

# THE COMPARABILITY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION STATISTICS\*)

BOHDANA HOLÁ\*\*)

---

**Abstract:** The importance of international migration for the demographic situation in most countries, particularly developed ones, has increased in recent years. Attention must, therefore, be given to the statistics describing this phenomenon. However, statistics produced in individual countries do not appear to be mutually comparable. The author takes the example of migration flows between individual countries, from the point of view of the country of origin and the destination country, and describes the differences in observation, summarises the main reasons for these differences, and outlines possible ways of reducing the differences.

**Keywords:** International migration, migration flows, comparability of migration statistics, harmonisation of migration statistics, EU migration policy, immigrants

---

In recent years migration has become an important factor affecting demographic change. Foreign migration is also beginning to capture the attention of European politicians as one potential solution to the crisis of the pay-as-you-go pension systems in connection with demographic ageing, which is occurring in every European country to at least some degree. For this reason the issue has garnered more and more attention in international talks and conferences.

The interest of politics is turned towards migration policy and establishing the appropriate parameters for determining what kind of people (or what kind of attributes, qualifications, and experiences people should have) should be coming to European countries. On a worldwide scale this mainly involves determining how to harmonise the interest of advanced countries in “young blood” and a less demanding but highly qualified labour force with needs in developing countries, which need to release some of the pressure from an exploding population, but must try to avoid the occurrence of a massive “brain drain”, as such individuals are an essential to the future development of such countries.

On a European level and from the perspective of individual states this is also a matter of the acceptance of migrants by the domestic population, without the emergence of negative side-effects in the form of nationalist and racist movements, so that migrants are able to become fully integrated in society.

Each state has slightly different ideas about the parameters of immigration policy, their acceptance of migrants, and balancing the rights of newcomers and their obligations towards their new homeland. Each country embodies these ideas in legislation governing the residence of foreigners, asylum procedures, employment, trade licences, and even in legislation on population records.

---

\*) This text was presented at the international conference “Statistics – Investment in the Future” in the session on Social Statistics III – Demography and Migration, which was held on 6–7 September 2004 and was organised by the Czech Statistical Office. It was published in the journal *Demografie*, 2005, 47, p. 177–187. The contents of the journal are published on the Web site of the Czech Statistical Office at: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/redakce.nsf/i/demografie>

\*\*) Direct all correspondence to: Ing. Bohdana Holá, Czech Statistical Office, Na padesátém 81, 100 82 Prague 10, Czech Republic, e-mail: [bohdana.hola@czso.cz](mailto:bohdana.hola@czso.cz)

**Table 1 Taxonomy of international mobility**

Order	Group	Category
1.	Transients (not relevant for int. migration)	Border workers (pendlers)
2.		Transients
3.	International tourism	Excursionists (stay without accomodation for a night)
4.		Tourists (stay with accomodation for a night)
5.		Business travellers
6.	Traditionally excluded from international migration	Diplomatic and consular personnel (incl. dependants and employees)
7.		Military personnel
8.		Nomads
9.	International migration	Students
10.		Trainees
11.		Workers
12.		Employees of international organisations
13.		Persons excercising the right of free establishment in the country
14.		Settlements
15.		Family formations and reunions
16.		Refugees
17.	Others relevant for international migration but whose duration of stay in the destination country is uncertain	Asylum seekers
18.		Illegals

Source: UN Recommendation on International Migration Statistics, Revision 1, UN New York, 1998.

As part of the Treaty of Amsterdam migration policy in the EU was shifted from the third pillar (the independent responsibility of each state, with EU institutions in just an advisory position) to the first pillar (a common EU policy based on the EC Regulations and Directives). The transition to a common EU policy in this sphere requires a relatively long period of time because the process of harmonising the many diverse migration policies of individual states is considerably demanding, and even when the legislation of individual countries is altered to reflect EU policy harmonisation in practice will take much more time. While the rules for asylum procedures have been streamlined (the Dublin Convention), the free movement of EU citizens has been addressed, and some basic rules regarding procedures relating to citizens of third countries (e.g. the right to family reunification), other aspects of the common EU policy are being prepared.

### The framework of foreign migration statistics

In relation to the increasing emphasis on migration policy, interest in data on migrants is also growing, both owing to the need for information about the background situation in order to establish the parameters of migration policy, and owing to the possibility to monitor the success of the given migration policy.

