

Working Paper No.7
12 March 2005

ENGLISH ONLY

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION AND
UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE (UNECE)**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
(EUROSTAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

UNECE/Eurostat Seminar on Migration Statistics
Organized in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 21-23 March 2005)

Session 2– Invited paper

**COUNTING IMMIGRANTS AND EXPATRIATES IN OECD COUNTRIES: A NEW
PERSPECTIVE¹**

Submitted by OECD²

¹ Jean-Christophe Dumont and Georges Lemaître, « *Counting Immigrants and Expatriates : A New Perspective* », OECD, Social, Employment and Migration Working papers (forthcoming).

² The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of participants of the National Statistical Offices (NSOs) in the data collection effort and of John Martin, Martine Durand, Enrico Giovannini and Jean-Pierre Garson, who provided comments and advices on a preliminary version of this paper. Contacts: jean-christophe.dumont@oecd.org and georges.lemaitre@oecd.org

SUMMARY

Since the end of the 1990s, issues related to international migration, and more particularly to the international mobility of highly-qualified workers, are receiving increasing attention from policy-makers. This reflects, among other reasons, the increasing international movements that have been taking place following the fall of the Iron Curtain and in conjunction with the growing globalisation of economic activity. Despite these increased movements and the heightened policy interest in this area, the quality and comparability of international data on migration have scarcely kept pace.

In particular, data that are generally available on migration flows do not provide a clear idea of the relative scale of movements across countries and data on total immigrant stocks have suffered from differing national views concerning who is an “immigrant”. In addition to the lack of comparability on immigrant populations, most OECD member countries have little information at their disposal on their expatriates. In developing countries, the question of the international mobility of highly-qualified workers is generally manifested through a concern about the so called “brain drain” and the loss of economic potential which could result from this.

With the 2000 round of censuses, however, virtually all OECD countries have incorporated in their census a question on the country of birth of persons enumerated, as well as on their nationality. With this information, it is possible to provide, for the first time, a detailed, comparable and reliable picture of immigrant populations in OECD countries, reflecting the cumulative effect of movements within and to the OECD area over the past decades. And with additional information on the educational attainment of migrants, the cumulative impact of flows of human capital can be depicted and, in particular, the conventional wisdom on the brain drain confronted with actual data.

Results presented in this paper based on the new database on immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries, show that (i) the percentage of the foreign-born in European OECD countries is generally higher than the percentage of foreigners; (ii) international migration is quite selective towards highly skilled migrants; (iii) in most OECD countries, the number of immigrants with tertiary education exceeds the number of highly qualified expatriates to other OECD countries; and (iv) among non-member countries the impact of the international mobility of the highly skilled is diverse: the largest developing countries seem not be significantly affected and indeed may benefit from indirect effects associated with this mobility while some of the smallest countries, especially in the Caribbean and in Africa, face significant “emigration rates” of their elites.

Introduction

1. Since the end of the 1990s, issues related to international migration, and more particularly to the international mobility of highly-qualified workers, are receiving increasing attention from policy-makers. This reflects, among other reasons, the increasing international movements that have been taking place following the fall of the Iron Curtain and in conjunction with the growing globalisation of economic activity. In addition, demographic imbalances between developed and developing countries and large differences in real wages have tended to encourage the movements of workers from economies where they are in surplus to those where they are most in need. Moreover, many OECD countries have been attempting to attract qualified human resources from abroad, which their increasingly knowledge-intensive economies need in order to sustain economic growth in face of ageing populations. Despite these increased movements and the heightened policy interest in this area, the quality and comparability of international data on migration have scarcely kept pace.

2. In particular, data that are generally available on migration flows do not provide a clear idea of the relative scale of movements across countries. In the so-called settlement countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States), only “permanent” migrants are counted as immigrants, that is, persons who are admitted to the country and granted the right of permanent residence upon entry. Persons who are granted temporary permits may not even figure in the official migration statistics. In other countries, immigrants consist of persons who are enrolled onto a population register, which is a file of persons residing in the country that is generally maintained at the municipal level. To be registered, a person entering from outside the country must intend to stay in the country for more than a specified minimum period and have a residence permit (if required) of at least the minimum duration. In some countries (e.g. Belgium, Japan), the minimum period is three months, in others one year (Sweden, Finland). In practice, this means that international students, for example, will often be counted as immigrants in these countries, whereas in the settlement countries, they would not figure in the official migration statistics. Although the solution would normally be to harmonise the statistics across countries, for a number of technical reasons, progress in this area is exceedingly slow.

3. As with international data on annual flows, those on the total immigrant stocks have suffered from differing national views concerning who is an “immigrant”. In the settlement countries, immigrants are considered to be persons who are foreign-born, that is, who at some stage have immigrated into the country of residence.¹ For these countries, the acquisition of nationality is relatively easy and it is rare to see statistics on persons of foreign nationality.²

4. In other countries, immigrants are considered precisely to be persons of foreign nationality. However, because persons born abroad can acquire the nationality of the country of residence and because persons born in a country do not necessarily acquire thereby the citizenship of the country of birth, statistics on the foreign population may not yield the same result as those on the foreign-born population. This would not be problematical if it were possible to produce data on both bases. But this was not the case for many countries until fairly recently, with the result that it was customary to see international statistics for two sets of generally non-overlapping countries, those applying the concept of a foreign country of birth to define the immigrant population and those for whom foreign nationality was the determining criterion.

5. As immigrant populations have grown in many countries and naturalisations have become more common, estimates based on these different concepts have become less and less comparable across countries. While new arrivals of foreign citizens tend to increase the size of the foreign population, those already there may acquire the citizenship of the host country and become nationals. As a result, the

magnitude of the population of foreign citizenship may tend to remain more or less stable or to grow slowly, while the number of foreign-born persons continues to increase.

6. In addition to the lack of comparability on immigrant populations, most OECD member countries have little information at their disposal on their expatriates.³ And those which have some information do not necessarily have a clear picture of the countries of destination or of the exact magnitudes of persons who have left the country. Finally, rare are the countries which have a precise picture of their expatriates by duration of stay abroad, level of qualification, occupation or branch of industry.

7. In developing countries, the question of the international mobility of highly-qualified workers is generally manifested through a concern about the so called “brain drain” and the loss of economic potential which could result from this. In OECD countries, the retention of qualified persons and the return of expatriates constitute important challenges to which several countries have tried to respond.⁴ Several recent studies undertaken at the OECD have demonstrated that the question is more complex than is often depicted (OECD, 2002; Dumont JC. and JB. Meyer, 2003). These studies also highlight the deficiencies and the gaps in the statistical data available, making it difficult to grasp the complex international mobility patterns of highly skilled workers. To date, only one study has attempted to estimate rates of emigration by country of origin and by level of qualification (Carrington and Detragiache, 1998).⁵ This study is widely cited but is now somewhat dated (it uses data from the 1990s), and is subject to a number of biases which limit its usefulness.

8. As a result, current statistics tend to show a rather imperfect image of the actual extent of migration in general and of the movements of the highly skilled in particular, both with respect to movements from developing to developed countries but also within the OECD area as well. With the 2000 round of censuses, however, virtually all OECD countries have incorporated in their census a question on the country of birth of persons enumerated, as well as on their nationality. With this information, it is possible to provide, for the first time, a detailed, comparable and reliable picture of immigrant populations within OECD countries, reflecting the cumulative effect of movements within and to the OECD area over the past decades. Not only can immigrant populations be compared on a common basis across countries, but the extent of migration from a single source country to each OECD country as well as to the OECD as a whole can be determined. And with additional information on the educational attainment of migrants, the cumulative impact of flows of human capital can be depicted and, in particular, the conventional wisdom on the brain drain confronted with actual data. As will be seen, the picture which emerges will confirm a certain number of commonly held views about international migration movements, but also reveal quite a few surprises.

9. This document is divided into four sections. The first section describes the new database that is the source of the information in this document. The second section presents the basic results derived from the new database on immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries. The third and fourth sections will discuss in detail the results on expatriates from OECD and non-member countries. The fifth section provides an overview of recent policy measures related to movements of the highly skilled in OECD countries. A summary and conclusions follow.

A new comparable database on international migrants

10. The information presented in this document is based on a data collection launched in July 2003, addressed to OECD National Statistical Offices (NSOs)⁶ and aimed at obtaining census data on the stock of the foreign-born population in OECD countries. The core objective of the project was to better measure and characterise foreign-born populations and especially, to obtain, by aggregating across receiving OECD countries, data on expatriates by country of origin.

11. The new database on immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries (see Box 1) is the first internationally comparable data set with detailed information on the foreign-born population for almost all member countries of the OECD. In addition, using the data base, it is possible to calculate 'emigration rates'⁷ to OECD countries by level of qualification and country of origin for approximately 100 countries. This provides a broad view of the significance of highly skilled emigration, for both OECD and less developed countries.

Box 1. Development of a database on international migrants in OECD countries

Most censuses in member countries were conducted around the year 2000 and the results are currently available for almost all of them. Due to their comprehensive coverage, censuses are particularly well adapted to identifying and studying small population groups. In several countries, however, there is no population census and it has been necessary to turn to data from population registers or from large-sample surveys. Census data were actually used for 23 of the 29 participating countries and other sources for the remainder (see Annex 1 for more detailed information); Iceland did not participated in the exercise. The data base currently includes data on the foreign-born in OECD countries by detailed place of birth, nationality and educational attainment (three levels). The data are incomplete for two countries and will be available in a revised version of the database in the near future.

The database covers 227 countries of origin and 29 receiving countries within the OECD area. Only 0.46% of the total population of all OECD countries did not report its place of birth and 0.24% did not report a specific country for the place of birth (either a region was specified or no answer was given). The level of education was reported for more than 98% of the population 15 years of age or older. Finally, complete information (i.e. detailed education and detailed place of birth) is available for 97.8% of the OECD population aged 15+. 'Emigration rates' by level of qualification have been calculated for more than 100 countries.

Data adjustments have been necessary for only two situations. Firstly, data for Japan and Korea were not available by country of birth. For these two countries, it has been assumed that the reported country of nationality is the country of birth. This seems a reasonable assumption for the foreign-born, given the very low rate and number of naturalisations in these two countries. However, it will tend to overestimate the number of foreign-born relative to other countries, because persons born in Japan or Korea to foreigners will tend also to be recorded as foreign and thus be classified as foreign-born.

