International migration data collection

A paper prepared for the Policy Analysis and Research Programme of the Global Commission on International Migration

by
John Parker

parkervj@hotmail.com

September 2005

Purpose

The Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) requested the provision of an analysis of information to be gathered from a mix of countries from the north and south and a range of international organisations with a view to:

- establishing the breadth, nature and understanding of significant terms, definitions and expressions used in the field of migration;
- assessing the modes of data collection and the facility with which such data is collected, retrieved and analysed;
- examining the common themes for collecting migration-related data;
- analysing the common terms and expressions widely used in a migration context to convey similar meaning;
- highlighting any inconsistencies which might arise in the terms, definitions and expressions and their usage and, where appropriate, the meanings attributed to these terms and expressions; and
- assessing shortcomings in current migration data activities of relevant institutions and relevant governments.

General methodology for this report

2. In collaboration with the Executive Director, GCIM, it was decided to approach South Africa, Philippines, Ghana, Pakistan and Mexico to represent the views and perspective of so-called developing countries and the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia to represent the perspective of developed countries (the survey countries).

3. For the views of a range of international organisations, it was determined that key personnel should be approached from the International Labour Office (ILO), International Office for Migration (IOM), Inter-Governmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugee and Migration Policies (IGC), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

4. Because of the need to survey international organisations and a mix of countries and realistically compare information provided by them, the judgement was also made, again with the agreement of the Executive Director, GCIM, to elicit information from prospective survey participants through the completion of a standard form of questionnaire ('the main survey questionnaire').

5.   As the significance of migration-related terminology and the use to which immigration-related data could be put could vary according to the particular requirements and agendas of the collector/collator/researcher of data, a decision had to be taken about what terminology qualified as 'significant' for the purposes of the main survey questionnaire. It was determined that the questionnaire should ask survey participants'

reaction to a range of twenty two terms commonly encountered in international migration. To encourage responses from survey participants, questions were constructed to elicit 'yes' or 'no' answers but also to provide sufficient information about a broad range of migration-related data collection/retrieval issues together with any additional information participants considered might be of additional assistance. The twenty two terms were:

Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)
Persons admitted for family reunion
Foreign retirees
Foreign born persons
Persons admitted temporarily for work
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)
Persons deported from the state (deportees)
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months
Nationals deported back to the State from other States
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently
Asylum seekers
Persons recognized as refugees
Refugees under UN Mandate
Persons granted temporary protection status
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons
Stateless persons

6. Each country participant was also asked to address a supplementary survey questionnaire regarding a range of 50 international migration terms and definitions set out in the glossary to the "Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration (Revision 1)" published in 1998 by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs ('the Glossary to the UN Recommendations). The questions posed were:

Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?

Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?

In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?

Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?

If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?

Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?

If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?

Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?

Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data?

If no, please list the possible reasons.

Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?

Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?

Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?

Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?

Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?

Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?

7. The Glossary to the UN Recommendations is a useful study about the collection of international migration statistics (including terminology and definitions) with the aim of broadly assisting the understanding of the importance of the dynamics of international migration, its causes and effects. The document identifies what it considers to be core and optional information about all categories of international migrants.

8. The supplementary survey questionnaire asked each country participant to consider and compare the terminology used in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations with that in use in their own country, and comment on the usefulness of the broad range of migration terminology covered. The supplementary survey questionnaire sought to test the possibility of harmonisation of terminology using the UN revision as a guide. To

encourage participants to respond to this questionnaire, it was also designed to elicit short answers while, at the same time, providing an overall picture of each country's use of migration terminology in the context of its own data collection requirements.

9. The internet websites of the OECD and ILO were visited and material available on those websites has been used in the preparation of this report where it was considered relevant. The OECD website provided some instructive material about international migration data collection and their SOPEMI [1] report of 2004 was also consulted and material of interest to this report on 'foreign-born population' has been incorporated.

10. Professor John Salt of the University College of London, a leading researcher in the area of international migration, was consulted for his views about migration data research and usage. Reference was also made to publications of the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) [2] and ILO [3].

11. Consultations took place with relevant personnel and officials over a period of some five weeks. Additional perspective was also gained from discussions that took place at the GCIM Regional Hearing for Africa held in Cape Town, South Africa on 28 February - 1 March 2005.

12. The formal responses from each participant to the main and supplementary survey questionnaires are annexed to this report.

13. Tables 1 – 17 summarise the responses of each country and organisation.
Table 18 presents an overview across all participants of the ease with which data on the 22 terms covered in the main survey questionnaire could be identified for data retrieval.
Table 19 is an overview across all country participants of reaction to the terminology listed and defined in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations.

14. There is no country specific table summary for New Zealand's response to the supplementary survey questionnaire. New Zealand's formal response is referred to in the cross-country overview in Table 19.

15. The main and supplementary questionnaires were completed by Australia, Canada, Ghana, Mexico, Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. New Zealand did not complete the main survey questionnaire but provided a limited response to the supplementary survey questionnaire. South Africa and Pakistan did not respond to either questionnaire.

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of conclusions from responses by survey participants

16. The responses received from survey participants indicate that 'migration-related' data is collected, collated and analysed by all countries. Moreover, such data generally reflect the particular interests of the collector:
- Countries' collection of data reflects national legislative, administrative and policy imperatives;
- International Organisations' collection of data reflect core responsibilities and objectives; and
- Academics and other researchers of data gather and use data to make comparative studies of selected and specific topics and for the production of commissioned reports.

17. Apart from primary data collected by those international organisations in the delivery of their core objectives/responsibilities, much international migration data are collected nationally by countries and provided to international organisations on request.

18. Countries collecting data do so to support their own national legislative, policy and administrative imperatives. For this reason most of the countries surveyed indicated that it would not be possible for them to adopt a standard or universal list of defined terminology. Even if there was a will to adapt to such a list, other possible reasons cited for making this impractical were listed, to wit, inconsistency with current data collection systems; expense associated with altering data collection systems; possible legislative difficulties for change to be facilitated; insufficient relevance for own data collection needs. The adoption of a standard list of defined terms appears therefore to be of academic interest only although the existence of lists such as that found in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations and other lexicons of terminology permits a general understanding of those terms.

19. The countries and organizations that participated in the survey were most helpful in answering the two questionnaires provided to them. Most participants willingly gave of their time and indicated a good level of interest in the exercise. The responses to the survey questionnaires, tended to show there is a core or nucleus of international migration terms to which all survey participants could readily relate. This could form the basis, in future, upon which to facilitate the development of a mutual understanding of exactly what data collected by all countries might be included under each term. An understanding of what data each term includes for the purposes of each country would assist in more meaningful data comparison in the future.

