reasons, including the early date of publication and the constraints concerning legal and financial matters, some countries have not as yet been able to implement these existing possibilities.

As well as discrepancies in the definitions of crucial concepts described above, there are a number of other problems that considerably hinder the international comparability of flow data. Time-related issues are predominant. First, migration events are counted at various dates. For immigration this might be the date of issuing a permit, the date of arrival or the date of reporting for registration; for emigration, the date of expiry of a permit, the date of reporting the departure or the date of departure are variously used. Secondly, in some cases a reference period other than a calendar year might be applied (e.g. April to April in Ireland). In addition, when a very short (or no) duration of stay criterion is employed, an individual may migrate several times during the reference period. All of these events are counted separately in the international migration statistics. When the one-year time limit is strictly applied and the data are collected on an annual basis, only one migration (immigration or emigration) can be

counted for a given migrant and, accordingly, there should be no difference between the number of migrants and the number of migrations.

This analysis leads to the general conclusion that currently available data on international migration flows are still far from being internationally comparable. This is evident at intra-EU level when data on flows between pairs of EU MS, reported by both the country of origin and the country of destination, are compared. In fact, data collection on international migration is unique in demography because the same phenomenon, the same events (international migrations) and the same people (international migrants) are counted by two different countries in two completely different data-collection systems. The emigration figures produced by sending countries and the immigration figures collected by receiving countries should be similar if the two data-collection systems use identical definitions and the data are reliable. The idea of using a double-entry matrix for comparing these figures is more than thirty years old[8].

Comparative Table 17 displays the double-entry matrix for migration flows between EU MS in 2002. Each cell includes, for a given migration flow from country A to country B, both the number of emigrations recorded in country A and the number of immigrations registered in country B. In this way, the two figures in the same cell are directly comparable. Here are the general conclusions based on the 2002 matrix:

- Belgium, Estonia, Greece, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta and the UK submitted no data at all (except that Ireland and Malta provided immigration and emigration data with the UK, and Malta also provided immigration data from Italy). As a consequence 56 cells include no data at all, either for emigration or for immigration[9].
- By contrast, both figures are available for 277 migration flows. This means that it is possible to compare the statistics for 46% of all cases. 134 cells include only immigration data, and the remaining 133 cells only emigration data[10].
- In the 277 cells where both figures are available, the total number of immigrations exceeds the total number of emigrations (508,800 immigrations compared to 448,636 emigrations). This does not

[8] Such double-entry matrices have been produced annually by UNECE since 1972 and more recently by Eurostat. The two main proponents of using this tool to estimate the level of harmonisation of international migration flows are John Kelly (1987) and Michel Poulain (1999).
[9] The Luxembourg and UK data are also available for some years.
[10] Please note that the equal number of cells with either immigration data or emigration data may be explained by the fact that countries providing immigration data have also emigration data.

necessarily mean that immigrations are systematically better recorded than emigrations, as it may also be a consequence of better recording (of both immigration and emigration flows) in traditional countries of immigration.

- A comparison of immigration and emigration figures in the 230 cells with non-zero figures shows that 135 of the figures are higher for immigration than for the corresponding emigration. The reverse is true in 95 cases (41% of the total).
- A difference between immigration and emigration figures of less than 25% might be considered an acceptable level of reliability. Only 37 cells are in this favourable situation. This represents only 16% of all the pairs of migration figures compared and a little more that 5% of all intra-EU migration flows.
- The inter-Nordic flows between Denmark, Finland and Sweden show the most consistency between immigration and emigration figures. This is explained by the Inter-Nordic agreement, which imposed the rules of the country of immigration on the synchronised registration or inter-Nordic migrants in both sending and receiving countries. The remaining differences may be attributed to dual citizenship and time delays for migrations occurring at the end of the year.
- In 53 cells (23%) the emigration figure exceeds the corresponding immigration figure by a factor of more than two, while in 87 cells (38%) the immigration figure is more than twice the emigration one. In total about two out of three migration flows are in this unfavourable situation. Some comparisons are even worse: for example, Spain recorded only 122 emigrations to Denmark, whereas Denmark enumerated 1,613 immigrations from Spain, Slovak Republic recorded 219 emigrations to Germany, compared to the 11,600 immigrations from the Slovak Republic registered in Germany.
- Germany reports a larger number of both immigrations and emigrations than all other countries. Next, but far behind, come Denmark, Netherlands and Austria. The Slovak Republic, Portugal, Poland and Slovenia record the smallest number of both immigrations and emigrations. Part of the explanation for these huge differences may be found in variations in the definitions and time criteria used. In fact, Germany records immigration and emigration strictly within eight days of its occurrence. Most other countries have longer time criteria or no criterion at all, and in this situation most migrants who consider their move to be temporary do not report it.