The same assumption could not be made for Germany, where the available source was the Microcensus, a large-scale household sample survey.⁸ This source identifies whether or not a person was born abroad, but not the country of birth. Equating country of birth and country of nationality for Germany would have attributed "Germany" as the country of birth to naturalised foreign-born persons, whose numbers are not negligible, and to the numerous "ethnic" German immigrants who obtained German nationality upon entry into Germany. Another data source (the German Socio-Economic Panel) was used to adjust the data for Germany where this was possible (see Annex 1 for more details).

2. Immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries: first results

12. Table 1 compares the incidence of the foreign and foreign-born populations for almost all OECD countries. As is evident, it is in the settlement countries (i.e. Australia, Canada and New Zealand), as well as in Luxembourg and Switzerland, that the percentage of the foreign-born is highest, close to or exceeding 20% in all of these. In addition, certain European countries (e.g. Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden) have a percentage of immigrants at least as high as that recorded in the United States (approximately 12%).⁹ Likewise, the percentage of the foreign-born population exceeds 10% of the total

population in Belgium, France, Greece and Ireland. These figures are appreciably higher than those generally presented for the immigrant population, measured on the basis of foreign nationality and which never exceed 10%, except for Luxembourg and Switzerland. It is clear that many European countries have managed to admit and absorb immigrants in considerable numbers over the past decades, significantly more than is evident from looking at statistics on the resident foreign population.

Table 1. Percentage of foreign-born and non-citizens in the total population in OECD countries

	Percentage of foreign-born	Percentage of non-citizens
Mexico	0.5	..
Turkey	1.9	..
Poland	2.1	0.1
Slovak Republic	2.5	0.5
Finland	2.5	1.7
Hungary	2.9	0.9
Czech Republic	4.5	1.2
Spain	5.3	3.8
Portugal	6.3	2.2
Denmark	6.8	5.0
Norway	7.3	4.3
United Kingdom	8.3	..
France	10.0	5.6
Netherlands	10.1	4.2
Greece	10.3	7.0
Ireland	10.4	5.9
Belgium	10.7	8.2
Sweden	12.0	5.3
United States	12.3	6.6
Germany	12.5	..
Austria	12.5	8.8
Canada	19.3	5.3
New Zealand	19.5	..
Switzerland	22.4	20.5
Australia	23.0	7.4
Luxembourg	32.6	36.9
Japan ¹	..	1.0
Korea ¹	..	0.3
Weighted average for above countries	7.8	4.5

1. In the absence of place-of-birth data for Japan and Korea, it has been assumed that all non-citizens are foreign-born and that nationals are native-born (see Annex 1 for further details).

Source: See Annex 1, Secretariat calculations and OECD 2003 for the percentage of foreigners in the United Kingdom and Germany.

13. Caution, however, needs to be exercised in interpreting the data for some countries. In France, but also in Portugal, for example, the foreign-born population includes a significant proportion of persons


born abroad as citizens and repatriated from former colonies. Thus, about 1.6 million people born with French nationality outside of France (mainly in Algeria) are counted in the population census of 1999. A similar situation occurs for other countries and in particular the United States, because of persons born overseas of American parents (for instance, children born to military personnel stationed abroad). Unfortunately, few countries¹⁰ collect information on nationality at birth, which is what is needed to distinguish the immigration of non-citizens from the entries of persons born as citizens abroad. Estimates for the share of the foreign-born taking into account this phenomenon are presented in Table A1 in Annex 2 for countries for which it is possible to do so.

14. For certain countries, in particular the United States, Australia or Canada, statistics on non-citizens are seldom published. Such statistics provide another perspective on migration. For example, 6.6% of the population of the United States does not have United States citizenship. The figure for Australia is 7.4%, that for Canada 5.3%, levels comparable to those recorded in some European countries such as France, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands. It is clear that for these countries as well, data on persons of foreign citizenship would not give an accurate picture of the magnitude of their immigrant populations.

15. The differences between the statistics on non-citizens and on the foreign-born are partly attributable to the varying requirements across countries for obtaining the citizenship of the country of residence, and to the fact that in many countries, persons born in the country of parents of foreign nationality do not automatically acquire the citizenship of the host country. Table A2 in Annex 2 confirms that in Australia and in Canada, but also in Sweden and the Netherlands¹¹, a large share of the foreign-born acquires the citizenship of the host country. On the other hand, the acquisition of citizenship is more difficult and less common in Luxembourg and Switzerland.¹²

16. The distribution of foreign-born residents in OECD countries by area of origin (see Chart 1 and Table A3 in Annex 2) is equally informative. In the OECD zone, people born in North Africa (Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco) are at least as numerous as persons born in China. Migrants originating from North Africa are concentrated in three European countries (i.e. France, Spain and the Netherlands). On the whole, Asians and Latin Americans (excluding Caribbean countries) account for more than 15 million immigrants each. Spain, a recent immigration country, alone has received more than 740 000 people from Latin America, and the United States, approximately 13.5 million. However, it is continental Europe (including Turkey and central Eastern Europe), which accounts for the largest number of expatriates to OECD countries. There are, for example, nearly 2 million immigrants from the enlarged European Union (EU25) in each of Canada, Australia, France and Germany.

Chart 1. Foreign-born by region of origin in OECD countries, percentages



Note: "Other Europe" and "Other Africa" include data for not stated European countries and not stated African countries, respectively.

Source: See Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

17. The countries which practise a selective immigration policy based on human capital criteria stand out in Table A4 in Annex 2 as the countries with the highest percentages of highly qualified immigrants.¹³ This is the case for example in Australia, Canada and to a lesser extent the United Kingdom, Ireland, Korea, Norway and New Zealand, where 30 to 42% of immigrants have a higher education degree. In addition, in a number of countries, foreign-born persons with a doctoral degree account for a high proportion of all persons holding such degrees in the host country. In the United States, even if a significant part of the immigrants are not highly qualified, more than 440 000 foreign-born persons hold a PhD¹⁴. This accounts for approximately 25% of the total stock of PhDs in the country. The proportion of foreign-born doctorates in Sweden is comparable and in Australia and Canada it stands even higher, at 45% and 54%, respectively.

18. The situation in Austria, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain or Turkey differs significantly. In these countries, at least 50% of the foreign-born have less than upper-secondary education. In Austria, the difference between the percentage of low-qualified among the foreign and native-born populations is particularly large (approximately 16 percentage points). This is also the case in Poland and the Czech Republic.

3. Expatriates of OECD member countries residing in another member country

19. Much attention has been directed in recent years within OECD countries at the emigration of highly qualified persons, attracted to countries where job opportunities are more prevalent and research funding more generous. Solid evidence regarding the extent of this phenomenon has been notably absent from the public debate. Although the database described here does not allow one to remedy this as yet with respect to recent departures, it does provide a broad overall picture of expatriation over the past decades.

20. Table A5 in Annex 2 presents the complete data on expatriates from OECD countries. It gives the stock of persons born in one OECD country and residing in another (see Box 2 for more information on alternative methods for obtaining data on expatriates). In the 29 OECD countries currently under review, 36.3 million persons, i.e. 46% of the total foreign-born population, come from another OECD country. In certain host countries, such as Luxembourg, the Slovak Republic, Ireland, Mexico, the Czech Republic and to a lesser extent Switzerland and Belgium, the share of the foreign-born from other OECD countries is very high (between 65% and 85%). At the other extreme, it is close to 24% in Hungary, Poland and Korea and only 11% in Japan.

21. The largest expatriate group consists of persons born in Mexico, with nearly 9.5 million people, of whom the vast majority are resident in the United States. The number of persons born in Germany and in the United Kingdom residing in other OECD member countries is also large, more than 3 million people for each of them. The number of persons born in Turkey, Italy and Poland and residing in other OECD countries amounts to over 2 million persons each.

Box 2 : Counting expatriates: Methods and limits

Identifying and counting expatriates abroad is not without difficulties and different methods may produce different estimates. There are three main types of estimates, each of them with its advantages and shortcomings: (i) statistics of people registered in embassies and consulates overseas; (ii) emigration surveys in origin countries; and (iii) compilation of statistics from receiving countries.

Administrative data from embassies and consulates provide an interesting source for estimating the stock of nationals abroad. Indeed in most cases expatriates need to register to receive social benefits or pension payments, to pay taxes, to vote overseas, to renew identity papers, or simply to report their presence in the country. Unfortunately, because registration is not always compulsory or enforced, the data coverage is not perfect and may vary a lot from one country to another. For instance, the estimate of French citizens living in other OECD countries by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1.4 million in 1999) is more than double the number of official registrations at consulates. Furthermore, because people do not necessarily deregister and because some people may register even for short stays abroad (especially in countries where there is some risk), overestimation is also a problem.

Several countries have included specific questions on residents temporarily overseas in Censuses or have implemented specific surveys to identify their nationals abroad. It is possible to ask an interviewed household member how many usual members of the household are currently abroad. This type of estimate, however, covers only short stays abroad (including those for reasons of tourism) and excludes many long-term emigrants, because the situations in which the entire household has settled overseas are not covered.

In this paper, the expatriate community is identified by compiling the data on the foreign born by place of birth in all OECD countries. The estimate is thus based on the place of birth and is not directly comparable to the other sources mentioned previously (see Table 2). One of the major problems with this approach is that it is not always possible to identify foreign-born persons who were citizens of their current country of residence at birth (e.g. children born overseas of national parents). This situation can be particularly problematic for countries which have had important communities abroad. Another problem arises from the fact that some people do not report their place of birth in censuses. Persons not specifying a place of birth represent 10% of the total population in the Slovak Republic, about 5.7% in Australia, and 4% in New Zealand and Switzerland (see Table A1 in Annex 2). Furthermore, some censuses do not identify systematically all countries of origin (e.g. Korea only records 17 foreign nationalities in its Census). Consequently, the estimates presented in this paper on expatriates by country of origin should be considered a lower bound.

Table 2. **OECD expatriates in other OECD countries**


	Nationals registered abroad at embassies or consulates ¹	Native-born living abroad (OECD Censuses)
United States	3 071 167	1 227 249
France	1 392 764	1 119 130
Switzerland	828 036	319 176
Australia	562 668	328 405
Japan	556 561	656 690

1. 1999 for France and the United States; 2000 for Switzerland; 2001 for Australia and Japan.

Sources: Nationals registered abroad at embassies or consulates: Australia: ABS Australian Demographic Statistics Quarterly and Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; France: Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Direction des Français à l'étranger et des étrangers en France; Japan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Consular and Migration Affairs Department; Switzerland: DFAE, Service des Suisses de l'étranger; United States: US Census Bureau and Bureau of Consular Affairs; Native-born living abroad: OECD censuses (excluding Italy) and Secretariat calculations.