20. Working towards a common understanding of what data should be included under each of the core terms would require further coordinated networking with national and organizational data collectors. To assist such a process might also require some capacity building for those collectors attempting to establish appropriate and accurate data

Other conclusions

21. There are a great many terms and expressions associated with the field of international migration. Most recently, in 2004, the International Organisation for Migration published its "Glossary on Migration". This presents a large number of migration- related terms and expressions and their meanings. The publication observes that "definitions in this field are often vague, controversial or contradictory" and that there "is an absence of universally accepted definitions". It makes no comment or judgement about rationalisation or harmonisation terminology save to observe that there are often many definitions used for particular expressions and that this results in problems of interpretation which will continue until such time as a universally acceptable definition is decided.

22. While there was a general acceptance by all those who participated in the surveys that a unified approach to collecting essential immigration-related data is a desirable objective and that harmonisation of terminology and the ability to compare like data with like is also desirable, the specific requirements and indeed interests of those involved in collecting, collating or researching data and the modes of data collection will continue to dominate data collection and the use to which it is put.

23. The recording of inward and outward movements of people across borders in some countries cannot be comprehensive because of the extent of their land borders with other countries. Such movements are acknowledged and there is tacit acceptance that informal or traditional movement of peoples across borders cannot be effectively controlled. By way of example, movements into Ghana are captured only by reference to persons who formally enter through officially controlled border control points by the presentation of a form of entry card. That country has relatively lengthy land borders with Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire and Togo. The peoples of all three countries and other countries further afield eg. Chad tend to move in and out of Ghana in what can only be described as traditional or customary patterns or in times of drought or for the purpose of herding cattle or for customary trading. While Ghana harbours concerns about the possible movement across its territory of certain types of people eg. rebels possibly pursuing militaristic objectives, the countries in West Africa have not found any real solution to this informal movement across borders. It is a moot question whether such traditional or inter-regional movements are sufficiently significant in the context of overall immigration data collection? Even in relatively experienced data collection countries such as Australia, there is acquiescence in certain types of traditional movements; Australia recognises through its own migration legislation, the movement of persons into and across some northern parts of Australia for traditional purposes. Such movements are not recorded although attempts are made to monitor them through local authorities.

INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

Breadth, nature and understanding of significant terms, definitions and expressions used in the field of international migration

24. As previously noted, the main survey questionnaire asked participants to consider a selection of twenty two terms regarded as possibly significant in international migration. In the supplementary survey questionnaire, country participants were asked to relate to a wider range of defined terminology specified in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations.

The twenty two terms

25. Table 18 sets out each of the terms and summarises the comparative ease with which each of the terms was identified for the purposes of data retrieval. All participants (with the exception of New Zealand) provided answers about data collection, collation and retrieval on each of the twenty two terms covered in the main survey questionnaire.

26. The responses indicated little difficulty in understanding each of the terms.

27. Table 18 shows that of the 22 terms listed in the survey, eleven were readily recognized by all of the participants surveyed and this would be useful in terms of data retrieval. In the order in which they were addressed in the main survey questionnaire, the terms were:

C3   (Persons admitted as permanent migrants);
C4   (Persons admitted for family reunion);
C6   (Foreign-born persons);
C7   (Persons admitted temporarily for work ie. temporary workers);
C8   (Persons admitted temporarily as students);
C9   (Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity ie temporary business migrants);
C12   (Persons deported from the State ie deportees);
C17   (Asylum seekers);
C18   (Persons recognized as refugees);
C19   (Refugees under UNHCR Mandate)
C21   (Persons admitted to the State for other humanitarian purposes)

[Note:
a) Persons admitted to Australia have the ability to perform work on the basis of what is permitted by their visa conditions;
b) Canada does not capture data about students on short courses of 6 months or less;
c). Ghana recognised the last three categories but apparently does not distinguish between them and treats them together as refugees;

28. This list reveals a core group or nucleus of terms in international migration readily identifiable by the survey participants.]

29. Comment is needed about 'foreign-born persons' and 'irregular migrants':

Foreign-born persons
The category of foreign-born persons is included in the core list as a familiar term although data on the category is usually only established from periodical census data (ie. a stock concept). The category held no interest or relevance for the IGC and UNHCR.. There is, according to the OECD, the need for caution in comparing data about this category [4].

Irregular migrants
The omission of 'irregular migrants' from the core group of terms perhaps requires some comment since the subject matter seems to be of some importance to the community interested in international migration. The real issue seems to be one of definition where there is no clear meaning of what is an 'irregular migrant' – see the approaches of Australia and the US in particular and the comments of the IGC and UNHCR below.

From Table 18 it can be seen that the ease of data retrieval in this category remains relatively difficult. Canada indicated data retrieval in this category was not possible while the Philippines expressed a high degree of difficulty in its ability to retrieve data about irregular migrants. The US indicated that it does collect information on the number of persons not authorised for stay in the US which it describes as "irregular migrants". The US data is collated from a count of the number of persons apprehended between "points of entry into the USA and the interior of the country". The number of persons not authorized for stay in Australia can also be established from the data recording entry into and exit from the country. Australia noted that it does collect data about persons who overstay the period for which they are permitted to remain in Australia and about those who come to attention attempting gain entry to Australia unlawfully. Those who manage to evade the authorities will only become statistical data if they come to the attention of the authorities.

For UNHCR the defining of irregular migrants presented some difficulty. It considered a better description for this category to be that of "undocumented arrivals" (for comparison, note the comments of the IGC in the paragraph below). UNHCR indicated that it collects specific statistics on irregular/secondary movements of asylum-seekers but cautioned that the data are imperfect as they reflect consideration of secondary movements obtained by looking at asylum claims which have been closed for "non substantive purposes / otherwise closed cases". UNHCR indicated that the number of "otherwise closed" asylum cases could be used to give a rough estimation of secondary movements but it stressed that cases could be "otherwise closed" for other reasons than when persons move on to another country while they have a pending asylum-application. "Otherwise closed" cases might also include withdrawals of applications or applications by persons who die before the completion of asylum processing. Moreover, persons who might withdraw their applications or leave the country before receiving a decision, might not always

apply for asylum in another country. UNHCR also points out that "otherwise closed" cases usually only includes cases which are allowed into the asylum process. In many countries there is a preliminary asylum procedure (e.g. the "Dublin procedure" in Europe). Usually UNHCR does not include decision data for cases in the preliminary procedure. This means that persons who move on to another country during the preliminary procedure will not be recorded as otherwise closed, furthermore we do not collect data on decisions in the preliminary procedures on how many persons who are sent back to a first country of asylum.