The absence of a time criterion thus has a negative impact on the reliability and coverage of the data collection.

- Moreover, in countries where the data collection and the definitions used are not the same for nationals, other EU citizens and third-country nationals, the figures should be done separately for the citizens of the sending country, those of the receiving country, other EU citizens and third-country nationals.
- Finally, the large differences observed between countries are considered to be mainly due to problems of coverage. Differences in definition can explain only small differences between countries[11]. Accordingly, we may conclude that the harmonisation of definitions is necessary to improve the overall comparability of international migration data within the EU but is not sufficient to eradicate all the problems. The primary requirement is a global improvement of the reliability of registration and data-collection processes.

This investigation of the intra-EU double-entry migration matrix demonstrates the weak comparability of the available data. The same comparability problems probably affect data on the international migration of EU citizens outside the EU, as the same rules and practice are in force. Fortunately, the immigration of third-country nationals is better recorded in most EU MS as the residence permit database is used (directly or indirectly) to measure these flows. However this is not true for emigration.

The above conclusions on the comparability of international migration flows by country of origin or country of destination are probably also valid for international migration by citizenship or country of birth. However no direct check is possible.

Conclusion

An urgent need for international migration statistics coincides with an unsatisfactory degree of availability, reliability and comparability of data on international migration flows. The comparability problems occur at different stages of the procedures used to produce immigration and emigration statistics. Firstly, different data sources are used to collect statistical information. Usually, statistics on international migration flows are by-products of information collected for administrative purposes and as such their coverage and possible tabulation are limited by the scope of the

[11] Some checks have been carried out by the THESIM team in Sweden, Denmark and Belgium that show that differences in the time criterion can be responsible only for differences of less than 25%.

information gathered for these administrative purposes. Registered migration events and recorded characteristics depend in turn on national migration policy, while the level of under-registration of international migrations depends on the existence of incentives and disincentives prompting compliance with registration rules.

Undoubtedly the problem of defining international migrants and migration is of great importance. The numerous discrepancies in basic concepts applied in identifying migrants and migration are one of the main reasons that international flow statistics are not comparable. But the problems of coverage, and particularly under-registration of migration, are the most important and the situation is worsened when no fixed time criterion is used for the self-declaration of migration. The review of the availability, reliability and comparability of the data on international migration flows which is to be required under the EU Regulation showed very diverse situations in the twenty-five EU MS. However it also suggested ways in which the data could be improved so as to comply with the EU Regulation or at least to clarify the differences between the data requested and those produced.

In order to improve the overall situation, the need for a fixed time criterion for identifying immigration has been highlighted as of great importance. A twelve-month period should be recommended, alongside the EU Regulation, even if the threshold of three months would probably be more effective in terms of coverage and reliability.

Most efforts should be focused on the registration of emigration, of both nationals and non-nationals, by facilitating the administrative procedure and by introducing incentives for both the people concerned and the local administration to register the move. For migration between EU MS, the EU Directive lays down that the registration of immigration is compulsory in the receiving country; the declaration of emigration and deregistration in the sending country should also be made compulsory. Following the experience of the Nordic countries, an exchange of information between EU MS would be really helpful in improving statistics on migration within the EU. For emigrations outside the EU, the registration of nationals in consulates abroad should be encouraged by providing concrete advantages to the migrant. This information should then be systematically transferred to the central population registration system and used to deregister the migrant from his or her previous place of residence.

For third-country nationals, the residence permit database is the most reliable source of data for immigration if only the first permit issued is considered. It is more difficult to estimate emigration by using this data source. Generally speaking, the information on the expiry of residence

permits should be systematically transferred to the population registration system and used as the starting point for investigating and possibly deregistering emigrations that have not been self-declared. It would also be possible to register the emigration when the external border of the EU is crossed by checking the residence permit. However this would involve the exchange of information between all EU MS, as emigrants may be usually resident in one EU country but leave the EU through a border in another EU country.