22. Expressed as a percentage of the total population, almost 24% of people born in Ireland are currently living in another OECD member country (see Chart 2). Other significant expatriate communities include persons born in New Zealand (16%), Portugal (13.7%), Luxembourg (12.8%) and Mexico (9.9%).

Chart 2. **Expatriates as a percentage of all native-born, OECD countries**
Total population and highly skilled



Note: CSFR stands for "Former Czechoslovakia". Data for Korea are partial as several OECD countries do not systematically distinguish between people born in South and North Korea.
Source: See Annex 1, Secretariat calculations based on OECD censuses.

23. A closer look at these first results reveals a number of other interesting findings. The Korean community in France, for example, is larger than those of all the other European countries¹⁵; the Dutch are more numerous in Canada than in the United States; there are nearly 110 000 British-born persons in

Spain¹⁶; there are approximately 450 000 people persons born in the United States living in Europe but 4.6 million persons born in Europe and living in the United States (of which 70 600 persons were born in Austria). Other examples include the high mobility among the Scandinavian countries, the high geographical dispersion of persons of German origin or the large numbers of persons born in France and living in Portugal or born in the United States and living in Mexico or Ireland. There are almost as many British-born persons in France (84 500), as there are French-born persons in the United Kingdom (96 300).

24. Even when information on the size of expatriate communities in member countries is available, there is not often information on the characteristics of this population. Speculation on the “brain drain” regularly feeds the media in certain countries, generally without credible statistical evidence. Some national studies exist (e.g. Hugo and *alii*, 2003 ; Barre and *alii*, 2003 ; Ferrand, 2001; Saint-Paul, 2004), but they do not always make it possible to cover the topic extensively.

25. Table 3 shows the distribution of educational attainment for expatriates from each OECD country living in other OECD countries. It reveals the relative importance of the migration of highly qualified persons (i.e. persons with tertiary education). It is for the United States and Japan that the proportion of expatriates with tertiary education is highest (almost 50%). The selectivity of emigration with respect to qualifications, measured by the difference between the proportion of expatriates and that of the native-born with tertiary-level attainment, highlights several European countries, notably France, Austria and Switzerland (at least 20 percentage points difference). Hungary and Denmark also have a relatively significant proportion of their expatriates who are graduates of higher education institutions compared to the native-born. On the other hand, emigration originating from Portugal, Turkey, Mexico or the Slovak Republic is essentially not highly qualified.

26. With the notable exceptions of some Central and Eastern European Countries as well as Mexico, Ireland, Korea and Finland, highly skilled immigration towards OECD countries from the rest of the world systematically exceeds highly skilled emigration from OECD countries to other OECD countries (see Chart 3)¹⁷. On this measure (and provided that expatriation of the highly skilled to non-OECD countries can be assumed to be relatively uncommon), most OECD countries would seem to benefit from the international mobility of the highly skilled.

27. Within the OECD area, only the United States, Australia, Canada, Switzerland, Spain, Sweden, Luxembourg and Norway (in this order) are net beneficiaries of highly skilled migration from other OECD countries. The United Kingdom has 700 000 more highly skilled expatriates in OECD countries than it has highly skilled immigrants from other OECD countries. Comparable figures exceed 500 000 for Germany, 400 000 for Mexico and 300 000 for Poland. France and Belgium have almost as many highly skilled immigrants from, as expatriates, to OECD countries. This of course gives only a partial picture of brain drain / brain exchange, because it does not include movements of the highly skilled between non-OECD and OECD countries. When movements from all countries to the OECD are included, the picture changes significantly.


Table 3. Number and distribution of OECD expatriates by level of education

	Tertiary	Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	Less than upper secondary	unknown	Total
Australia	116 513 45.9	84 091 33.1	53 308 21.0	13 402	267 314
Austria	105 149 30.0	164 504 47.0	80 401 23.0	15 970	366 024
Belgium	108 797 34.6	104 109 33.1	101 295 32.2	7 343	321 544
Canada	417 750 40.6	411 595 40.0	200 175 19.4	15 458	1 044 978
Former CSFR	32 796 30.1	46 232 42.5	29 781 27.4	1 175	109 984
Czech Republic	53 084 25.2	106 613 50.5	51 239 24.3	4 943	215 879
Denmark	59 905 37.4	61 958 38.7	38 317 23.9	12 829	173 009
Finland	67 358 26.3	108 708 42.4	80 378 31.3	8 801	265 245
France	348 432 36.4	313 538 32.8	294 700 30.8	56 911	1 013 581
Germany	865 255 30.4	1201 040 42.1	783 364 27.5	84 098	2933 757
Greece	118 318 16.6	190 647 26.7	405 698 56.8	20 767	735 430
Hungary	90 246 29.6	129 452 42.4	85 451 28.0	9 773	314 922
Iceland	7 792 36.1	8 552 39.7	5 223 24.2	1 503	23 070
Ireland	186 554 27.5	143 679 21.2	347 073 51.2	115 010	792 316
Italy	300 631 13.0	619 946 26.8	1 395 714 60.3	114 048	2 430 339
Japan	281 664 49.7	220 158 38.9	64 529 11.4	9 641	575 992
Korea	134 926 44.2	116 535 38.2	53 568 17.6	7 509	312 538
Luxembourg	7 115 27.9	8 252 32.3	10 179 39.8	1 618	27 164
Mexico	472 784 5.6	2057 184 24.4	5 900 254 70.0	1 159	8 431 381
Netherlands	209 988 36.1	203 897 35.0	168 284 28.9	34 740	616 909
New Zealand	166 854 44.6	84 113 22.5	122 942 32.9	36 754	410 663
Norway	39 152 33.9	45 054 39.0	31 263 27.1	6 610	122 079
Poland	328 058 26.6	518 868 42.0	387 023 31.4	42 533	1 276 482
Portugal	82 938 6.7	295 053 24.0	850 758 69.2	39 977	1 268 726
Slovak Republic	51 798 14.0	168 803 45.5	150 445 40.5	3 524	374 570
Spain	137 708 18.7	204 284 27.8	392 793 53.5	28 228	763 013
Sweden	78 054 40.1	74 559 38.3	42 167 21.6	11 824	206 604
Switzerland	93 859 36.5	94 918 36.9	68 182 26.5	5 497	262 456
Turkey	138 323 6.4	467 630 21.7	1 547 933 71.9	41 759	2 195 645
United Kingdom	1 265 863 41.2	1 006 180 32.8	798 421 26.0	159 212	3 229 676
United States	390 244 49.9	220 869 28.3	170 665 21.8	27 762	809 540

Note: Population aged 15 and over.

Sources: See Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

Chart 3. Immigrant and emigrant population aged 15+ with tertiary education in OECD countries



Note: Data for Korean emigrants are partial as several OECD countries do not systematically distinguish between South and North Korea.

Source: see Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

28. The difference between the number of highly skilled emigrants to OECD countries and highly skilled immigrants from all countries is largely positive in the United States (+8.2 million), Canada and Australia, but also in France and Germany, even though these countries have a significant number of highly skilled expatriates in other OECD countries. Highly skilled immigration expressed as a percentage of the total highly skilled workforce is particularly significant (over 20%) in Australia, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Canada and New Zealand. The percentage of the highly skilled who are expatriates is below 10% for most OECD countries (see Chart 2 above) and particularly low in Japan, the United States, Spain and Australia. Conversely, more than 10% of the highly skilled born in Switzerland, Portugal, Austria, or the United Kingdom are living in other OECD countries. This percentage is over 20% for three countries: Luxembourg (22.2%), Ireland (24.2%) and New Zealand (24.2%). Table 4 clearly confirms the selective character of migration (in favour of the highly skilled) in OECD countries. This phenomenon is the result of pull factors attributable to selective migration policies in receiving countries, but also to other factors such as the fact that highly qualified persons are more tuned into the international labour market (because of social capital, language skills, access to information ...) and have more resources to finance a move.

**Table 4. Persons with tertiary education by place of birth,
selected OECD countries**

Percentages

	Native-Born	Foreign-Born	Expatriates
Canada	31.5	38.0	40.6
France	16.9	18.1	36.4
Germany	19.5	15.5	30.4
Hungary	10.7	19.8	29.6
Korea	26.7	32.2	44.2
New Zealand	27.2	31.0	44.6
Sweden	22.8	24.2	40.1
Switzerland	18.1	23.7	36.5
United States	26.9	24.8	49.9

Source: see Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

29. Among non-member countries the biggest expatriate community is that originating in the former USSR with 4.2 million people, followed by the former Yugoslavia (2.2 million), India (1.9 million), the Philippines (1.8 million), China (1.7 million), Vietnam (1.5 million), Morocco (1.4 million) and Puerto Rico (1.3 million)¹⁸. Among persons with tertiary education, the former USSR still ranks first (1.3 million) with India having the second largest expatriate community (1 million). (See Table A6 in Annex 2)

30. To estimate 'emigration rates' by level of qualification for non-member countries, information on the level of education of the relevant population in the country of origin is required. Two sets of estimates have been compiled for such countries, based on two data sources (see Box 3). The results are presented in Table 6 for the 15 countries with the lowest 'emigration rates' for the highly qualified aged 15 and over, as well as for the 15 countries with the highest rates. Most OECD countries, which are not included in Table 5, would tend to fall among countries having lower rates.

31. Among countries with low 'emigration rates' of highly qualified persons (ie. inferior to 5%), we find most of the large countries included in the database (ie. Brazil, Indonesia, Bangladesh, India and China). At the other end of the spectrum, smaller countries, a number of which are islands such as Jamaica, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, Mauritius or Fiji, have more than 40% of their highly skilled populations abroad and sometimes as much as 80%. The importance of the size of the origin country is confirmed by simple correlation analysis (see Chart 4a).

32. This first result stresses the heterogeneity of situations among non-member countries and the possibility that emigration of highly skilled workers may adversely affect small countries, preventing them from reaching a critical mass of human resources, which would be necessary to foster long-term economic development¹⁹. In addition, labour market might be too small to absorb workers with highly specialized skills. Nonetheless, there may be compensating effects associated with remittances sent back to the source country by such emigrants.