The IGC also drew attention to the category of "irregular migration" stating that the variable quality of the data caused the most difficulty for data capture and collation. This variable quality stemmed in part from a lack of appropriate definition or understanding about the term where, for example, in some countries, nationals seeking to enter the country without a passport or to enter with an expired passport are counted as "irregular". In this example, re-categorisation of the term as "undocumented arrivals", as suggested by UNHCR would still capture data about persons not considered to be irregular migrants by most countries.

30. In addressing the degree of difficulty associated with collecting data on the twenty two terms, IOM indicated that this was generally governed by the completeness or otherwise of data, differing definitions from country to country and different conceptual clarity eg the differences between trafficking and smuggling. Some of these issues had been resolved, or at least improved, by uniform definitions being provided in an international context [5].

31. Despite the reticence of some countries (apart from UK and Canada) to list terms in use that were not included in either of the lists contained in the main and supplementary survey questionnaires, most country participants expressed the view that the Glossary to the UN Recommendations did not cover all the terminology on international migration in use in their own states.

32. Of the International Organisations, IOM considered it might be useful for "Victims of Trafficking" to be accommodated as a separate category and possibly some health categories particularly persons affected by TB, HIV and Conflict Trauma related conditions.

33. Countries' identification of the ease with which data on the shorter list of 22 terms (Tables 1 and 3) could be retrieved showed a high degree of familiarity with the handling of those terms. In the case of Canada however, data retrieval on relating to some of the terms was stated to be "not possible" because the data relating to those terms is not electronically captured because it is not sufficiently relevant for the purposes of Canadian Immigration legislative and administrative requirements.

The glossary to the UN Recommendations

34. Table 19 sets out the issues covered by the supplementary survey questionnaire and summarises all country participants' reactions to the issues covered.

35. Each of the country participants (with the exception of New Zealand) was also able to relate to the 50 terms and definitions in the UN study.

36. There was a mixed response to the questions whether the Glossary to the UN Recommendations was too extensive and whether the terms and definitions are too complicated. Australia and Ghana considered the number and definitions of expressions to be a difficulty. The UK had difficulty with the Glossary to the UN Recommendations as it did not include some terminology essential for its own operations. Canada considered there was room for the inclusion of a separate category of permanent migration of skilled workers. The US response to the glossary was that the list of terms was too extensive, too complicated and impractical for its own purposes.

Modes of data collection and facility with which such data is collected, retrieved and analysed

37. This section deals with information referred to in the Country and Organisation tables on data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange (Tables 1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15, 16 and 17) and to Table 18 (Comparative ease with which terms could be identified in terms of data retrieval).

Survey countries' perspective:

38. Most of the "developed" countries surveyed, especially those that might be regarded as having "permanent residence" based systems of migration (see below the OECD's categorisation of "permanent residence" versus "temporary permit" based systems), were well versed in the capture of migration data for the purposes of their own national programme outcomes. The majority of their data are captured electronically or converted from manually captured data transposed to electronic systems and can therefore be retrieved with relative ease.

39. The degree of difficulty in retrieving or accessing data in any of the given categories in the list of twenty two terms covered by the main survey questionnaire increases where there is a need to gather immigration data from different agencies within a country ('cross data checking') and much migration data is derived from information collected for purposes other than migration. Cross data checks seem not to be unusual across a range of countries. The survey also showed that at least some international migration data is collected via population censuses (particularly in the case of Canada and the UK). This need to cross check data to gather migration statistics appears therefore to be a normal process. Australia is able to interrogate its own immigration based databases for

significant information about migrants, however, as noted in Table 1, Australian data about population by country of birth, age and sex is usually taken from periodical censuses which are updated from immigration data between such censuses and also from registration of deaths. Australian data about employments status of immigrants is taken from monthly labour force surveys or from specific surveys of migrants that are conducted from time to time.

40. While the main survey questions did not request information as to whether data is collected on age, gender and nationality in each category, countries were asked separately for this and the information is summarized in each of the Country Tables. Most countries appear to categorise data by age, gender and nationality/country of birth or origin.

41. New Zealand's comments on the supplementary survey questionnaire about the Glossary to the UN Recommendations, (which the writer took also to be applicable to the survey on the twenty two terms), indicated that the limited "responses to this survey have been developed through discussion within the Department of Labour (Immigration Service), and with Statistics New Zealand and the Ministry of Tourism" and advised that there were a range of other government agencies in New Zealand that collect data relevant to international migration movements and outcomes.   To answer the supplementary survey questionnaire adequately New Zealand would require "the development of a cross-agency view, based on each agency considering the risks and benefits for its own data collection. This work, which has not been done, would need to also include input from others with an interest in using migration data and undertaking relevant research (e.g. academics, private research bodies)." In summary, New Zealand indicated that consensus about most of the questions covered would be difficult without considerable work through the various agencies responsible for data collection and collation.

42. The UK Immigration area of the Home Office had to refer to its Office of National Statistics for details on some international migration data. The writer was also referred to certain material which has been produced by the UK task force working on THESIM (Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration).

43. While not all of the 'developing' countries approached to participate responded, it seems safe to assume from the responses received that there is reliance on a mix of manual retrieval of hard records and electronic capture/collation of data in the categories mentioned. Where hard records are consulted, this seems to be a periodical exercise resulting in aggregated statistical data either being transposed to an electronic record or in the form of a report to higher authority (Ghana for example provides statistics in an annual report to its parliament on the migration categories relevant to it.   Ghana's response to the questionnaires was greatly encouraging and it was indicated that progress was being made to convert their data capture from hard copy to electronic).   Mexico indicated that its data was captured electronically and was updated on a continuous basis.

International organisations' perspective:

44. All the international organisations surveyed collected data relating to their own core business. All such data was collected and captured electronically.

Internation Organisation for Migration (IOM)

45. IOM indicated that it is a primary collector of data on inward and outward movements where it is a direct part of its operations eg. When it is involved in emergency operations and labour migration on behalf of states. The data is captured electronically. The inward and outward movement data collected by IOM is categorised into nineteen of the twenty two terms specified in the main survey questionnaire.

46. Because IOM doesn't have global coverage for all migration data, it also collects and collates some regional data of relevance to its operations such as from the CIS countries and Central America [6]. It also uses Statistical Information System on Migrations in Central America (SIEMCA) to obtain some of its data. IOM also sources data back to the OECD, Eurostat, UN Population and Statistics Division, US Census Bureau and other UN agencies known to have reliable data on the subject-matters it covers.