Data on migration and on the number of immigrants in a country (in the EU) and their characteristics is in most cases based on data taken from administrative records on foreigners and citizens. National legislative and registration terms also determine who qualifies as a migrant and how migration is monitored.

At the international level efforts exist to harmonise the statistics on foreign migration so that the data published on migration at least roughly refer to the same group of individuals in each country. Thus far the theoretical foundation for this has been the **UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration** from 1998. These Recommendations contain a

Table 2 Migration flows between European countries, 2002

From where	To where										
	CZ	DK	DE	CY	LV	NL	PL	PT	SI	FI	SE
Czech Republic	x	202	11 150	93	8	393	34	8	5	47	151
	x	56	1 087	24	8	159	1 117	8	19	39	57
Denmark	51	x	2 889	54	30	465	27	39	-		
	143	x	2 700	35	372	613	588	128	30	<b>376</b>	<b>4 337</b>
Germany	987	3 543	x	374	76	7 959	2 335	692	332	854	2 699
	9 691	2 974	x	242	1 378	9 336	78 739	11 315	2 502	2 658	3 876
Cyprus	12	13	260	x	-	29	4	-	-	26	59
	21	-	42	x	-	21	21	-	-	42	21
Latvia	8	455	2 195	-	x	92	5	5	-	53	189
	11	52	210	-	x	14	28	2	-	60	60
Netherlands	224	886	13 976	73	9	x	83	332	10	228	780
	207	540	10 822	32	11	x	492	710	26	299	659
Poland	1 679	962	100 968	29	23	2 275	x	32	3	95	1 186
	38	95	17 806	2	7	290	x	6	-	9	174
Portugal	23	171	8 806	-	3	1 653	4	x	2	52	178
	-	-	776	-	-	200	-	x	-	-	-
Slovenia	21	37	2 379	-	2	66	-	8	x	2	14
	18	6	907	1	-	45	10	6	x	4	44
Finland	34	396	2 203	8	23	408	4	24	-	x	
	30	384	730	22	24	270	37	28	2	x	<b>3 591</b>
Sweden	70		3 481	46	26	680	70	48	15		x
	68	<b>2 241</b>	1 659	64	46	551	190	100	24	<b>3 211</b>	x

Source: New Cronos – Eurostat database.

definition of the term “country of usual residence” (as the country in which a person resides for more than one year), and this description is subsequently used as a differentiating point between short-term and long-term migration: short-term migration is a change of residence for a period of over three months but less than one year; long-term migration is a change of country of usual residence; the three-month dividing line is a difference between tourism and short-term migration. Also defined here are categories of migrating individuals and their classification in or omission from international migration statistics. The distinction by state citizenship is only a secondary characteristic. Categories of migrating individuals and their classification are presented in the following table 1.

Recommendations, even when issued by international institutions like the United Nations, are not a legally binding standard, and this can pose a problem in their application. While in some states the Recommendations are regarded as a kind of “gentlemen’s agreement”, and the adherence to and application of this agreement is incorporated in the legislative system, in the Czech Republic these gentleman’s agreements are not accepted by the *Foreign and Border Police* as a substantial enough argument, for example, to change the system of residence controls, making it possible to honour (in whatever form) the Recommendations.

Proposed EU directives on foreign migration statistics are currently in the approval process and are based on the UN Recommendations on International Migration Statistics and on the Eurostat Joint Questionnaire, the UN Statistics Division, the UN Economic Commission for Europe, the Council of Europe, and also the International Labour Organisation’s guidelines

on international migration statistics, which all the member and candidate countries of the EU have been using since 1995.

### **Migration statistics and international comparisons**

In addition to the above-mentioned problems, international migration statistics are also a problem in terms of the fact that unlike, for example, statistics on the labour market or national accounting there are always two subjects that are statistically affected by one and the same flow of migrants. While national accounts can only be compiled in the statistical office of the given state, information on the fact that a person moved, for example, from the Czech Republic to Germany is observed (or should be observed) by both the statistical office in the country of origin (in this case the Czech Statistical Office) and the statistical office in the destination country (Statistisches Bundesamt). When we add together all the cases of migration from the Czech Republic to Germany we have two items of data that should *in theory* be the same. But these two items of data (and any other two items of data depicting migration flows from the perspectives of the countries of origin and destination) are not the same. And very often these two data items are not even similar in order, which can be discerned from the following table containing available pairs of information on migration flows in 2002. The data item within a single cell should be the same. The grey row indicates the situation from the perspective of country "A" (emigration from country "A" to country "B"), the white row indicates the situation from the perspective of the destination country "B" (immigration from country "A" to country "B"). The table contains data only for those countries where data on immigrants was available from the destination country and data on emigrants was available from the country of origin.