Table 5. **Highly skilled expatriates from selected non-OECD countries**¹
Percentages of total expatriates

		Highly skilled aged Cohen and Soto (2001) 15+	Highly skilled aged Barro and Lee (2000) 15+	
15 non- OECD countries with the lowest percentage of highly skilled 15+ expatriates in OECD countries	Brazil	1.7	Brazil	1.2
	Myanmar	1.7	Thailand	1.4
	Indonesia	1.9	Indonesia	1.5
	Thailand	1.9	Paraguay	1.8
	Bangladesh	2.0	Argentina	1.8
	Paraguay	2.0	China	2.4
	Nepal	2.1	Myanmar	2.4
	India	3.1	Peru	2.7
	Bolivia	3.1	Nepal	2.9
	China	3.2	Bangladesh	3.0
	Jordan	3.2	Bolivia	3.1
	Venezuela	3.3	India	3.4
	Costa Rica	4.0	Egypt	3.4
	Syria	4.3	Venezuela	3.5
	Egypt	4.4	Swaziland	3.5
15 non-OECD countries with the highest percentage of highly skilled 15+ expatriates in OECD countries	Guyana	83.0	Guyana	76.9
	Jamaica	81.9	Jamaica	72.6
	Haiti	78.5	Guinea-Bissau	70.3
	Trinidad and Tobago	76.0	Haiti	68.0
	Fiji	61.9	Trinidad and Tobago	66.1
	Angola	53.7	Mozambique	52.3
	Cyprus	53.3	Mauritius	50.1
	Mauritius	53.2	Barbados	47.1
	Mozambique	47.1	Fiji	42.9
	Ghana	45.1	Gambia	42.3
	United Rep. of Tanzania	41.7	Congo	33.7
	Uganda	36.4	Sierra Leone	32.4
	Kenya	35.9	Ghana	31.2
	Burundi	34.3	Kenya	27.8
	Sierra Leone	33.3	Cyprus	26.0

1. Two different sources for the educational attainment of non-OECD countries have been used. They are identified at the top of each column. See Box 3 and bibliography for the detailed references.

Box 3 : Estimation of ‘emigration rates’ by educational attainment and country of origin

Until the constitution of the data set described in this paper, there was limited data on the extent of international mobility of the highly skilled. One study by Carrington and Detragiache (1998), which has recently been updated by Adams (2003), relies on United States census data on the foreign-born and OECD immigrant stock data from the Trends in International Migration data base to construct a data base for emigration by level of education and by country of origin. The authors use the United States 1990 Census data to determine the educational profile of immigrants by country of birth and apply it to immigrants (in many cases, foreigners) living in other OECD countries to estimate the total stocks of migrants by level of education and country of origin. The Barro and Lee (1993) database on educational attainment levels is the source for the stock of the population by level of education in countries of origin. This then becomes the denominator of reference to estimate the emigration rates.

The estimates based on this methodology are subject to a number of limitations. One significant problem concerns the assumptions made because of data availability limitations. In particular, the foreign-born population in EU countries is assumed to be the foreign population and foreigners of a particular nationality are considered to have the same educational profile as the foreign-born of the United States. As a result, the estimates tend to be problematical for small source countries and countries whose citizens tend to migrate to countries other than the United States. In addition, Cohen and Soto (2001) have shown that the Barro and Lee (1993) database on educational attainment is of uneven quality.

The database on immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries, which is the basis of this document, has direct measures of the educational attainment of immigrants for all OECD receiving countries, and thus can avoid making the assumptions made in previous studies. ‘Emigration rates’ can be produced by level of qualification and country of origin. The ‘emigration rate’ for country i and education level l (‘Emigration rate $_{i,l}$ ’) is calculated by dividing the expatriate population from the country of origin i and level of education l ($Expatriates_{i,l}$) by the total native-born population of the same country and level of education ($Native\ Born_{i,l} = Expatriates_{i,l} + Resident\ Native\ born_{i,l}$) (see also footnote 4). Three levels of qualification are considered (see Annex 1 for more details). Highly skilled persons correspond to those with a tertiary level of education.


Two sets of estimates of the $Resident\ Native\ born_{i,l}$, using two reference data bases for the structure of education of the population 15+ in origin countries, have been produced. The first makes use of an updated version of Barro and Lee (1993) for the year 2000 which covers 113 countries (Barro and Lee, 2000). The second database covers 95 countries (Cohen and Soto, 2001). The authors of the latter have used the OECD education database plus some other sources for non-member countries to construct a new database on human capital stock in 2000. Data for the total population come from the World Development Indicators. A Spearman rank correlation test confirms that the two calculations produce a similar classification ($\rho=0.94$), despite significant differences for some countries (e.g. Argentina, Chile, Zimbabwe, Singapore and Uruguay).

Because of differences in the population stocks between the World Bank figures and those obtained directly from OECD censuses (partly attributable to differences in reference years) and differences in the specification of levels of education, some differences appear when comparing the ‘emigration rates’ calculated for OECD countries from these two data sets with those discussed and presented earlier for OECD countries alone, based on census data.

33. The world map (see map 1) presents ‘emigration rates’ of the highly skilled for all countries, with African countries standing out as those having particularly high ‘emigration rates’. Anglophone African countries as well as Portuguese-speaking countries (e.g. Mozambique and Angola, but also Cape Verde)


record the highest brain drain rates. Emigration of the highly skilled is also quite significant in Central America but more moderate in Asia, with the relative exceptions of Hong Kong and Singapore. The former USSR faces intensive migration from former soviet republics towards Russia, which unfortunately it is not possible to illustrate here²⁰. However, emigration of the highly skilled from countries of the former USSR, considered as a whole, towards OECD countries remains moderate relative to the total stock of qualified persons in these countries.

**Map 1. Percentage of expatriates to OECD countries
among all highly skilled born in the country**



34. Determinants of emigration of the highly skilled are not easy to identify empirically, even though economic theory predicts that differences in wage levels and in returns to education between sending and receiving countries should be significant elements. Charts 4b and c show that the correlation between the 'emigration rate' of people aged 15+ or of the highly skilled is not strongly correlated to either the unemployment rate in origin countries or to GDP per capita at PPP²¹. On the other hand, Chart 4d illustrates the strong selectivity of migration in favour of the highly skilled. For almost all countries reviewed, the 'emigration rate' of the highly skilled exceeds that of persons 15 and over as a whole.

Chart 4. Emigration rate for 15+ and highly skilled 15+ associated with various socio-economic characteristics for non-OECD countries



Note: The regression curves represent a power regression in Chart 4a and a logarithmic regression in Chart 4c.

Sources: Emigration rates are calculated with Cohen and Soto (2001) data. Data on unemployment come from the ILO (Laborsta) and data on GDP per capital at PPP (2001) from World Bank (WDI).

Recent policy measures in OECD countries for facilitating the international recruitment of the highly skilled.

35. The above paragraphs have provided a descriptive overview of, among others, movements of the highly skilled from and to OECD countries. The development of information technology and the growing role of human capital in economic growth has contributed to increasing the demand for skilled labour significantly in most OECD countries during the 1990s (OECD, 2002). IT competencies and skills, however, are not the only ones in demand. Population ageing in most OECD countries and the related increase in health care requirements are increasing the demand for medical personnel. Doctors, nurses, nursing auxiliaries and care assistants are particularly sought after in several OECD countries. The same applies to teachers, translators, human resources in science and technology or in the biomedical or agro-food sectors, for example.

36. In the medium term in several OECD countries, retiring baby-boomers will generate relatively high demand for replacement labour in these and other specific occupations. While some and perhaps many of these vacancies will be filled by native-born new entrants and re-entrants to the work force, some will also be filled by immigrants.

37. Competition is keen among OECD countries to attract human resources they lack and to retain those who might emigrate. Many countries amended their legislation in the late 1990s to facilitate the entry of skilled foreign workers and to allow foreign students to access their labour markets (under certain conditions and for specific occupations) upon graduation (see Tremblay, 2001 and OECD, 2004). Most countries introduced more flexibility into their existing labour migration policies, while others also launched more specific recruitment programmes to meet labour shortages (Doudeijns and Dumont, 2002).

The recent economic downturn did not significantly affect this trend although some countries have reintroduced restrictions in some sectors.

38. In Denmark, France, Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, the application of labour-market-testing criteria has been relaxed for those occupations reflecting current labour market needs. These occupations include IT specialists, highly skilled workers and, in some cases, biotechnology, medicine, healthcare and education professionals, as specified, for example, in the United Kingdom's *Shortage Occupation List*²².

39. Although family preference is the cornerstone of permanent immigration policy in the United States, the country nonetheless admits a large number of permanent highly skilled foreign professionals (almost 180 000 in 2002), as well as highly skilled workers on renewable three-year visas (H-1B visas). This temporary immigration is subject to an annual quota which was set at 195 000 until the end of 2003 (it has been reduced to 65 000 since then). In 2001 in Switzerland, the quota for highly skilled workers was increased by almost 30% even though it had remained unchanged for more than 10 years prior to this. Japan and Korea share a determination to confine immigration to highly skilled workers. In the past ten years, high-skilled immigration has increased by 40% in Japan and more than ten-fold in Korea.

40. Some OECD countries have also created new programmes to facilitate the international recruitment of highly skilled workers. Norway and the United Kingdom, for instance, have introduced programmes to allow highly skilled foreign workers to come to seek work for a limited period of time. Although these programmes are still very limited (approximately 5000 persons for each country), they represent a significant change with regard to the usual migration policies of European countries, which generally require a job offer as a prerequisite for labour migration. Germany, on its side, has developed a special programme to recruit IT specialists, which has been extended until January 2005. Approximately 15 800 permits have been granted between August 2000 and January 2004. In addition, the German authorities have recently reformed their immigration law to facilitate the entry of highly skilled workers, such as engineers, computer technicians, researchers and business leaders.

41. In settlement countries, such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand²³, permanent immigration is subject to a points system with an increasing emphasis on the potential immigrant's profile (age, education, skills, work experience). Permanent skilled immigration to these countries has significantly increased in the past four years (by almost 25%) and temporary immigration of highly skilled workers is facilitated more and more. In a similar vein, the Czech Republic has recently implemented a programme aiming at recruiting highly skilled workers through a point system.

42. In addition to immigration policy measures, some OECD countries have introduced specific fiscal incentives to attract highly skilled migrants (see Table 6). Some of these offer virtual income-tax-free status for up to 5 years for certain categories of highly qualified personnel most in need, or large tax deductions (e.g. 25% in Sweden, 30% in the Netherlands, 35% in Austria or 40% in Korea). New legislation along the same lines has been adopted recently in France and is under consideration in New Zealand.