47. IOM's experience is that the quality of its migration data collection process varies from country to country. The gathering of statistical data in international migration has gathered momentum and those who do collect it are continuously trying to improve the quality of their data. In addition, some data areas have become subject to standard definitions eg. trafficking and smuggling.

48. Of the data collected by it, IOM considered that data relating to trafficking had generally been of low quality. IOM indicated that there had been great reservation and qualification put on the trafficking/smuggling data which it stated was based in part on estimates/guesstimates of numbers. Data quality after 2000 had been improving since the terms were defined by Protocols to UN Conventions [5]. IOM suggested that a possible criticism of the definitions in the Protocols covering trafficking and smuggling is that they may be too broad (ie. that they do not set out certain minimum requirements).

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

49. Under Article 35 of the United Nations Convention on Refugees, UNHCR is provided with annual statistical data by 150 countries mostly in a form requested by UNHCR, supplied through local in-country UNHCR offices. They are able to collate data supplied according to a consistent, transparent formula for the calculation of the numbers of refugees by country and globally.

Inter-Governmental Consultations on Asylum, Refugee and Migration (IGC)

50. The IGC collects data from its participating states. The IGC does not attempt to find common definitions of migration terms as between its participating states. Its capture and retrieval of data is all electronic. Comparative analyses done by the IGC of data supplied by its participating states is on the basis of the definitional parameters used by each of its participating states. The IGC indicated that subject to certain minor adjustments to data categories and the way statistics are reported and counted, it has maintained the same collection formula since February 1998. Each of the categories in which in it collects data is subject to confidential meta-data explanation and this has lead to common understandings of terminology among its participating states and thus relatively easy comparative analyses for the IGC. Rather than attempting to find commonality of definitions of terminology, the development of a common understanding of the various terms has lead to greater flexibility in understanding and comparing the terms in use.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

51. In its capture of international migration data, the OECD notes in material posted on its internet website [7] under the heading "Sources and comparability of migration statistics" that the sources of migration statistics in many of the countries it covers are population registers, residence or work permits, acceptances for permanent settlement, censuses and surveys but observes that a wide variety of other data sources exists such as counts at border crossings and analyses of passenger landing cards and special surveys eg. labour force surveys. This accords with the views of Professor John Salt of the University College of London who considers that much of the data being analysed for purposes of international migration is data collected for purposes other than international migration.

52. The OECD distinguishes between migration data collected by what it calls "temporary permit" systems and "permanent residence" systems of migration [8].

53. In 'permanent residence' systems, the migration statistics on persons entering the country for permanent residence usually provide an indication of inflows and of foreign-born population while in 'temporary residence permit' systems, population registers are generally used to obtain this information (France and the UK are the exception to this as they do not use population registers but other sources of data to establish inflows and foreign-born populations).

Common themes for collecting migration-related data

54. Table 18 (Comparative ease with which terms could be identified in terms of a data retrieval process) indicates that eleven of the twenty two terms covered in the main survey questionnaire are recognizable as common themes in international migration. This is useful for the purposes of data collection purposes in all of the countries that

participated in the main survey. The common terms are listed in paragraph 27 above. All the survey participants other than those international organisations for whom data on foreign-born persons has no relevance indicated they are able to retrieve data on stocks of foreign-born [9].

55. Apart from Canada, New Zealand and the US, the data on the remainder of the terms covered by the main survey questionnaire seems to be available from all the survey participants other than those international organisations for which some of the terms do not form part of core business (in particular, UNHCR). In the case of Canada some data is simply not available and therefore not possible to retrieve. In the case of New Zealand, the comments made in their response to the supplementary country questionnaire (and, by implication, when applied to the main questionnaire) indicated an equivocal response. It would therefore be unfair to positively state a New Zealand position.

56. The US counts persons entering the country but does not distinguish on the basis of length of stay. The US difficulty with some data has been reflected by answering the 'level of difficulty' question with answers which indicate "great difficulty" (ie represented by the number "5").

57. From the perspective of availability of country data, the list of twenty two terms of international migration in the main survey questionnaire presented little difficulty to the countries that participated in the survey. With the exception of Canada and the US, the retrieval of data about those categories was mostly available.

Analysis of common terms and expressions widely used in a migration context to convey similar meaning and inconsistencies arising in terms, definitions and expressions and their usage

58. This section deals with information referred to in the Country and Organisation Tables 1 - 17 (Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange; Viability for States of terms and definitions used in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations; Table 18 (Comparative ease with which terms could be identified in terms of data retrieval); and Table 19 (Comparative table of States' reaction to questions on viability of terminology used in the Glossary to the UN Recommendations).

59. The collection of actual definitions used by countries in dealing with the terms and definitions covered by the surveys proved to be impractical for the purposes of this report. Country participants considered the terms covered in each of the survey questionnaires. From the answers provided, the existence was established of eleven 'core' common terms readily recognised by all survey countries. These are listed at paragraph 27**,** namely, persons admitted as permanent migrants; persons admitted for family reunion; foreign-born persons; persons admitted temporarily for work; persons admitted temporarily as students; persons admitted temporarily for business related activity; persons deported from the State (deportees); asylum seekers; persons recognized as refugees; refugees under UN Mandate; and persons admitted to the State for other

humanitarian purposes. As noted in paragraph 27 above, Ghana apparently treats recognized refugees, UNHCR mandated refugees and humanitarian cases simply as refugees.

60. The country participants considering the Glossary to the UN Recommendations revealed no agreement on the number of terms which might be included in a list of 'standard' terms used in international migration. It is equally apparent that however many terms might be regarded as standard, it is highly unlikely that agreement would be secured on standard definitions for each term that might be included in such a list.

Assessment of shortcomings in current migration data activities of relevant institutions and relevant governments

61. The observations of Professor John Salt of the University College of London are instructive on some of the frustrations and shortcomings of international migration terminology, migration data capture and analyses:

- Much of the data being analysed for purposes of international migration are data collected for purposes other than international migration.
- Many countries cannot supply data in a recommended form.
- It is unreliable to test data on outflows – Australia is the only country that is able to provide reliable data on outflows.
- The collection of an extensive range of data by countries does not necessarily mean easier comparative analysis of the data across those countries because the categories of data may not be exactly similar.
- The methods and categories of data being collected under current global arrangements paradoxically offers researchers a degree of flexibility for comparative analysis of existing data.
- Although individual migration terms may vary from country to country, researchers have attained a sufficient level of expertise to be able to reconcile such variations and make meaningful analyses of collected data.
- Trying to reduce terminology down to the lowest common denominator is not a solution to assist comparative analyses of data. If analysis of data was restricted to situations where there were only common definitions, it could possibly result in the loss of richness of the information available across all countries.
- Breaking statistical data down to a common understanding about certain set themes might be acceptable.
- There is a linguistic dimension to international migration terminology which has to be factored into data comparison – a particular term might have variations or nuances of meaning depending upon the language of the country utilizing the expression.
- In the final analysis, with whatever data that is collected, there is a good chance that there are going to be future migration issues for research that are not covered by appropriate data or on which little data may be available.