There are a number of evident differences in the table. Particularly noteworthy is the difference between the measurement of migration in Germany and in almost every other country. Also interesting is the measurement of migration flows between the Czech Republic and Poland and a comparison of the differences in reverse flows (records of flows are similar that actually need not necessarily be similar in the order, while data that should be similar show order differences).

A somewhat more relevant picture can be obtained from the following two tables. The first presents absolute deviations (the data in the white row – the data in the grey row, or immigration – emigration). The second table presents the relative deviations (absolute deviation in relation to the arithmetic average of both figures).

The data in the tables essentially call into question migration statistics and any analyses of migration flows based on these data. However, this is not a result of inconsistent data on international migration. Migration is part of the net population statistics or the registered number of inhabitants in a given state or community. Ultimately it can be asked how many inhabitants the EU really has, whether the "per capita" indicators are significantly distorted (e.g. in the Czech Republic and Poland undervalued), whether the problems with measuring migration flows are not also reflected in irregularities in the elections to the European Parliament (whether it would purely theoretically be possible to cast a vote in twenty member countries), problems with multiple taxation, or problems with overlapping social-benefits payments.

In any case it is necessary to devote more detailed thought to the background of the observed differences and attempt to find a possible solution that could help improve the measurement migration flows. As noted above, statistics in this field are to a large degree dependent on particular legislative parameters, and statistics themselves can do little to influence this. So improvement is often dependent on political will. However, politicians, who are one of the principal users of data on international migration, rarely recognise their role in the process of improving data collection.

**Table 3 Absolute deviations of data on international migration flows, 2002**

From where	To where										
	CZ	DK	DE	CY	LV	NL	PL	PT	SI	FI	SE
CZ	x	146	10 063	69	0	234	-1 083	0	-14	8	94
DK	-92	x	189	19	-342	-148	-561	-89	-30	-16	-87
DE	-8 704	569	x	132	-1 302	-1 377	-76 404	-10 623	-2 170	-1 804	-1 177
CY	-9	13	218	x	0	8	-17	0	0	-16	38
LV	-3	403	1 985	0	x	78	-23	3	0	-7	129
NL	17	346	3 154	41	-2	x	-409	-378	-16	-71	121
PL	1 641	867	83 162	27	16	1 985	x	26	3	86	1 012
PT	23	171	8 030	0	3	1 453	4	x	2	52	178
SI	3	31	1 472	-1	2	21	-10	2	x	-2	-30
FI	4	12	1 473	-14	-1	138	-33	-4	-2	x	-59
SE	2	147	1 822	-18	-20	129	-120	-52	-9	44	x

**Table 4 Relative deviations of data on international migration flows, related to the mean of both data, 2002**

From where	To where										
	CZ	DK	DE	CY	LV	NL	PL	PT	SI	FI	SE
CZ	x	1.13	1.64	1.18	0.00	0.85	-1.88	0.00	-1.17	0.19	0.90
DK	-0.95	x	0.07	0.43	-1.70	-0.27	-1.82	-1.07	-2.00	-0.04	-0.02
DE	-1.63	0.17	x	0.43	-1.79	-0.16	-1.88	-1.77	-1.53	-1.03	-0.36
CY	-0.55	2.00	1.44	x	-	0.32	-1.36	-	-	-0.47	0.95
LV	-0.32	1.59	1.65	-	x	1.47	-1.39	0.86	-	-0.12	1.04
NL	0.08	0.49	0.25	0.78	-0.20	x	-1.42	-0.73	-0.89	-0.27	0.17
PL	1.91	1.64	1.40	1.74	1.07	1.55	x	1.37	2.00	1.65	1.49
PT	2.00	2.00	1.68	-	2.00	1.57	2.00	x	2.00	2.00	2.00
SI	0.15	1.44	0.90	-2.00	2.00	0.38	-2.00	0.29	x	-0.67	-1.03
FI	0.13	0.03	1.00	-0.93	-0.04	0.41	-1.61	-0.15	-2.00	x	-0.02
SE	0.03	0.06	0.71	-0.33	-0.56	0.21	-0.92	-0.70	-0.46	0.01	x