Comparative Table 14. Data sources of statistics on international migration flows

	IMmigration or EMigration	Central Population Register		Local Population Registers		Statistical forms		Alien Register or residence permits database		Sample survey	
		NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR
BE	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
CZ	**IM**	X							X		
	EM	X							X		
DK	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
DE	**IM**			X	X						
	EM			X	X						
EE	**IM**	[X][1]	[X]								
	EM	[X]	[X]								
EL	**IM**								[X]		
	EM										
ES	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
FR	**IM**								X		[X]
	EM										
IE	**IM**									X	X
	EM									X	X
IT	**IM**			X	X						
	EM			X	X						
CY	**IM**									X	X
	EM									X	X
LV	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
LT	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
LU	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
HU	**IM**	X							X		
	EM	X							X		
MT	**IM**					X[2]	X				
	EM[3]										
NL	**IM**			X	X						
	EM			X	X						

	IMmigration or EMigration	Central Population Register		Local Population Registers		Statistical forms		Alien Register or residence permits database		Sample survey	
		NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR	NAT	FOR
AT	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
PL	**IM**					X	X				
	EM					X	X				
PT	**IM**								X	[X]	
	EM									X	X
SI	**IM**	X							X		
	EM	X							X		
SK	**IM**					X	X		X		
	EM					X	X		X		
FI	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
SE	**IM**	X	X								
	EM	X	X								
UK	**IM**									X	X
	EM									X	X

[1] [X] means that this data source could be available or expected to be used in the future.
[2] Statistical forms filled in by persons who intend to settle in Malta. Data collection is organised by custom authorities in co-operation with the statistical office.
[3] The only available information to produce emigration statistics is that on Maltese emigrants requesting permission for permanent settlement in the United Kingdom, received from the British High Commission.

Comparative Table 15. Availability of statistics on international migration flows[1]

	IMmigration or EMigration	Total	By citizenship			By country of birth			By country of previous/ next residence		
			Total	Additional dimension		Total	Additional dimension		Total	Additional dimension	
				Age	Sex		Age	Sex		Age	Sex
BE	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	-[+]	-[+]	-[+]	-L,Q	-L,Q	-L,Q
CZ	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	-[+]	-[+]	-[+]	+	+	+
DK	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DE	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
EE	**IM&EM**	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]	-Q [+]
EL	**IM**	-[f:+]	-[f:+]	-[f:+]	-[f:+]	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ES	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
FR	**IM**	n:-f: +	n:- f:± [+]	n:- f:± [+]	n:- f:± [+]	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IE	**IM&EM**	+	±	+	+	±	+	+	±	+	+
IT	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
CY	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
LV	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LT	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LU	**IM&EM**	+	+	+	+	-[+]	-[+]	-[+]	-Q	-Q	-Q
HU	**IM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	n:- f:- Q	n:- f:- Q	n:- f:- Q
	EM	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
MT	**IM**	+	±	+	+	±	+	+	±	+	+
	EM	n:± f:-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n:± f:-	n:+ f:-	n:+ f:-

	IMmigration or EMigration	Total	By citizenship			By country of birth			By country of previous/ next residence		
			Total	Additional dimension		Total	Additional dimension		Total	Additional dimension	
				Age	Sex		Age	Sex		Age	Sex
NL	**IM& EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
AT	**IM& EM**	+	+	+	+	-[Q] [+]	-[Q] [+]	-[Q] [+]	+	+	+
PL	**IM& EM**	+	-[Q]	-[Q]	-[Q]	-	-	-	+	+	+
PT	**IM**	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+	n:- f:+
	EM	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-[Q]	+
SI	**IM**	+	+	+	+	-[+]	-[+]	-[+]	n:+ f:-	n:+ f:-	n:+ f:-
	EM	+	+	n:+ f:- [+]	+	-[+]	-[+]	-[+]	n:+ f:-	n:+ f:-	n:+ f:-
SK	**IM& EM**	+	+	+	+	n:-[+] f:+	-[+]	-[+]	+	+	+
FI	**IM& EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
SE	**IM& EM**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
UK	**IM& EM**	+	±	±	+	±	±	+	±	±	+

[1] Legend:
+ Available
- Not available
n: Information referring to nationals
f: Information referring to non-nationals
[ ] Information referring to data that might be produced in the future
[Q] Statistics are not produced due to low quality of data
[L] There are legal constraints on the publication of data
± Only some data are available:

FR: Immigration statistics do not cover EEA citizens; Disaggregation by age and sex available but not provided;

IE: Selected countries of citizenship/birth/previous or next residence;

MT: Immigration statistics available only for selected countries of citizenship/birth/previous residence; Statistics on immigration by country of previous residence refer to immigration of persons of Maltese origin; Emigration statistics cover only nationals emigrating to the UK;

UK: Selected countries of citizenship/birth/previous or next residence; Disaggregation by age available only for some countries.