Table 6. Fiscal incentives for highly skilled immigrants

Australia	In order to encourage businesses requiring a skilled labour force to locate in Australia, since July 1, 2002, foreign source income of eligible temporary residents is exempt from tax for 4 years.
Austria	An individual who has not had a residence in Austria during the past 10 years, who maintains his primary residence abroad and has an assignment with an Austrian employer for less than 5 years benefits from tax deductions for up to 35% of the taxable salary income for expenses incurred in maintaining a household in Austria, educational expenses and leave allowances.
Belgium	Certain foreign executives, specialists and researchers residing temporarily in Belgium are eligible for a special tax regime that treats them as non-residents. Taxable income is calculated by adjusting the remuneration according to the number of days spent outside Belgium. Reimbursements of expenses incurred by an employee as a result of his temporary stay in Belgium are not subject to personal income tax.
Denmark	A special expatriate tax regime applies to foreigners employed by Danish-resident employers. Under qualifying contracts, salary income is taxed at a flat rate of 25% instead of the usual rates of 39% to 59%. To qualify, expatriates must reside in Denmark and earn more than 50 900 DKK a month in 2001. This tax regime is valid for up to 36 months.
Finland	A foreigner working in Finland may qualify for a special tax at a flat rate of 35% during a period of 24 months if he receives any Finnish-source income for duties requiring special expertise and earns a cash salary of €5,800 or more per month. This law provides that the expert has not been resident in Finland any time during the five preceding years.
France	Recent legislation changes which aim at encouraging foreign professionals to work in France include a 5-year tax exemption for bonuses paid to foreign expatriates where these are directly related to their assignment in France, and tax deductions for social security payments made by the expatriates in their home countries. A deduction will also be available for pension and health care payments made outside France. It applies to foreign professionals (including French nationals with a foreign labour contract who have been residing out of France for a least 10 years) coming to France from 1 January 2004.
Japan	For expatriates living in Japan, relocation allowances and once -a-year home-leave allowances are generally tax-free
Korea	Since January 2003, tax-free allowances of up 40 per cent of salary to cover cost of living, housing, home leave and education. Tax-exempt salary for certain sectors for up to 5 years if the individual is (i) employed under a tax-exempt technology -inducement contract or (ii) a foreign technician with experience in certain industries.
Netherlands	Expatriates may qualify for a special facility called the “30 per cent” (previously the “35 per cent”). This enables an employer to pay, for up to 10 years, employees seconded in the Netherlands a tax-free allowance of up to 30% of regularly received employment income and a tax-free reimbursement of school fees for children attending international schools.
New Zealand	A government discussion document, released in November 2003, outlines proposals to exempt the foreign-sourced income of certain migrants and returning New Zealanders from New Zealand's international tax regime. It is aimed at ensuring that New Zealand's tax system does not discourage the recruitment of overseas employees. The Government has proposed two possible approaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a narrow exemption that would apply for seven years and focus on those tax rules that are more comprehensive than the international norm; and • a second option that would apply for three years and provide eligible taxpayers with a broad exemption from paying New Zealand tax on all foreign -sourced income.
Norway	Expatriates expected to reside in Norway for 4 years or less may be allowed a 15 per cent standard deduction from their gross income instead of itemised personal deductions.
Canada	Researchers can benefit from 5-year tax relief in the province of Québec on 75% of their personal income if they settle in Quebec to work in R&D in a firm.
Sweden	Since 1 st January 2001 foreign key personnel who are experts and scientists with knowledge and skills that are scarce in Sweden may benefit from a new expatriate regime. No taxes are paid for the first 25% of their income. This is valid for a maximum period of 10 years.
United Kingdom	Persons who are seconded to the UK and declare their intention to remain in the UK on a temporary basis, can claim tax relief on their housing costs and traveling costs. Non-ordinary residents can also claim tax relief for days worked outside the UK.

Sources: UK Home Treasury (2003), Ernst and Young (2001) and national ministries.

Conclusions

43. If receiving countries and migrants are generally believed to profit from the opening up of borders to international migration of highly skilled human capital, the impact on sending countries is not so clear. For instance, some observers have claimed that the increase in the expected return on human capital as a result of expatriation increases incentives to invest in human capital in sending countries and that this increase is sufficient to offset the depletion effect of emigration on human resources in these countries. This argument seems problematical, both theoretically and empirically²⁴. On the other hand, the potential negative impact of emigration on the supply of human capital needs to be seen in the context of the employment situation in the origin country (the extent of participation and unemployment, the productivity of human capital). In many cases, expatriated professionals would have had few opportunities to work at home in their field.

44. Results presented in this paper based on the new database on immigrants and expatriates in OECD countries, show that:

- The percentage of the foreign-born in European OECD countries is generally higher than the percentage of foreigners. Migration to a number of European countries (e.g. Sweden, Germany, Austria, Greece or France) is significantly higher than is generally reported and approaches levels that are as high in relative terms as observed, for example, in the United States.
- The stock figures shown here reflect migration waves over a long period. Although recent migration to OECD countries tends to come largely from non-OECD countries, migration between OECD countries continues to have a significant impact. This migration is quite selective towards highly skilled migrants, underlining the effects of the current competition between OECD countries to attract 'the best and the brightest' from other countries, both inside and outside the OECD area.
- In most OECD countries, the number of immigrants with tertiary education exceeds the number of highly qualified expatriates to other OECD countries. On this measure, most OECD countries would appear to benefit from the international mobility of the highly skilled. This conclusion, however, must be considered as tentative, because the database described here does not cover expatriates to OECD non-member countries.
- Among non-member countries the impact of the international mobility of the highly skilled is diverse. The largest developing countries seem not be significantly affected and indeed may benefit from indirect effects associated with this mobility (return migration, technology transfers, remittances ...). At the other end of the spectrum, some of the smallest countries, especially in the Caribbean and in Africa, face significant 'emigration rates' of their elites. Further analysis is needed to better understand the determinants, the dynamics and the impact of the international mobility of the highly skilled on these countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams RH., 2003, *International Migration, Remittances, and the Brain Drain. A Study of 24 Labor-Exporting Countries*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3 069
- Barre R., V. Hernandez, JB. Meyer and D. Vinck, 2003, *Diasporas scientifiques*, Éditions IRD, Paris.
- Barro RJ. and JW. Lee, 1993, *International Comparisons of Educational Attainment*, Journal of Monetary Economics, 32, 363-94 (<http://www.nuff.ox.ac.uk/Economics/Growth/barlee.htm>)
- Barro RJ. and JW. Lee, 2000, *International data on Educational Attainment : updates and implications*, NBER Working Paper n°7911 (<http://www2.cid.harvard.edu/ciddata/>)
- Carrington W. and E. Detragiache, 1998, *How big is the brain drain ?*, IMF working Paper WP/98/102.
- Cohen D. and M. Soto, 2001, *Growth and Human Capital: good data, good results*, OECD Development Centre WP n°179 (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/13/2669521.xls>)
- Commander S., M. Kangasniemi and L.A. Winters, (2004) *The brain drain: curse or boon? A survey of the literature*, forthcoming in R. Baldwin and L.A. Winters (eds.), *“Challenges to Globalisation”*, NBER and University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Doudeijns M. and JC. Dumont, 2002, *Immigration and labour shortages: evaluation of needs and limits of selection policies in the recruitment of foreign labour*, presented at the OECD-EU conference on “The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration” - Brussels, 21-22 January 2003 (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/13/59/15474016.pdf>).
- Dumont JC., 1999, *Santé, Éducation et Développement: une approche systémique de l'hétérogénéité du capital humain*, PhD Thesis, Université Paris Dauphine, Paris.
- Dumont JC. and JB. Meyer, 2003, *The international mobility of health professionals: an evaluation and analysis based on the case of South Africa*, in Trends in International Migration, OECD, Paris
- Eisenbaum B., 2005 forthcoming, *The Brain Drain of Scientists from Russia*, OECD, Paris.
- Ferrand A., 2001, *Rapport d'information au Sénat chargé d'étudier l'ensemble des questions liées à l'expatriation des compétences, des capitaux et des entreprises*, Rapport n°386.
- Hugo G., Rudd D. and K. Harris, 2003, *Emigration of Australians : Recent developments and policy issues.*, National Centre for Social Application GIS, University of Adelaide.
- Little M., (forthcoming), *New Zealand's Skilled immigration policy: an overview of the new selection framework.*, OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, OECD Paris.
- OECD, 2002, *The International Mobility of the Highly Skilled*, OECD, Paris.

OECD, 2003, *Trends in International Migration*, OECD, Paris

OECD, 2004 forthcoming, *A new database on the international mobility of the highly skilled and policy options*, OECD Policy Brief.

OECD, 2004, *Migration for Employment. Bilateral agreements at a crossroad*, OECD, Paris.

Saint-Paul G., 2004, *The brain drain: Some evidence from European Expatriates in the United States*, IZA DP N°1310.

Tremblay K., 2001, *Student mobility between and towards OECD countries: a comparative analysis*, in Trends in International Migration, OECD, Paris

¹ Some foreign-born persons were born abroad with the citizenship of the current country of residence; these persons would not normally be considered as immigrants. This phenomenon is common only in a certain number of countries; it can generally be ignored in most countries without risk of providing a distorted picture of the immigrant population.

² There are connotational differences between the terms “nationality” and “citizenship”. They refer to more or less the same notion, but the former tends to be used in countries where citizenship at birth is based on that of the parents (*jus sanguinis*), whereas the latter is common in countries where citizenship is granted to persons born in the country (“*jus soli*”). Hereafter, we will use the two terms interchangeably.

³ The term “expatriates” is used in this paper to refer to all foreign-born persons living abroad, regardless of the current or eventual duration of their stay abroad. Obviously, many and perhaps most will never return to their country of birth to live.

⁴ Some of the measures adopted include reinforcing tax incentives to promote return migration, seeking to enhance the environment for scientific and technical research or improving the status of certain professions.

⁵ See also Adams (2003), who applied the methodology developed by Carrington and Detragiache (1998) to more recent data.

⁶ The network created associates statisticians from NSOs in 29 member countries, as well as observers from several multilateral organisations (the ILO, Eurostat, the European Commission, the UN statistics division, the UN Economic Commission for Europe).