The main reasons for the observed differences can be summarised under the following four categories: **legislation and methodology, the location of data collection, the approach of officials, registering immigration and emigration.**

### Legislation and methodology

Several sub-categories in this area can be distinguished:

1) **Restrictions on entry and the strictness of residence terms:** Generally, the stricter entry and residence terms are, the better the information that can be obtained on migrants. There are good records on the people who enter the territory of a state for a period longer than three months and need a visa or residence permit (leaving aside the issue of illegal migration, which is not part of migration statistics in any regard) in the information systems of the Foreign and Border Police or similar institutions. The records are much worse wherever simple registration is all that is required. This is the case of the free movement of citizens between countries in the EU. With registration much less data may be requested from migrants than is required from migrants applying for a residence permit, and it is not easy to penalise those who do not register. In this area the differences between countries are likely to grow (unless some effective measures aimed at consolidation are taken). It is also important whether other rights or responsibilities are attached to a residence permit or registration, and how motivated an individual coming into a country is to legalise their stay.

2) **The distinction between tourism and migration:** Although there are recommendations for differentiating between tourism and short-term migration – three months – each country approaches this question individually and the distinctions differ considerably. Countries also vary in terms of how difficult it is to distinguish between short- and long-term migration (e.g. in some states in Germany it is necessary to register when a person is residing outside a hotel or accommodation facility if the period of stay is longer than two weeks, and all such cases are included under migration).

3) **Categories of arrivals and departures included under migration:** Some countries, for example, do not include students or asylum-seekers or detected illegal immigrants.

4) **The definition of the country of original/future residence:** Information on the country of prior residence or future residence is based only on what the person migrating provides to the foreign police or the registration office. People can deliberately conceal information about where they are from and where they are going, or they can change their mind. There is also a problem when the one-year limit is used to differentiate between short- and long-term migration, because a particular individual can leave country A and go to country B, but then soon after move to country C and only there actually reside for a longer period. Information about longer migration routes never reach country A. Similarly, country C need not know that the usual place of residence of the migrant was not country B but country A.

The appendix here contains a comparison of the systems for monitoring migration in the Czech Republic and in Germany, along with a more detailed comparison of migration flows between these two countries.

The gradual elimination of legislative discrepancies, at least within the EU and the European Economic Area should be achieved by means of a common migration policy and the harmonisation of residence terms through the introduction of EU Regulations and Directives.

### **The location of data collection**

Data quality can be substantially affected by the fact that the data is collected (i) during a visa application and granting procedure (e.g. at the consulate of the destination country), (ii) when crossing the border into the destination country, or (iii) when applying for a residence permit at the foreign police or similar institution responsible for legalising the stay of foreigners in a country, (iv) during registration at a regional registration office in the location where residence is being applied for, or (v) in sample surveys, which is how it is done in England.

If all other differences were eliminated, however, the location of data collection would not play a big role.

### **The approach of officials**

The human factor often relates to national character. For example, German immigration officials or officials at registration offices are regarded as considerably stricter than, say, Italian officials.

The relationship of this factor to national character necessarily means that overcoming differences in the approach of officials will be a “long haul”, and it can only be achieved if, say, the national characters of the states of the EU were to converge.

### **Recording immigration and emigration**

Generally, immigration is documented more than emigration, and there are several reasons for this. First, the failure to legalise residence can result in serious problems (deportation, prohibition on residence, repatriation, etc.), while the failure to legalise the end of stay need not be the source of any problems (if someone is no longer in a country, it is impossible to penalise them for not being in the country illegally). That is why emigration from a country is often not documented.

For foreigners there is a safety catch in that a visa or a residence permit is only valid for a specific period. Once the document expires the foreigner can “officially” leave.

In the case of a country’s citizens things are more complicated, because there is no time limit on their residence. If there is no advantage to a citizen from reporting their departure (for example, tax registration and the minimum tax obligations in the place of residence, or penalties for not paying health and social insurance while absent and without announcing one’s absence), citizens are not particularly motivated to report their departure and data on emigration are significantly undervalued.