62. Traditional countries of immigration (Canada and Australia and the US), capture immigration data as an incidence of the administration of their programmes. The data are used to inform government on the impact of those programmes and as evidence for directional/policy change if required. This is also the case with countries such as the Philippines which has a well developed program involving nationals proceeding overseas to work.

63. For most countries, the adoption of a standard set of terminology (even if regarded as a desirable goal) would be impractical and expensive:
  - Canada, stated simply that it could not subscribe to any theory of standardisation or harmonisation of terminology and would continue to capture its data as a reflection of its own legislative and administrative requirements;
  - Australia expressed qualified support for adopting a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions. However, it considered the adoption of a standardised list of terms and definitions such as that represented by the Glossary to the UN Recommendations would be inconsistent with its current data collection systems and that change would be impractical unless the terminology accurately reflected its policies on migration;
  - New Zealand noted there would be major implications in changing its own terminology in an attempt to reflect a global taxonomy of terms and listed its difficulties as cost of changing documentation, websites and databases, "branding" (some terminology currently in use in NZ has a 'branding purpose e.g. "skilled migrant". In addition, it stated that the adoption of a global taxonomy would require a cultural shift with associated training costs;
  - The UK indicated that it also used terminology specific for its own immigration purposes. It remains to be seen how the EU wide harmonisation of European Statistics on International Migration may affect that position. That exercise provides the hope for conceptual harmonisation (if not definitional unity) so that data can be more easily compared;
  - The US was negative about standardisation of terminology and listed a number of influencing factors for this view such as inconsistency with its current data collection systems, expense associated with altering such systems, lack of consistency with US policies on migration, legislative difficulties in facilitating such changes, irrelevance of some terms for its purposes and extent and complexity of standard definitions.

64. Organisations such as the OECD and ILO have a more comparative focus in the assessment of migration data which is consistent with production of regular reports about the impact of population flows.

65. Standardisation of terms and definitions in the field of international migration could possibly depend on degree of global harmonisation of migration policies. Harmonisation of migration policies on a global basis is unlikely because of the wide variety of immigration/emigration related interests of countries around the world. Harmonisation of policies on regional bases, however, are becoming more frequent as in the European Union, Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern Africa

Development Community (SADC) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). This is probably unsurprising because of the confluence of interest such groups of countries have in the movement of migrants through their regions.

66. As noted however, there is a nucleus of eleven terms in international migration that may be acceptable as a basis, for the development of a common understanding about what data those terms include. This would assist future data comparison and might overcome some of the current frustrations of data researchers.

1 Systeme d'Observation Permanente sur les Migrations.

2 "Crossings" March 2005 – Vol. 6 No. 2 (Harmonisation of migration policies in SADC states"; "Uniform migration data collection..".

3 A Fair deal for migrant workers in a global economy – "Development of a global knowledge base"

4 OECD *SOPEMI 2004* - page 322 - there are major differences in how immigrants are defined. Some countries, it asserts, have traditionally focused on producing data on "foreign residents" (European countries, Japan and Korea) while others refer to the "foreign-born" population (the so-called settlement countries of Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the US). This difference in focus, it states, relates in part to the nature and history of immigration systems and to legislation on citizenship and naturalization. The OECD concludes that reference to 'foreign-born population' can be viewed as representing first generation migrants and may consist of both foreign and national citizens while the term of 'foreign population' may also include immigrants having retained the nationality of their country of origin as of second and third generations born in the host country.

5 For example, since 2000, trafficking and smuggling have been covered by international protocols: Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (This is a supplement to the UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime; Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (This supplements the UN Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime)

6 The Puebla Process - since 1996.

7 www.oecd.org

8 In "temporary permit" systems (which characterize many OECD countries), initial entry to a country is on the basis of a temporary residence permit and where permanent residence can only occur after several years stay in the country. Permanent residence **on entry** to these countries is only available to special groups such as close relatives and refugees. In "permanent residence" systems such as those found in Australia, Canada and the US, there is a planned stream of entry for the specific purpose of permanent residence reflecting the use of migration policy for populating those countries.

9 The issue of foreign-born is subject to the caution provided by the OECD in SOPEMI 2004 – see note 4 above.

ATTACHMENTS:

Responses of survey participant countries and organisations to main survey questionnaire about collection of inward and outward movement data.

Responses of survey participant countries to supplementary survey questionnaire regarding glossary of terminology contained in the "Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration (Revision 1)" published in 1998 by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 & 13 - Summaries for Australia, Canada, Ghana, Mexico, Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States covering main survey questionnaire about collection of inward and outward movement data generally and identification of twenty two terms in international migration;

Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14 - Summaries for Australia, Canada, Ghana, Mexico, Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States covering answers to supplementary survey questionnaire about glossary of terminology contained in the "Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration (Revision 1)" published in 1998 by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
[New Zealand response to the supplementary survey questionnaire covering the 1998 UN "Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration (Revision 1)" is not in tabulated form because of qualified response];

Tables 15, 16 and 17 – Summaries for IGC, IOM and UNHCR covering main survey questionnaire about the collection of inward and outward movement data and identification of twenty two terms in international migration

Table 18: Summary of the comparative ease with which terms could be identified in terms of data retrieval.

Table 19: Comparison of States' reaction to questions about the possible viability of terminology defined in the glossary to "Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration (Revision 1)" published in 1998 by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

COUNTRY: AUSTRALIA

Table 1: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange [Note 1]	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality [1]				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Foreign retirees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x [2]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a
Asylum seekers	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Refugees under UN Mandate	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Stateless persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Inward movement	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC
Outward movement	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC		IO/OC

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

Note 1 – Australia does not routinely engage in data exchange of unit record data but publicly available statistical aggregate data is provided on request.

[1] Australian immigration data collects data on both country of birth and actual nationality of persons. It should be noted however, that population by country of birth, age and sex is taken from periodic censuses conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. This data is updated between censuses from immigration data and also death registrations.