⁷ ‘Emigration rates’ are calculated by dividing the number of foreign-born residing in OECD countries and originating in a particular country by the total number of natives from that country, including those no longer living in the country. It does not correspond to the usual definition of an emigration rate, which relates flows of migrants over a certain period of time to the initial stock of persons in the origin country.

⁸ The last German census was conducted in 1987.

⁹ The 2000 United States Census enumerated close to 8 million more persons than had been anticipated on the basis of the post-censal population projections. Most of these were believed to be undocumented aliens.

¹⁰ Six countries have provided detailed information on nationality at birth (Belgium, Canada, France, Norway, Switzerland and the United States).

¹¹ Portugal could have been added to this list, but in this case the result would be largely attributable to persons repatriated from Angola in the mid-1970s.

¹² In a recent referendum in Switzerland, a proposal to facilitate the acquisition of nationality for “third-generation” immigrants was rejected.

¹³ There is, to a certain extent, an implicit assumption here, which is that persons born abroad were educated abroad. This is obviously not always the case.

¹⁴ The figure is approximately 422 000 if one excludes the foreign-born offspring of American parents.

¹⁵ There are also a significant number of Japanese born-persons in France (14 300) but fewer than Japanese-born persons living in the United Kingdom (37 500).

¹⁶ These are likely to be mostly retired.

¹⁷ Stocks of persons, both emigrants and immigrants, are being considered here. In the case of Ireland, an analysis of net flows of migrants would produce a rather different picture, including for the highly skilled.

¹⁸ For practical reasons, as most OECD countries have identified Puerto Rico as separate country, Puerto Rico has been considered as such in the database. People born in Puerto Rico and living in the United-States are thus considered as foreign-born (see Annex 1 for more details).

¹⁹ Dumont (1999) shows that “convergence groups” of countries can be identified based on the human capital stock (education and health) available at the beginning of the period considered.

²⁰ As the database only covers OECD countries, it is not possible to evaluate migration from former soviet Republics to Russia. For more information and estimates on this issue, see Eisenbaum (2005 forthcoming).

²¹ Since current migrant stocks reflect the cumulative impact of different historical migration waves, it is not entirely surprising to find no strong correlation with recent GDP per capita at PPPs or unemployment rates in origin countries. Ideally, this analysis would be carried out using the difference in receiving and host-country unemployment rates together with the wage gap minus the expected cost of migration. Further analysis is needed to better understand the main determinants of international migration in general and of highly skilled migration in particular.

²² IT occupations were withdrawn from the list in the UK in 2002 because of the economic downturn in this sector. A special regulation for IT specialists was also rescinded in 2004 in France.

²³ Following a comprehensive review of its skilled immigration policy, New Zealand has recently introduced a new Skilled Migrant Category to replace the General Skills Category. This change is a deliberate policy shift to promote the active recruitment of the skilled migrants that New Zealand needs (see Little 2004 for details).

²⁴ Commander, Kangasniemi and Winters (2004) show that the conditions to be met to reach such a result are indeed very restrictive and depend on the size of migration flows, the type of selection process in receiving countries as well as the functioning of the education system in source countries.

ANNEX 1 : DATA SOURCES AND DATA AVAILABILITY

Of the 29 countries taking part in the project, 23 have population censuses and seven have population registers. Other sources were identified by some countries but the census or the population register is generally the most suitable source (see attached table on data sources).

For the great majority of the countries involved, data by country of birth are available. For some countries the situation is, however, more problematic. In the case of Japan, for example, the data by country of origin and level of education were not published or processed at the time of the drafting of this document even if they appear in the census. In the case of the Netherlands, the data on education are not available from the population register and it was thus necessary to use the labour force survey averaged over several years (2000-2002), in order to estimate the foreign-born by level of education and country of birth (for those countries of birth for which there were samples large enough to support reliable estimates).

Korea and Japan do not identify the foreign-born in their censuses. For these countries, because naturalisations are rare, nationality can serve as a reasonable proxy for country of birth. This approximation was not possible, however, in the case of Germany where the only data available, from the annual Microcensus (1999-2002), does not record the place of birth, although it does record the nationality and whether or not a person was born in Germany. In this case to compile data on expatriates the following assumptions and adjustments were made: (i) for non-German citizens born abroad, it was assumed that their place of birth was the same as their nationality; (ii) for "unknown" place of birth or nationality in the Microcensus, a response was attributed according to the distribution observed when a response was available; and (iii) for German citizens born abroad, the German Socioeconomic Panel (GSOEP), which does identify the place of birth, was used for those countries for which the sample was large enough to produce reliable estimates. The data included in the publicly available OECD data file, however, does not include the adjustments which were made through the GSOEP.

With regard to the structure of the levels of qualification retained, it was decided to take into consideration five levels compatible with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED): ISCED 0/1/2: Less than upper secondary; ISCED 3/4: Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary; ISCED 5A: "Academic" tertiary; ISCED 5B: "Vocational" tertiary; ISCED 6: Advanced research programmes. The detail at the higher levels, however, was available only for a subset of countries. For France, Switzerland, Luxembourg and Austria 5A and 6 are not distinguishable; for the United States, Turkey, Mexico and Spain 5A and 5B are not distinguishable; for the Slovak Republic, Korea, Netherlands and Hungary 5A, 5B and 6 are not distinguishable.

The objective was to minimize residual (i.e. "other") categories, with regard to the coding of countries of birth. An attempt was made to preserve the maximum information available while distinguishing between continental/regional residual categories whenever this was possible (ie. "other Africa", "other Europe", "other Asia", "other South and Central America and Caribbean", "other Oceania", "other North America").

With regard to split, recomposed or newly constituted countries, there was little choice but to respect the coding in the national data collection, which varies from one country to another. In the United States, for example, people born in Korea have the choice of three ways to indicate their country of birth: Korea, North Korea or South Korea. More than 80% of them (80% of the nationals and 85% of foreigners) indicated having been born in Korea³, without further specification. In the censuses of many OECD

³ It is not possible to distinguish between Koreans who emigrated to the United States before and after 1953.

countries the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic are aggregated under the name of the former Czechoslovakia. The same applies to the former USSR and the former Yugoslavia and Yemen.

To produce a consistent list of countries of birth across receiving countries, some minor adjustments had to be made, especially with respect to small islands and overseas territories. This recoding explains the small differences that might exist with national estimates for foreign-born and native-born populations. The following recodings were carried out:

AUS	DNK	FRA	GBR	PRT	USA⁴
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heard & McDonald Islands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faeroe Islands • Greenland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French southern territories • Tromelin Island • Guadeloupe • Martinique • Reunion • Juan De Nova Island • Guyane • Mayotte • Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Channel Islands • Isle of Sark • Isle of Man 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madeira Islands • Azores Islands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US minor island • Christmas isle • Wake Island • Palmyra Atoll • Navassa Island • Midway Islands • Johnston Atoll • Howland Island • Baker Island

⁴ People born in Puerto Rico are considered as foreign born in the United States.

Data sources

<u>Country</u>	<u>Data year(s)</u>	<u>ISO code</u>	<u>Type of source</u>	<u>Source description</u>
Australia	2001	AUS	CEN	Australian Census of Population & Housing
Austria	2001	AUT	CEN	Census of Population
Belgium	2001	BEL	GSS	General Socio-Economic Survey
Canada	2001	CAN	CEN	Census of Population
Czech Rep	2001	CZE	CEN	Census of population Register-based population and labour force statistics
Denmark	Yearly since 1981	DNK	REG	Population statistics
Finland	Yearly	FIN	REG	Census of Population
France	1999	FRA	CEN	Microcensus
Germany	Yearly	DEU	LFS	Census of population
Greece	2001	GRC	CEN	Census of Population
Hungary	2001	HUN	CEN	Census of Population
Ireland	2002	IRL	CEN	Census of Population
Italy	2001	ITA	CEN	Census of Population
Japan	2000	JPN	CEN	Census of Population
Korea	2000	KOR	CEN	Census of population
Luxembourg	2001	LUX	CEN	Census of Population
Mexico	2000	MEX	CEN	Census of population
Netherlands	1995-2000	NDL	REG	Matched data from the Population Registers, the Tax Department and the Ministry of Justice
Netherlands	Yearly	NDL	LFS	Labour Force Survey
New Zealand	2001	NZL	CEN	Census of Population and Dwellings
Norway	Varies	NOR	REG	Various administrative and statistical registers
Poland	2001	POL	CEN	Census of population
Portugal	2001	PRT	CEN	Census of population
Slovak Rep	2001	SVK	CEN	Census of population
Spain	2001	ESP	CEN	Census of Population
Sweden	Yearly	SWE	REG	Total Population Register TPR
Sweden	Yearly	SWE	EDU	Education register
Switzerland	2000	CHE	CEN	Census of Population
Turkey	2000	TUR	CEN	Census of Population
United Kingdom	2001	GBR	CEN	Census of Population
United States	2000	USA	CEN	Census 5% Public Use Microdata Sample

ANNEX 2

Table A1. **Stocks and percentages of non-citizens and foreign-born in OECD countries** (Total population)