This inconsistency can be solved, for example, by linking tax returns and social and health insurance payments to the registered main place of residence.

Another option is to use the principle applied in internal migration statistics for international migration. Internal migration statistics are based on the relationship between the new and the original municipality of residence. If a person moves from municipality A to municipality B and in municipality B registers as a resident, fills in a change of residence form, which municipality B sends to municipality A (or, more recently, as written communication is abandoned, municipality B enters the change in the **Central Population Registry** and the original municipality makes an electronic change of address entry).

This principle could be applied to cross-border migration if states were able to agree and allow the exchange of such data at the international level. In order to substantially improve the results of migration statistics, this procedure would best be taken up at the level of the EU and states cooperating with the EU (Norway, Switzerland, Island, and even the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand). This approach should also include the institution of one main and several other places of residence, the way the system works today, for example, in Germany. All rights and obligations linked to place of residence (insurance, taxes, voting rights, etc.) would then be attached to the main place of residence.

The international cooperation described above already operates in the Nordic Union – an agreement between Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland – and more recently also Belgium. The destination municipality registers the immigrant, who also fills in a registration form. If the person remains in the municipality longer than six months, the municipality sends a copy of the registration form to the previous place of residence, regardless of whether the place of residence is in the same or in a different country of the Nordic Union. If we compare in Table 2 the size of the migration flows shown by individual sides, we find that the countries associated in the Nordic Union exhibit just minor differences (in Table 2 the data for these countries are highlighted in a different colour).

The precondition for applying this approach is the political and public will to set up this kind of cooperation (which in a certain sense affects the issue of the protection of personal data – individual data on Czechs are at present provided to authorities outside the country only as part of legal assistance and on the basis of bilateral agreements pertaining to this assistance) and statisticians can do little to influence this political will. It is of course possible to draw the attention of politicians and the public at every opportunity to the existence of this problem and its further implications, but joining the Nordic Union or expanding it across the entire EU is a political and not a statistical matter.

Another problem can emerge in connection with the resources of regional authorities for covering new postal expenses. The issue of financial resources may to a considerable degree be a restrictive factor on the entire system, because international postage is understandably more expensive than domestic postage. One solution could be to use so-called clearing centres and the representative institutions of each state. Post could be sent through these centres and registration documents would thus be transferred in mass mailings, for example, once quarterly, and that would certainly reduce the costs of the process.

### References

*UN Recommendations on International Migration Statistics*. New York: UN, 1998.

*New Cronos Database*.

*European Social Statistics: Migration 2003*. Luxembourg: Eurostat, 2004.

*Population Statistics – Data 1960–2003*.

Holá, Bohdana. *Zpráva ze služební cesty do Wiesbadenu*. (Report on a Research Trip to Wiesbaden) Prague: ČSÚ, 2005.

BOHDANA HOLÁ graduated on the University of Economics (specialising in statistical-insurance engineering – demography and social analysis) in 2000, where she defended her dissertation on **Fertility Trends in the Czech Republic 1930–1999**. She works for the Czech Statistical Office, where she focuses on international migration. In 2003 she was appointed the head of the Specific Population Statistics Independent Unit (statistics on international migration and gender statistics). She is a member of the Commission for the Integration of Foreigners under the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.