Comparative Table 16. Time criteria and compatibility of international migration statistics with the EU Regulation[1]

	IMmigration or EMigration	Nationals	Other EEA citizens	Non EEA citizens	Possibility of providing statistics according to the 12 months rule[2]		
					Nationals	Other EEA citizens	Non EEA citizens
BE	**IM**	No time critera	3 months	3 months	P	P	P
	EM	No time critera	3 months	3 months, permit expiry	P	P	P
CZ	**IM**	Permanent, no time criteria	one year	one year	N	Y	Y
	EM	Permanent, no time criteria	permanent/permit expiry	permanent/permit expiry	N	N	N
DK	**IM[3]**	3 months/6 months	3 months/6 months	3 months/6 months	P	P	P
	EM[4]	6 months	6 months	6 months	P	P	P
DE	**IM[5]**	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	N	N	N
	EM	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	N	N	N
EE	**IM**	[no time criteria]	[3 months]	[3 months]	[P]	[P]	[P]
	EM	[no time criteria]	[no time criteria]	[no time criteria]	[P]	[P]	[P]
EL	**IM**	no statistics	no statistics	[one year]	N	N	[Y]
	EM	no statistics	no statistics	no statistics	N	N	N
ES	**IM**	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	P	P	P
	EM	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	P	P	P
FR	**IM**	no statistics	no statistics	One year [6]	N	N	Y
	EM	no statistics	no statistics	no statistics	N	N	N
IE	**IM**	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	N	N	N
	EM	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	N	N	N
IT	**IM**	no time criteria	no time criteria	6 months	N	N	N
	EM	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
CY	**IM**	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
	EM	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
LV	**IM**	no time criteria	one year validity for residence permit[7]	one year validity for residence permit [7]	P	P	P
	EM	6 months	6 months or end of validity of permit	6 months or end of validity of permit	P	P	P

	IMmigration or EMigration	Nationals	Other EEA citizens	Non EEA citizens	Possibility of providing statistics according to the 12 months rule[2]		
					Nationals	Other EEA citizens	Non EEA citizens
LT	**IM**	6 months	one year validity for residence permit[7]	one year validity for residence permit[7]	P	P	P
	EM	6 months	6 months or end of validity of permit	6 months or end of validity of permit	P	P	P
LU	**IM**	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	P	P	P
	EM	no time criteria	no time criteria	no time criteria	P	P	P
HU	**IM**	3 months	3 months	one year	N	N	Y
	EM	3 months	permanent/ permit expiry	permanent/ permit expiry	N	N	N
MT	**IM**	permanent	permanent	permanent	N	N	Y
	EM	permanent	no statistics	no statistics	N	N	N
NL	**IM**	4 out of the forthcoming 6 months	4 out of the forthcoming 6 months	4 out of the forthcoming 6 months	P	P	P
	EM	8 out of the forthcoming 12 months	8 out of the forthcoming 12 months	8 out of the forthcoming 12 months	P	P	P
AT	**IM**	3 months [one year]	3 months [one year]	3 months [one year]	P	P	P
	EM	3 months [one year]	3 months [one year]	3 months [one year]	P	P	P
PL	**IM**	permanent	permanent	permanent	N	N	N
	EM	permanent	permanent	permanent	N	N	N
PT	**IM**	no statistics	one year	one year	N	Y	Y
	EM	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
SI	**IM**	3 months	3 months	3 months	P	P	P
	EM	3 months	permanent/permit expiry	permanent/permit expiry	P	P	P
SK	**IM**	permanent	permanent	permanent/3 months	N	N	N
	EM	permanent	permanent	permanent/permit expiry	N	N	N
FI	**IM**	no time criteria	one year	one year	P	Y	Y
	EM[7]	one year	one year	one year	P	P	P
SE	**IM**	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
	EM[7]	one year	one year	one year	P	P	P
UK	**IM**	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y
	EM	one year	one year	one year	Y	Y	Y