	Native-born			Total	Foreign-born			Total	Place of birth unknown	Grand Total	Percentage of foreign-born ¹	Percentage of non citizens
	Citizens	Non-Citizens	Unknown		Citizens	Non-Citizens	Unknown					
AUS	13411351	34173	183963	13629487	2739559	1263728	69926	4073213	1066542	18769242	23.0	7.4
AUT	6913512	115840	175	7029527	408093	593420	1019	1002532	867	8032926	12.5	8.8
BEL	9001480	194443	514	9196437	447555	650705	935	1099195	718	10296350	10.7 (9.3)	8.2
CAN	23920315	1725		23922040	4150095	1566920		5717015		29639055	19.3 (19.0)	5.3
CHE	5109295	338107		5447402	459569	1111187		1570756	269852	7288010	22.4 (20.2)	20.5
CZE	9556459	20018	607	9577084	357355	90411	711	448477	204499	10230060	4.5	1.2
DEU			71973166	71973166			10256084	10256084		82229250	12.5	
DNK	4939264	42973		4982237	145508	215545		361053	25064	5368354	6.8	5.0
ESP	38603844	71326		38675170	671514	1500687		2172201		40847371	5.3	3.8
FIN	5031826	12928	158	5044912	54131	75867	1450	131448	4755	5181115	2.5	1.7
FRA	52142848	509598		52652446	3114654	2753588		5868242		58520688	10.0 (7.4)	5.6
GBR			53923642	53923642			4865563	4865563		58789205	8.3	
GRC	9705670	105248	285	9811203	466165	656382	93	1122640	254	10934097	10.3	7.0
HUN	9896815	8520	49	9905384	208259	84485	187	292931		10198315	2.9	0.9
IRL	3405941	7290	45248	3458479	179034	216971	4011	400016		3858495	10.4	5.9
JPN ²	125625759			1.26E+08		1294341		1294341		126920100		1.0
KOR ²	45985289			45985289		135105	15707	150812		46136101		0.3
LUX	257446	37249		294695	18590	124062		142652	2192	439539	32.6	36.9
MEX			94925622	94925622			492617	492617	2065173	97483412	0.5	
NLD	14268673	103025		14371698	1050600	564777		1615377		15987075	10.1	4.2
NOR	4195719	22752	12	4218483	158865	174875	29	333769		4552252	7.3 (6.7)	4.3
NZL	2890869			2890869	22212		676335	698547	147813	3737229	19.5	
POL	36765038	10135	96108	36871281	741880	29748	3654	775282	583517	38230080	2.1	0.1
PRT	9692065	11987	593	9704645	431357	219633	482	651472		10356117	6.3	2.2
SVK	4673150	5888	41592	4720630	98392	18403	2277	119072	539753	5379455	2.5	0.5
SWE	7826472	71123		7897595	672990	404606		1077596	479	8975670	12.0	5.3
TUR			66525256	66525256	997314	262061		1259375	1155	67785786	1.9	
USA	246787150			2.47E+08	16069523	18565268		34634791		281421941	12.3 (11.1)	6.6
Total	690606250	1724348	2.88E+08	9.8E+08	33663214	32572775	16391080	82627069	4912633	1067587290	7.8	4.5

1. Figures in parentheses indicate the percentage of foreign-born in total population after excluding foreign-born citizens at birth.

2. In the absence of place of birth for Japan and Korea, it has been assumed that all non-citizens are foreign-born and that nationals are native-born (see annex 1 for further details).

Sources: see Annex 1, Secretariat calculations

Table A2 : Acquisition of citizenship in receiving countries

	Total number of foreign-born	Foreign-born with the citizenship of the country of residence	Percentage of foreign born with the citizenship of the country of residence
AUS	4 003 287	2 739 559	68.4
AUT	1 001 513	408 093	40.7
BEL	1 098 260	447 555	40.8
CAN	5 717 015	4 150 095	72.6
CHE	1 570 756	459 569	29.3
CZE	447 766	357 355	79.8
DNK	361 053	145 508	40.3
ESP	2 172 201	671 514	30.9
FIN	129 998	54 131	41.6
FRA	5 868 242	3 114 654	53.1
GRC	1 122 547	466 165	41.5
HUN	292 744	208 259	71.1
IRL	396 005	179 034	45.2
LUX	142 652	18 590	13.0
NLD	1 615 377	1 050 600	65.0
NOR	333 740	158 865	47.6
POL	771 628	741 880	96.1
PRT	650 990	431 357	66.3
SVK	116 795	98 392	84.2
SWE	1 077 596	672 990	62.5
USA	34 634 791	16 069 523	46.4

Sources: see Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

Table A3: Stocks of total foreign-born by region of origin, OECD countries

	of which: North African countries		%	of which: China and Chinese Taipei		%	Latin	North	Caribbean	Oceania	EU25	Other	Unknown	
	Africa			Asia			America	America				Europe		
AUS	191 501	2 573	1.3	1 115 655	232 320	20.8	74 893	81 018	32 000	423 428	1 889 893	264 819	6	AUS
AUT	19 934	3 560	17.9	57 236	8 254	14.4	6 054	9 029		1 931	364 624	527 007	16 717	AUT
BEL	247 515	139 799	56.5	68 494	9 410	13.7	20 387	18 071	3 976	1 468	621 471	117 787	12	BEL
CAN	323 580	52 485	16.2	2 040 590	657 930	32.2	336 570	287 465	285 295	53 215	2 014 255	375 710	335	CAN
CHE	68 801	21 153	30.7	101 599	8 318	8.2	48 327	29 319	8 834	4 787	854 305	352 962	101 822	CHE
CZE	2 374	588	24.8	21 365	1 251	5.9	870	2 687	595	341	344 256	75 989		CZE
DEU	175 665	51 230	29.2	567 021			47 578	81 308			2 552 578	5 244 548	1 587 387	DEU
DNK	31 875	6 520	20.5	110 454	4 590	4.2	9 208	11 123	785	2 249	118 004	77 355		DNK
ESP	423 082	343 819	81.3	86 669	28 848	33.3	744 221	25 141	95 979	4 443	597 948	194 676	42	ESP
FIN	9 713	1 783	18.4	18 375	2 120	11.5	1 817	4 086	261	750	51 681	44 764	1	FIN
FRA	2 862 569	2 296 979	80.2	444 774	36 831	8.3	79 987	58 398	24 836	6 211	1 978 923	412 539	5	FRA
GBR	838 459	26 088	3.1	1 579 133	154 111	9.8	95 357	238 043	232 940	170 278	1 493 235	175 577	42 541	GBR
GRC	58 275	1 416	2.4	75 854	671	0.9	5 486	35 683	1 128	21 111	191 038	733 183	882	GRC
HUN	2 687	517	19.2	10 730	4 002	37.3	773	3 199	367	298	65 057	209 815	5	HUN
IRL	26 650	1 238	4.6	27 768	7 449	26.8	2 793	25 624	688	8 406	291 340	16 408	339	IRL
JPN	5 742	421	7.3	969 799	253 096	26.1	232 248	45 871	482	8 801	25 299	6 098	1	JPN
KOR				116 732	56 272	48.2		14 408		719	3 246		15 707	KOR
LUX	5 692	1 134	19.9	4 382	1 202	27.4	1 562	1 399	274	133	116 309	11 855	1 046	LUX
MEX	1 214	262	21.6	10 765	2 001	18.6	71 644	349 366	9 922	811	44 396	4 096	403	MEX
NLD	280 007	163 658	58.4	367 987	34 754	9.4	221 626	29 826	93 326	13 226	340 220	269 158	1	NLD
NOR	31 278	5 665	18.1	100 274	5 869	5.9	15 133	17 017	1 268	1 489	116 637	49 868	805	NOR
NZL	39 351	273	0.7	175 302	62 736	35.8	3 651	21 126	17 100	156 078	271 008	14 724	207	NZL
POL	2 962	741	25.0	9 479	667	7.0	920	10 566	202	671	248 868	483 223	18 391	POL
PRT	349 859	1 596	0.5	16 859	2 397	14.2	74 949	14 627	914	1 256	159 008	34 000		PRT
SVK	404	50	12.4	1 400	142	10.1	154	945	77	64	99 931	16 097		SVK
SWE	78 039	9 962	12.8	244 246	12 106	5.0	59 965	17 627	2 840	3 376	456 262	215 241		SWE
TUR	12 686	1 627	12.8	83 657	1 802	2.2	1 010	15 006	216	3 265	447 739	695 795	1	TUR
USA	988 253	58 530	5.9	8 402 240	1 550 070	18.4	13 476 759	965 485	4 469 340	288 391	4 594 095	1 442 654	7 574	USA
Total	7 078 167	3 193 667	45.1	16 828 839	3 139 219	18.7	15 633 942	2 413 463	5 283 645	1 177 196	20 351 626	12 065 948	1 794 230	Total

Note: Data for EU25 are limited to three countries (DEU, FRA and GBR) in statistics provided by Korea and to 16 countries (BEL, DNK, FIN, FRA, GRC, IRL, ITA, LUX, NLD, AUT, PRT, SWE, POL, ESP, HUN and GBR) in data provided by Germany.

Sources: see annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

Table A4: Stocks and percentages of persons by education level and place of birth in OECD countries (People 15+)

Table A4: Stocks and percentages of persons by education level and place of birth in OECD countries (People 15+)																			
	Native-born								Foreign Born								Unknown place of birth		
	Less than upper secondary (ISCED 0/1/2)	Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary (ISCED 3/4)	Tertiary (ISCED 5/6)	of which PhD (ISCED 6)	Unknown	Less than upper secondary (ISCED 0/1/2)	Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary (ISCED 3/4)	Tertiary (ISCED 5/6)	of which PhD (ISCED 6)	Unknown									
AUS	4282959	45.8	1467214	15.7	3610692	38.6	145112	1.6	890502	1310051	38.3	643732	18.8	1465733	42.9	120729	3.5	442044	743848
AUT	1924574	33.4	3203774	55.7	626609	10.9				456032	49.4	362918	39.3	104742	11.3				795
BEL	3209646	46.8	2078319	30.3	1570363	22.9	30180	0.4	613374	443045	54.2	197573	24.2	176917	21.6	9099	1.1	201779	513
CAN	5864360	31.6	6847165	36.9	5834055	31.5	59365	0.3		1612380	30.1	1709705	31.9	2033490	38.0	69300	1.3		
CHE	1024780	25.6	2252546	56.3	723364	18.1			337712	485466	41.6	405183	34.7	276791	23.7			286745	250763
CZE	1809625	22.8	5310328	67.0	806551	10.2	29446	0.4	38276	164538	38.4	208718	48.8	54766	12.8	3037	0.7	4212	178184
DEU	13011570	23.7	31154820	56.8	10675988	19.5				3870908	43.7	3612460	40.8	1372254	15.5				
DNK	1648305	41.0	1613993	40.2	753930	18.8	7895	0.2		155216	48.6	101842	31.9	62243	19.5	637	0.2		23089
ESP	19127995	63.9	4993877	16.7	5789438	19.4	153138	0.5		1029435	55.4	423225	22.8	404387	21.8	18407	1.0		
FIN	1662854	40.3	1497548	36.3	967291	23.4	22117	0.5		59374	52.7	31940	28.4	21322	18.9	1097	1.0		4453
FRA	19433046	45.8	15874617	37.4	7160516	16.9				3066864	54.8	1521910	27.2	1011424	18.1				
GBR	18424701	51.2	10314951	28.7	7232100	20.1			7209262	1602168	40.6	968116	24.5	1374370	34.8			558667	
GRC	4498041	54.4	2662076	32.2	1112057	13.4	73774	0.9		448046	44.8	399653	39.9	153083	15.3	9112	0.9		242
HUN	3711782	45.1	3636532	44.2	879571	10.7				113250	41.1	107779	39.1	54465	19.8				
IRL	1228075	47.8	758006	29.5	584325	22.7	6739	0.3	131206	92939	29.6	92011	29.3	128762	41.0	3655	1.2	19292	
KOR	13132782	36.1	13498737	37.2	9703531	26.7	568042	1.6	11483	33433	23.8	61950	44.0	45355	32.2			78	
LUX	55971	28.7	114240	58.6	24890	12.8			29853	40499	36.7	45807	41.6	23916	21.7			19539	1627
MEX	44760651	72.3	10380897	16.8	6757285	10.9	373353	0.6	528077	86732	36.5	60946	25.7	89689	37.8	14139	6.0	4095	174266
NLD	4534737	40.7	4426572	39.8	2169015	19.5				629462	53.0	349889	29.4	208863	17.6				148818
NOR	677175	21.2	1776416	55.6	739122	23.2	10074	0.3	210377	38466	18.3	106590	50.6	65535	31.1	3049	1.4	80830	
NZL	578331	30.1	819588	42.7	521349	27.2			226410	102603	18.7	276585	50.4	170082	31.0			74688	119859
POL	9321483	31.2	17427397	58.4	3111488	10.4	101047	0.3	173876	348750	47.9	293537	40.3	86385	11.9	6248	0.9	9067	516445
PRT	6494230	80.0	991642	12.2	627711	7.7	10223	0.1		320778	54.7	151806	25.9	113348	19.3	3039	0.5		
SVK	1057596	28.0	2342010	62.0	378694	10.0			19483	32933	29.3	63013	56.1	16424	14.6			805	405480
SWE	1375361	25.0	2868919	52.2	1252919	22.8	38438	0.7	32452	253195	29.6	395962	46.2	207558	24.2	13107	1.5	75394	359
TUR	36721637	79.4	7030720	15.2	2497755	5.4				479520	49.3	331728	34.1	161557	16.6	10988	1.1		456
USA	41438103	21.9	97004014	51.2	50983357	26.9	1317999	0.7		12632924	39.8	10885700	34.3	8204473	25.9	443152	1.4		