[2] Australian authorities indicate that information from completed passenger cards can provide data about residents returning for more than 12 months and those returning for less than 12 months (if the cards have been answered correctly). Through a data matching process, the Australian Bureau of Statistics is also able to know from the statistics provided by people returning for 12 months or more whether they left within 12 months and vice versa. This permits a calculation on annual net overseas migration.

Table 2: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?		x	
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?	x		
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?	x		
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?	x		
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?		x	
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?		x	
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			None listed
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?		x	
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	Inconsistency with Australia's current data collection systems; Expense associated with altering Australia's data collection systems; Not reflective of Australia's policies on migration; Not sufficiently relevant to Australia's data collection needs; Terms too numerous with insufficient flexibility for practical use; Terms and definitions too complex; Terms not focused on migration program outcomes.
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?	x		
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?	x		
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?	x		
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		x	
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?	x		
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?	x		

COUNTRY: CANADA

Table 3: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation [Note 1]	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode [Note 2]	Update Frequency	Data Exchange [Note 3]	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)		x								
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists		x								
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Foreign retirees		x								
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)		x								
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)		x								
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x								
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x								
Asylum seekers	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Refugees under UN Mandate	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons granted temporary protection status		x								
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Stateless persons		x								
Inward movement	x							UC	IO/OC	
Outward movement [Note 3]		x								

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

Note 1: Canada collects data that conform with Canadian immigration legislation and regulations which define the categories. Data are therefore collected for the purposes of administering Canada's Immigration Act.
Note 2: Retrieval of electronic source data is easily accessed by the Canadian Department of Immigration. Summary statistics are available on Immigration Canada's website.
Note 3: Canada's response to the questions about data exchange is qualified by the statement that Canada has no formal agreements with other countries or international organizations for the exchange of data. Aggregated data are supplied to countries and international organizations on request and most aggregated data are available on Canada's website. Qualitatively this approach is similar to that of Australia except that the answers given by Australia on the same questions appear as a "no" in the data exchange column of the table.

Table 4: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?		x	
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?		x	
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?	x		
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?		x	
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?		x	
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?		x	
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			Permanent migration of skilled workers; Insufficient distinction between permanent and temporary stay
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?	n/a	n/a	See **9** below
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	Canada would not consider adopting a standardized list. It will continue to administer its immigration policies according to its own laws including for the terms and definitions provided therein. To change would be inconsistent with its current data collection systems, it would not warrant the expense associated with such a change, would not be reflective of Canadian laws and policies, would be difficult to change legislation reuired to adopt such terminology and would not be sufficiently relevant to Canada's own requirements.
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?	n/a	n/a	See comments above
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?	n/a	n/a	See comments above
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?		x	The number of standard terms is irrelevant in a Canadian context
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		x	Data comparisons will continue and it will continue to be a matter for researchers of data to manipulate data to draw comparisons based on their research
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?		x	
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?		x	

COUNTRY: GHANA

Table 5: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists		x								
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Foreign retirees		x								
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)		x								
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x								
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x								
Asylum seekers		x								
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Refugees under UN Mandate		x								
Persons granted temporary protection status		x								
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons		x								
Stateless persons		x								
Inward movement	x					Infocard	M	A	IO	OC
Outward movement	x					Infocard	M	A	IO	OC

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

Table 6: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?	x		
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?	x		
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?	x		
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?	x		
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?	x		
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?		x	
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			None listed
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?	x		
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	Not sufficiently relevant to Ghana's data collection needs; Terms too numerous with insufficient flexibility for practical use.
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?	x		
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?	x		
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?	x		
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?	x		
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?	x		
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?	x		

COUNTRY: MEXICO

Table 7: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Foreign retirees	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Foreign born persons	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)		x								
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x								
Nationals deported back to the State from other States	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Asylum seekers	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons recognized as refugees	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Refugees under UN Mandate	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons granted temporary protection status	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Stateless persons	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Inward movement	x					E	E	UC	IO/OC	
Outward movement		x								

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

Table 8: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?	x		
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?	x		
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?		x	
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?	x		
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?		x	
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?	x		
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			None listed
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?	x		
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	Inconsistent with current data collection systems; Expense associated with altering current data collection systems; Possible legislative difficulty for change to be facilitated.
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?		x	
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?		x	
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?	x		
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		x	
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?	x		
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?	x		

COUNTRY: PHILIPPINES

Table 9: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No *
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists [1]	x					M to E	E		IO	OC
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Foreign retirees	x					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists) [2]	x		x	x	x	M to E	E		IO	OC
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)	Note 1								IO	OC
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)	x					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months	x					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Nationals deported back to the State from other States	x					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x								
Asylum seekers	x					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Refugees under UN Mandate		x								
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Stateless persons	x		x	x	x	M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Inward movement	x Note 2					M to E	E	UQ	IO	OC
Outward movement	x					M to E	E	UQ Note 3	IO	OC

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

* The Philippines has no policy about the formal exchange of data with other countries and only does so *ad hoc* on a request basis.

[1] The Philippines has a practice called "Balik Bayon" where entry for up to 1 year is permitted without a visa for those arriving with Filipino spouses.
[2] The Philippines allows unvisaed arrivals for up to 21 days. Only formality is completion of a form on arrival

Note 1: Only located irregular migrants are subject to statistical counts.
Note 2: The only outward movement counts that are made are of tourists, business travelers and Filipnos proceeding as overseas workers.
Note 3: The Philippines has special arrangements in place for Filipinos who leave the Philippines to work overseas. Data about this group of people is updated monthly while all data including migrant workers data is routinely updated on a quarterly basis.

Table 10: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?	x		
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?	x		
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?	x		
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?	x		
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?	x		
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?	x		
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			n/a
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?	x		
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.	x		n/a
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?		x	
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?		x	
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?		x	
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		x	
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?	x		
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?	x		

COUNTRY: UNITED KINGDOM

Table 11: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x[1]	x[1]	x[1]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists	x		x[2]	x[2]	x[2]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x[2]	x[2]	x[2]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Foreign retirees		x								
Foreign born persons	x		x[2]	x[2]	x[2]	E[3]	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x[2]	x[2]	x[2]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)		x								
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently	x		x[2]	x[2]	x[2]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Asylum seekers			x	x	x[4]					
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x[4]	E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Refugees under UN Mandate										
Persons granted temporary protection status		x								
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons										
Stateless persons	x					E	E	UQ/UA	IO/OC	
Inward movement	x								IO/OC	
Outward movement		x								

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

[1] Although these data are required under THESIM (Towards Harmonised European Statistics on International Migration), it is said that such data are incomplete.