[1] This table presents minimum duration of stay (in or outside the country) of migrants included in international migration statistics. The duration of stay criterion may result either from the registration rules and/or from the selection rules applied when producing statistics.
Legend:
[ ] The responsible authority or data supplier has indicated that these data may be available at some point in the future
…/…Information refers to: foreigners with permanent residence permits/other foreigners
2 Information on the possibility of providing statistics according to the 12 months rule refer to migration flow statistics produced on an ex-ante basis. If a country is able to provide statistics according to the 12 months rule, but only on an ex-post basis, Y is replaced by P.
3 Six months for all persons (Nationals, EEA citizens or non-EEA citizens) immigrating from another EEA country and three months if immigrating from outside EEA.
4 Between the Nordic countries, the time criteria for the registration of emigration are related to the time criteria for the registration of immigration in the receiving country.
5 Registration in the local population registers have to be done within 8 days after entering the country.
6 Only for foreigners who are selected to receive long-term resident permit in the future, even if they do not receive it at the moment of the entry. Therefore, some of those people with temporary residence permits valid for up to 1 year are included.
7 For immigrants with permanent residence permit, the criteria are the same as for nationals.

Comparative Table 17a. International migration between the EU MS in 2002 according to receiving (I) and sending country (E) (Eurostat database)

To / From		BE	CZ	DK	DE	EE	EL	ES	FR
BE	I		80	609	4.439	:	:	3.141	:
	E		:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ	I	:		202	11.150	:	:	442	:
	E	52		56	1.087	3	77	64	289
DK	I	:	51		2.889	:	:	723	:
	E	523	143		2.700	175	273	1.722	1.474
DE	I	:	987	3.543		:	:	13.757	:
	E	4.565	9.691	2.974		614	19.998	16.681	19.815
EE	I	:	9	234	991		:	98	:
	E	:	:	:	:		:	:	:
EL	I	:	61	264	15.913	:		195	:
	E	:	:	:	:	:		:	:
ES	I	:	42	1.613	15.426	:	:		:
	E	968	50	122	3.310	8	65		3.316
FR	I	:	340	1.439	18.619	:	:	8.200	
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
IE	I	:	45	373	2.230	:	:	1.186	:
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
IT	I	:	253	943	26.882	:	:	4.967	:
	E	1.170	28	126	7.416	1	244	849	2.417
CY	I	:	12	13	260	:	:	17	:
	E	63	21	0	42	0	1.412	62	62
LV	I	:	8	455	2.195	:	:	218	:
	E	3	11	52	210	120	1	6	105
LT	I	:	20	835	4.135	:	:	2.003	:
	E	18	28	128	817	40	6	174	103
LU	I	:	5	156	1.739	:	:	96	:
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
HU	I	:	59	147	17.211	:	:	326	:
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
MT	I	:	5	21	111	:	:	4	:
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
NL	I	:	224	886	13.976	:	:	3.273	:
	E	9.270	207	540	10.822	14	477	3.150	3.431
AT	I	:	339	321	14.401	:	:	540	:
	E	120	630	145	3.605	12	238	196	389
PL	I	:	1.679	962	100.968	:	:	3.869	:
	E	119	38	95	17.806	0	75	166	339
PT	I	:	23	171	8.806	:	:	3.958	:
	E	0	0	0	776	0	0	404	1.838
SI	I	:	21	37	2.379	:	:	57	:
	E	38	18	6	907	0	18	14	49
SK	I	:	13.326	72	11.600	:	:	422	:
	E	13	449	3	219	0	7	20	20
FI	I	:	34	396	2.203	:	:	875	:
	E	222	30	384	730	361	69	724	380
SE	I	:	70	2.388	3.481	:	:	1.730	:
	E	379	68	2.241	1.659	83	484	1.284	891
UK	I	:	489	3.645	14.703	:	:	27.249	:
	E	3.140	914	1.705	14.338	0	7.148	36.746	19.452

Comparative Table 17b. International migration between the EU MS in 2002 according to receiving (I) and sending country (E) (Eurostat database)