Note: For Finland, "less than upper secondary" includes "unknown" educational attainment.

Educational levels for the United Kingdom are for people aged 16-74; other age groups are coded "unknown".

Sources: see Annex 1, Secretariat calculations.

Page 32

Table A5. Stocks of persons originating in OECD countries and residing in another Member country (Total population)

Note: FCZE stands for "Former Czechoslovakia not included elsewhere". Data for Korea are partial as several OECD countries do not systematically distinguish South and North Korea (e.g. 529408 people in Japan and 743260 in the United States).
Sources: see Annex 1. Secretariat calculations.

Table A6. Total number of highly skilled expatriates and percentage of highly skilled expatriates by country of birth

	Total number of expatriates	of which: highly skilled (%)		Total number of expatriates	of which: highly skilled (%)		Total number of expatriates	of which: highly skilled (%)		Total number of expatriates	of which: highly skilled (%)		Total number of expatriates	of which: highly skilled (%)
Afghanistan	129211	25.2	Congo	100052	36.6	Hong Kong, China	587400	42.8	Myanmar	57962	42.9	Slovenia	52271	17.5
Albania	389264	9.1	Cook Islands	18002	8.6	Hungary	314923	28.7	Namibia	3390	45.3	Solomon Islands	1982	45.0
Algeria	1301076	16.4	Costa Rica	76112	24.2	Iceland	23070	33.8	Nauru	646	30.7	Somalia	131342	11.9
American Samoa	30539	10.4	Côte d'Ivoire	58843	27.5	India	1928199	51.9	Nepal	23229	39.9	South Africa	342947	47.9
Andorra	3687	23.1	Croatia	422277	14.0	Indonesia	289167	34.3	Netherlands	616910	34.0	Spain	763014	18.0
Angola	195674	19.6	Cuba	914501	24.2	Iran	632980	45.6	Netherlands Antilles	68949	15.5	Sri Lanka	292247	29.7
Anguilla	1677	30.9	Cyprus	138711	25.2	Iraq	294967	28.2	New Zealand	410663	40.6	Sudan	42086	40.5
Antigua and Barbuda	24400	26.5	Czech Republic	215879	24.6	Ireland	792316	23.5	Nicaragua	224531	17.9	Suriname	186532	14.6
Argentina	266070	37.8	Democratic People's			Israel	162567	42.9	Niger	4948	38.0	Svalbard and Jan		
Armenia	80442	30.1	Republic of Korea	1919	33.2	Italy	2430339	12.4	Nigeria	247497	55.1	Mayen Islands	23	17.4
Aruba	5744	47.1	Democratic Rep. of			Jamaica	796046	24.0	Niue	5633	10.0	Swaziland	2103	41.7
Australia	267314	43.6	Congo	66488	32.5	Japan	575992	48.9	Norfolk Islands	269	28.6	Sweden	206604	37.8
Austria	366023	28.7	Denmark	173009	34.6	Jordan	62796	41.0	Northern Mariana			Switzerland	262456	35.8
Azerbaijan	29263	41.2	Djibouti	5359	29.7	Kazakhstan	43226	28.4	Islands	3647	25.2	Syria	126372	34.1
Bahamas	30750	29.2	Dominica	25738	21.7	Kenya	197445	37.4	Norway	122079	32.1	Taiwan Province of	431462	61.1
Bahrain	7424	40.6	Dominican Republic	691884	12.3	Kiribati	1964	22.4	Occupied Palestinian			China		
Bangladesh	275770	27.9	East Timor	8994	17.5	KOR+PRK	672755	43.3	Territory	14798	43.8	Tajikistan	3094	42.4
Barbados	88895	26.3	Ecuador	490267	15.4	Kuwait	37591	44.1	Oman	2753	36.9	Thailand	249951	29.3
Belarus	149935	25.0	Egypt	274833	51.2	Kyrgyzstan	4640	39.0	Pakistan	655162	30.8	Timor-Leste	2190	20.8
Belgium	321544	33.8	El Salvador	839511	7.8	Lao People's			Palau	2187	28.5	Togo	18024	36.3
Belize	43023	20.2	Equatorial Guinea	12149	22.7	Democratic Republic	264864	14.4	Panama	140631	32.6	Tokelau	1815	11.3
Benin	13669	43.8	Eritrea	35127	24.0	Latvia	54153	37.4	Papua New Guinea	26074	43.9	Tonga	41116	11.2
Bermuda	19572	34.8	Estonia	35077	32.0	Lebanon	332270	32.9	Paraguay	18504	25.0	Trinidad and Tobago	276934	29.5
Bhutan	809	25.5	Ethiopia	113838	31.2	Lesotho	995	45.7	Peru	361506	30.2	Tunisia	371274	17.7
Bolivia	72400	30.4	Falkland Islands	1316	22.5	Liberia	41756	33.0	Philippines	1816418	48.1	Turkey	2195645	6.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina	536327	11.5	Federal Rep. Of			Libya	27481	43.4	Pitcairn	173	42.2	Turkmenistan	3269	32.8
Botswana	4298	37.4	Yugoslavia	1064580	11.9	Liechtenstein	3532	19.3	Poland	1276482	25.7	Turks and Caicos		
Brazil	351878	31.7	Fiji	119400	26.4	Lithuania	132843	22.1	Portugal	1268726	6.5	Islands	1429	18.2
British Indian Ocean			Finland	265245	25.4	Luxembourg	27164	26.2	Puerto Rico	1312753	14.7	Tuvalu	1065	8.0
Territory	36	13.9	Former			Macao, China	18881	36.0	Qatar	3384	43.3	U. Rep. Of Tanzania	70006	41.0
British Virgin Islands	2252	32.9	Czechoslovakia	109984	29.8	Macedonia	149014	11.8	Republic of Korea	312538	43.2	Uganda	82232	39.2
Brunei Darussalam	9059	39.3	Former USSR	2222270	29.0	Madagascar	75954	32.0	Republic of Moldova	35365	36.7	Ukraine	753080	27.2
Bulgaria	527819	14.5	Gabon	10951	35.8	Malawi	15024	35.2	Romania	613168	26.3	United Arab Emirates	14589	23.9
Burkina Faso	6237	38.4	Gambia	20923	16.9	Malaysia	209910	50.8	Russia	580570	43.0	United Kingdom	3229676	39.2
Burundi	10095	38.6	Georgia	83419	25.0	Maldives	519	34.5	Rwanda	14832	34.4	United States of		
Cambodia	238539	15.7	Germany	2933757	29.5	Mali	45034	12.6	Saint Helena	2460	10.4	America	809540	48.2
Cameroon	57050	42.3	Ghana	150665	34.0	Malta	96837	19.5	Saint Kitts and Nevis	20078	26.6	Uruguay	70093	29.9
Canada	1044978	40.0	Gibraltar	11886	23.3	Marshall Islands	5446	10.7	Saint Lucia	24722	20.3	US virgin Island	48770	25.0
Cape Verde	83291	6.2	Greece	735430	16.1	Mauritania	14813	18.5	Saint Vincent and the			Uzbekistan	34123	40.3
Cayman Islands	2389	19.5	Grenada	46825	23.2	Mauritius	86410	28.0	Grenadines	34969	24.5	Vanuatu	2002	32.1
Central African			Guam	57742	26.1	Mexico	8431381	5.6	Samoa	71801	10.3	Venezuela	200461	40.2
Republic	9855	32.7	Guatemala	489772	8.2	Micronesia (Federated			San Marino	775	17.9	Vietnam	1507164	23.6
Chad	5836	42.1	Guinea	19684	24.5	States of)	6697	13.3	Sao Tome and			Western Sahara	158	33.5
Chile	200366	33.0	Guinea-Bissau	29449	12.7	Monaco	11208	24.6	Principe	11732	10.7	Yemen	32428	19.3
China	1649711	39.6	Guyana	305544	24.9	Mongolia	4709	43.8	Saudi Arabia	34646	35.4	Zambia	34825	49.3
Cocos (Keeling)			Haiti	466897	19.8	Mozambique	85337	26.5	Senegal	104715	23.1	Zimbabwe	77345	43.3
Islands	2	0.0	Holy See	93	35.5				Seychelles	7602	22.5			
Columbia	682156	25.1	Honduras	278593	10.5				Sierra Leone	40556	33.6			
Comoros	17723	10.7							Singapore	105805	45.9			
									Slovak Republic	374570	13.8			

Note: KOR+PRK stands for "North and South Korea". OECD countries are identified with shaded areas.

Sources: See Annex 1, Secretariat calculations (not including Japan and Italy as receiving countries).