[2] The UK Census collects information on "usual residents". A "usual resident" is defined as someone who spends most of their time residing at the census address (including persons who have been or intend to be there for 6 months or more)

[3] The stock of foreign born persons is established by a 10 yearly census. Data by sex, age, citizenship and country of birth are available on the population of "usual residents" in the UK.

[4] The information provided by the Office of National Statistics in the UK suggests that the country of citizenship of asylum seekers is the available information equivalent to nationality.

Table 12: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?		x	
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?		x	
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?	x		
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?			No answer given
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?	x		Possibly unreliable definitions
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?		x	
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?		x	Rejected asylum seekers Temporary protected migrant/refugee Subsidiary protection Humanitarian status Forced returns Refusals Removals Assisted returns Order to leave Residence permit Leave to remain (temporary/permanent) Immigrant from former colonies Return of citizens by descent Foreign born Ethnic affiliation or Race "Immigrant switchers" Citizens by acquisition
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?		x	
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	UK has specific expressions it uses
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?		x	Not specific enough for UK needs
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?			No answer given
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?		x	
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		n	
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?	x		
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?	x		

COUNTRY: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Table 13: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode *	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)		x[1]								
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists		x[1]								
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Foreign retirees		x								
Foreign born persons		x								
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x								
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x								
Asylum seekers	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Refugees under UN Mandate [2]	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC/UM/UA	x	
Stateless persons		x								
Inward movement	x		x	x	x	E	E		x	
Outward movement	x[3]		x	x	x				x	

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

* The US advises that some of its data is collected electronically but that the majority is collected on manual records and then recorded into various electronic systems.

[1] The US advises that such persons are major categories of migrants for the US but that it does not distinguish among long term and short term migrants in the same manner suggested by the 1998 UN recommendations.
[2] The US considers all persons granted refugee status in the US to be refugees under UN Mandate.
[3] Outward movements from the US are counted but categories of persons departing or their reasons for departure are not recorded.

Note: The US advises that it also collects information about the number of persons not authorized for stay (irregular migrants) apprehended between points of entry and the interior of the country

Table 14: Viability for States of terms and definition used in 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration

Q.No.	Question	Yes	No	Other/Amplification
1	Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?	x		
2	Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for its own purposes using of a range of globally standard terms and expressions?		x	
3	In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?		x	
4	Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?		x	
5	If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?		x	
6	Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?		x	
7	If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?			None listed
8	Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?		x	
9	Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? If no, please list the possible reasons.		x	Inconsistency with current data collection systems Expense associated with altering data collection systems Not reflective of national policies on migration Possible legislative difficulties for change to be facilitated Not sufficiently relevant to own data collection needs Terms and definitions too complex Terms too numerous with insufficient flexibility for practical use
10	Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?	x		
11	Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?	x		
12	Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?		x	
13	Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?		x	
14	Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?		x	
15	Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?		x	

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTATIONS ON ASYLUM, REFUGEE AND MIGRATION POLICIES IN EUROPE, NORTH AMERICA AND AUSTRALIA (IGC)

Table 15: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation [Note 1]	Whether collected		Data Composition [Note 2]			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists		x								
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Foreign retirees		x								
Foreign born persons	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity	x					E	E	UA		
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)		x								
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants) [Note 3]	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UM	PS	IO
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x								
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x								
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently		x								
Asylum seekers	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UC[1]	PS	IO
Persons recognized as refugees	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA[1]	PS	IO
Refugees under UN Mandate		x								
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Stateless persons		x								
Inward movement	x		n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO
Outward movement [Note 4]		x [2]	n/a	n/a	x	E	E	UA	PS	IO

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; PS = Participating States

[1] Asylum claims are divided into asylum applications and asylum decisions. The former would fall into the category of 'asylum seekers' while the latter would be persons recognized as refugees. Data on the former is updated continuously while data on asylum decisions (refugees) is updated annually.

[2] The IGC does not routinely collect outward movement data from its participating states but data on returns is routinely collected (as a subset of outward movements from its participating states).

Note 1 - The IGC data collection reflects much of what its participating states (PS) provide to it. In addition to the data referred to in the table above, they maintain data about unaccompanied minors, pending cases in all categories, stocks of non-nationals in PS, persons rejected at the borders of PS, naturalizations and 'cohort data'.

Note 2 - The IGC does not break down its data into age and gender

Note 3 - The data about irregular migrants collected by the IGC includes improperly documented arrivals in PS.

Note 4 - Outward movement data columns reflect the position only as the data relates to returns as the IGC does not collect outward movement data other than that relating to returns.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)

Table 16: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Foreign retirees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for work	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity		x								
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)		x								
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons deported from the state (deportees)		x								
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Nationals deported back to the State from other States		x								
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Asylum seekers		x								
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Refugees under UN Mandate	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Stateless persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Inward movement	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	
Outward movement	x		x	x	x	E	E	UC & UA	IO/ OC	

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)

Table 17: Data collection, composition, categorisation, retrieval, collation and exchange

Data Categorisation	Whether collected		Data Composition			Collection Mode	Retrieval Mode	Update Frequency*	Data Exchange	
	Yes	No	Age	Sex	Nationality				Yes	No
Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for family reunion	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Foreign retirees		x	x	x	x					
Foreign born persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for work		x	x	x	x				IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training		x	x	x	x				IO/ OC	
Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity		x								
Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)		x								
Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)	x[1]		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/OC	
Persons deported from the state (deportees)	x					E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)		x	x	x	x					
Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months		x	x	x	x					
Nationals deported back to the State from other States	x					E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Asylum seekers	x					E		UM &UA		
Persons recognized as refugees	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Refugees under UN Mandate	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons granted temporary protection status	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Stateless persons	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Inward movement [2]	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	
Outward movement [3]	x		x	x	x	E	E	UA	IO/ OC	

M = Manually; E = Electronically; UA = Annually; UC = Continuously; UM = Monthly; UQ = Quarterly; UHA = Half Yearly; IO = International Organisations; OC = Other Countries

* UNHCR Data is updated routinely on anannual basis but asylum applicant data is done monthly and stocks and flows in developing countries is updated quarterly

[1] UNHCR collects data UNHCR does collect specific statistics on irregular/secondary movements of asylum-seekers but indicated that its data are imperfect and are estimates only – see paragraph 29 of the report.

[2] Inward movement data collected is about asylum seekers, refugees, forced migration and other humanitarian situations.

[3] Outward movement data collected is about repatriated refugees to country of origin.