To / From		IE	IT	CY	LV	LT	LU	HU	MT	NL
BE	I	:	1.807	19	3	17	:	:	:	5.357
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ	I	:	330	93	8	6	:	:	:	393
	E	41	211	24	8	20	5	37	3	159
DK	I	:	291	54	30	87	:	:	:	465
	E	311	777	35	372	680	131	119	17	613
DE	I	:	11.376	374	76	189	:	:	:	7.959
	E	2.634	36.535	242	1.378	2.290	1.327	16.411	91	9.336
EE	I	:	57	0	56	27	:	:	:	48
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
EL	I	:	688	4.423	1	2	:	:	:	1.077
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
ES	I	:	2.316	30	4	36	:	:	:	2.824
	E	1.132	1.256	4	4	14	104	48	2	907
FR	I	:	4.894	93	19	60	:	:	:	3.084
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
IE	I		325	23	4	8	:	:	:	664
	E		:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
IT	I	:		26	11	25	:	:	19	1.756
	E	125		0	2	4	198	129	97	481
CY	I	:	11		0	0	:	:	:	29
	E	0	63		0	0	0	62	21	21
LV	I	:	128	0		197	:	:	:	92
	E	7	11	0		176	0	2	0	14
LT	I	:	132	0	162		:	:	:	156
	E	66	64	3	122		2	4	0	69
LU	I	:	251	0	0	1		:	:	172
	E	:	:	:	:	:		:	:	:
HU	I	:	485	97	5	4	:		:	547
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:		:	:
MT	I	:	132	14	0	0	:	:		41
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:		:
NL	I	:	985	73	9	18	:	:	:	
	E	493	1.202	32	11	39	169	293	30	
AT	I	:	936	79	2	7	:	:	:	565
	E	57	735	10	12	54	19	1.279	5	269
PL	I	:	3.886	29	23	126	:	:	:	2.275
	E	13	302	2	7	4	23	11	0	290
PT	I	:	453	0	3	0	:	:	:	1.653
	E	0	0	0	0	0	494	0	0	200
SI	I	:	256	0	2	0	:	:	:	66
	E	3	145	1	0	1	5	11	0	45
SK	I	:	413	0	3	1	:	:	:	256
	E	2	36	1	0	0	1	24	0	19
FI	I	:	253	8	23	102	:	:	:	408
	E	137	183	22	24	28	76	132	1	270
SE	I	:	378	46	26	52	:	:	:	680
	E	217	477	64	46	23	104	140	49	551
UK	I	13.500	4.843	3.476	20	73	:	:	152	6.810
	E	0	6.344	2.387	0	0	507	4.638	196	10.965

Comparative Table 17c. International migration between the EU MS in 2002 according to receiving (I) and sending country (E) (Eurostat database)

To / From		AT	PL	PT	SI	SK	FI	SE	UK
BE	I	174	61	179	13	6	151	387	2.263
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ	I	1.063	34	8	5	749	47	151	0
	E	377	1.117	8	19	14.455	39	57	389
DK	I	179	27	39	0	1	360	4.250	3.507
	E	233	588	128	30	78	376	4.337	4.317
DE	I	9.403	2.335	692	332	86	854	2.699	23.577
	E	15.929	78.739	11.315	2.502	9.820	2.658	3.876	16.662
EE	I	31	0	5	0	0	1.378	345	0
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
EL	I	427	60	11	2	4	70	595	4.733
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
ES	I	514	63	1.015	5	3	525	1.166	13.122
	E	134	99	1.105	1	22	178	215	5.083
FR	I	687	247	552	14	17	281	877	16.172
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
IE	I	132	4	45	1	2	153	351	0
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	5.900
IT	I	1.386	251	268	68	20	227	508	6.674
	E	532	459	157	148	16	149	186	2.741
CY	I	17	4	0	0	2	26	59	276
	E	0	21	0	0	0	42	21	790
LV	I	67	5	5	0	2	53	189	0
	E	19	28	2	0	1	60	60	62
LT	I	99	40	3	0	1	66	261	0
	E	15	128	11	0	2	97	119	216
LU	I	65	2	16	0	2	49	93	505
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
HU	I	2.337	14	27	5	30	100	274	1.322
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
MT	I	10	0	2	2	1	2	29	803
	E	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	96
NL	I	586	83	332	10	7	228	780	8.411
	E	493	492	710	26	100	299	659	6.051
AT	I		156	37	90	64	101	318	225
	E		1.538	157	282	1.066	149	269	529
PL	I	2.514		32	3	29	95	1.186	1.288
	E	525		6	0	11	9	174	254
PT	I	296	4		2	0	52	178	1.685
	E	0	0		0	0	0	0	881
SI	I	388	0	8		2	2	14	0
	E	282	10	6		4	4	44	51
SK	I	2.246	10	1	1		13	76	0
	E	212	11	0	1		0	10	55
FI	I	226	4	24	0	0		3.532	1.025
	E	87	37	28	2	3		3.591	980
SE	I	487	70	48	15	9	3.255		2.460
	E	286	190	100	24	21	3.211		3.451
UK	I	932	208	939	22	16	870	3.120	
	E	4.197	1.387	2.082	0	284	273	1.759	