Table 18: Comparative ease with which terms could be identified in terms of data retrieval:

Terms covered:

C1. Long term migrants (persons remaining for 12 months or more)
C2. Short term migrants (persons remaining for less than 12 months) other than tourists
C3. Persons admitted for settlement (permanent migration)
C4. Persons admitted for family reunion
C5. Foreign retirees
C6. Foreign born persons
C7. Persons admitted temporarily for work
C8. Persons admitted temporarily as students or other educational or vocational training
C9. Persons admitted temporarily for business related activity
C10. Visitors for purposes of leisure, recreation, visits to relatives, health or medical reasons (tourists)
C11. Persons not authorized for stay by the receiving State (Irregular migrants)

C12. Persons deported from the state (deportees)
C13. Persons leaving the State permanently (emigrants)
C14. Persons leaving the state for periods less than 12 months
C15. Nationals deported back to the State from other States
C16. Nationals returning to the State to remain permanently
C17. Asylum seekers
C18. Persons recognized as refugees
C19. Refugees under UN Mandate
C20. Persons granted temporary protection status
C21. Persons admitted for other humanitarian reasons
C22. Stateless persons

Ease of identification indicated by a number ranging from simple represented by the number 1 to difficult represented by the number 5 (n/a = not applicable; n/p = not possible; nag = no answer given; dnp = did not participate):

Country/Organisation	Degree of difficulty in identification																					
	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22
Australia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5 [1]	1	1	1	1	1	1
Canada	n/p[2]	n/p[2]	1	1	n/a	Census[3]	1	3	3	n/p[4]	n/p	3	n/p[5]	n/p[5]	n/p	n/p[6]	1	1	1	n/p[7]	3	n/p
Ghana	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	*	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1
Mexico	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	3	5	2	5	5	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
New Zealand	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag	nag
Pakistan	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp
Philippines	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4/5	1	1	2/3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Africa	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp
United Kingdom	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
United States	5[8]	5[8]	1	3	5	Census5[9]	2	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	3	2	2	5	2	5
IOM	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	1	2	n/a	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
IGC	3	3	2	2	n/a	2	3	3	3	3	1 - 5	2	3	n/a	n/a	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
UNHCR	4	5	2	5	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	3	n/a	n/a	3	2	1	1	1	3	2	5

* Ghana failed to stipulate the degree of difficulty although it does collect data in this category.

+ UNHCR has indicated that it does collect specific statistics on irregular/secondary movements of asylum-seekers but indicated that its data are imperfect – see paragraph 29 of the main report

[3] Census data is used to estimate stock of foreign born persons in Canada. The census is conducted every 5 years.

[4] Not all visitors to Canada require a visa as there are a number of countries who have reciprocal visa free rights of entry to Canada. Where visas are presented at entry control points, they are stamped but not captured electronically. Customs declarations are collected from all visitors by air but again the information is not captured electronically. Additionally, the movement of visitors through Canada's extensive land border with the US is also not captured electronically.

[5] Canada has no exit controls and departures from Canada are not recorded (save for persons being deported from Canada). Moreover, information about departing and returning residents is not collected.

[6] Canada does not collect information about returning residents.

[7] Canada does not grant temporary protection status

[8] The US advises that such persons are major categories of migrants for the US but that the US does not distinguish among long term and short term migrants in the same manner suggested by the 1998 UN recommendations.

[9] The degree of difficulty here is taken to mean that the count foreign born persons in the US is, as in many countries, the subject of calculation from periodic censuses and that the data is not retrievable on demand.

Table 19: Comparative Table of States' reaction to questions on viability of terminology used in UN glossary of terms

Questions posed:

Q1. Are the terms or expressions currently in use relating to international migration sufficiently well developed?
Q2. Is it feasible to collect and collate migration data for the purposes of your own state using a range of globally standard terms and expressions?
Q3. In the context of international migratory movements, is it essential to be able to make global comparisons of sets of migration data collected by all countries without any confusion as to meaning ie. to be able to compare like with like?
Q4. Is the UN list a useful guide to the essential terms used in the field of international migration?
Q5. If the UN list of terms and definitions were to be adopted globally, are the definitions of each of the terms used in the UN list accurate for the current data collection categories of your country own?
Q6. Does the UN list of terms and definitions include or cover all categories of international migration data currently used in your country?
Q7. If the UN list is not sufficiently comprehensive or inclusive for the purposes of your country, list any other essential terms that ought to be included?
Q8. Does the UN list allow sufficient flexibility or consideration for possible variations of those terms in use in your country's collection and collation of migration data?
Q9. Would your country consider it feasible to adopt all relevant terms defined in the UN list when collecting and collating your own country's data? *
Q10. Is the number of terms in the UN list too extensive for the purposes of your country?
Q11. Are the terms and definitions in the UN list too complicated to apply in your own country's data collection and collation?
Q12. Should there be developed fewer but broader terms on international migration to facilitate application of such a list to data collection in your country?
Q13. Does your country consider the current ability of countries, international organizations and relevant academics to collect, collate and compare migration data to be sufficiently effective to assist assessing global movements of people?
Q14. Would your country support the possible development of a global list of compatible international migration terms and definitions?
Q15. Would your country support a coordinated change in terminology if such a list could be developed?

Notes:

Q 9 asked States to list the possible reasons why it might be difficult to adopt all the terms defined in the UN glossary. The listed reasons do not form part of the table below but can be found listed in table 2 for each country surveyed that provided a 'no' answer to this question.

Each of the States listed were approached to provide answers to the above questions. The answers are contained in the relevant columns: N = No; Y = Yes; nag = no answer given; n/a = not applicable; dnp = did not participate.

Answers given:

Country	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7 Any Listed	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
Australia	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	None	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Canada	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Table 2	n/a	N	n/a	n/a	N	N	N	N
Ghana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	None	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mexico	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	None	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
New Zealand	nag[1]	nag[1]	N	N	No view	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]	nag[1]
Pakistan	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp
Philippines	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
South Africa	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp	dnp
United Kingdom	N	N	Y	nag	Y[2]	N	Table 2	N	N	N[3]	nag	N	N	Y	Y
United States	Y	N	N	N	N	N	None	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N

[1] The new Zealand response indicated that responses provided to this questionnaire required consultation between their Department of Labour (Immigration Service), Statistics New Zealand and their Ministry of Tourism and noted that a range of other New Zealand government agencies collect data relevant to international migration movements and outcomes. A "nag" in a question column indicates there is no consensus between relevant New Zealand agencies as to the appropriate answer to the questions so marked.
[2] UK indicated that the answer to this question was a possible yest but expressed doubts about the sustainability and reliability of definitions.
[3] UK indicated that the list was not specific enough for the purposes of that country.