## APPENDIX 1

### Comparison of reported migration flows between the Czech Republic and Germany

Order	Germany	Czech Republic
1.	<p>Legal base</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Law on Statistics on the Movement of Population and the Current Adjustment of the Population Figure</b> (Federal Law on Population Statistics) Registration and deregistration forms and communication between Local Registration Offices and Statistical Offices of the Federal States</li> <li>- <b>Federal Frame Law on Registration + Registration Laws in Federal States</b> – duty to register and deregister when moving into or out of a sole or main residence or other accommodation at the Local Register Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Statistical Service Act</b> – items specification for demography, statistical balance, possibility of using administrative data sources</li> <li>- <b>Record of population and ID numbers' Act</b> – Population Record's Information system ("Population Register"), people and items in Record</li> <li>- <b>Foreigners Residence Act</b> – categories of stay, visa, purposes of stay, stay-mode</li> </ul>
2.	<p>Definition of internal migrant</p> <p>Person (regardless of citizenship or length of stay) who changes the municipality of their sole or main residence within Germany within one or two weeks</p>	<p>Definition of internal migrant</p> <p><b>Czech citizen</b> who changes his <b>permanent residence</b> and or <b>foreigner</b> who changes <b>his usual or permanent residence</b> from one municipality to an other within the Czech Republic</p>
3.	<p>Definition of external immigrant</p> <p>Person (regardless of citizenship or length of stay) who registers their main residence in Germany for more than two months (generally) and comes from abroad</p>	<p>Definition of external immigrant</p> <p><b>A. Czech citizen</b> who establishes their permanent residence again (after cancelling it and reporting it to authorities some time earlier) in the Czech Republic, or</p> <p><b>B. a foreigner</b> belonging to one of a selection of categories (see point 5) coming to the Czech Republic from abroad</p>
4.	<p>Definition of external emigrant</p> <p>Person (regardless of citizenship or lengths of stay) who deregisters their main residence in Germany and moves abroad</p>	<p>Definition of external emigrant</p> <p><b>A. Czech citizen</b> who cancels their permanent residence in the Czech Republic or</p> <p><b>B. a foreigner</b> belonging to one of a selection of categories (see point 5 – bold ones) cancelling their residence in the Czech Republic (real emigration) or after the expiration of their visa, permit or permanent residence permit-card (administrative emigration)</p>
5.	<p>Categories of foreigners</p> <p><b>EU citizens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- registered stay</li> <li>- <b>temporary residence</b></li> <li>- <b>permanent residence</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Third-country citizens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non-visa stay up to 90 days (if there is a bilateral agreement between the Czech Republic and the person's country of citizenship)</li> <li>- up-to-90 day visa (no agreement)</li> <li>- <b>90-day-and-over visa - valid for 1 year maximum – not prolongable</b></li> <li>- <b>long-term residence - valid for 1 year – prolongable</b></li> <li>- <b>permanent residence (incl. asylum-status holders)</b></li> <li>- asylum seekers</li> <li>- under temporary protection</li> </ul>	<p>Categories of foreigners</p> <p><b>EU citizens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- registered stay</li> <li>- <b>temporary residence</b></li> <li>- <b>permanent residence</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Third-country citizens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non-visa stay up to 90 days (if there is a bilateral agreement between the Czech Republic and the person's country of citizenship)</li> <li>- up-to-90 day visa (no agreement)</li> <li>- <b>90-day-and-over visa - valid for 1 year maximum – not prolongable</b></li> <li>- <b>long-term residence - valid for 1 year – prolongable</b></li> <li>- <b>permanent residence (incl. asylum-status holders)</b></li> <li>- asylum seekers</li> <li>- under temporary protection</li> </ul>

(Continued)

Order	Germany	Czech Republic
6.	<p style="text-align: center;">Foreigners and registration</p> <p>Foreigners and registration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>EU citizens – free movement</b> – Local Registration Office – when an EU citizen establishes their main residence in Germany and informs the Local Foreigners Office – from January 2005</li> <li>- <b>Third-country citizens – residence permits</b> – Foreigner gets a permit from the Local Foreigners Office if the intended length of stay is more than 3 months and the person is establishing their main residence in the area of the Local Registration Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>EU citizens – free movement</b> – registration (within one month of arrival) at the local Foreign and Border Police's Office</li> <li>- <b>Third-country citizens – valid visa or residence permits</b> (within 3 days of arrival) local Foreign and Border Police's Office</li> </ul> <p>Directorate of FBP transfers individual records on present foreigners monthly to "Population Register"</p>
7.	<p style="text-align: center;">Organisation of registration system (approx. numbers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ca. 12 500 politically independent municipalities</li> <li>- ca. 5400 Local Registration Offices → ca. 5400 local registers</li> <li>- 650 Local Foreigners Offices → one Central Foreigners Register</li> <li>- 16 Federal States → 16 Statistical Offices of Federal States – one Federal Statistical Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6250 politically independent municipalities</li> <li>- 229 (207 + 22 districts of Prague) municipalities with extended competence (registration office) – on-line connection with one Central Population register</li> <li>- 77 (districts) – local Foreign and Border Police's Offices – Foreigners' Information System (Central Foreigners' Register – on-line) – one Czech Statistical Office</li> </ul>
8.	<p style="text-align: center;">Registration process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- every change of dwelling within one or two weeks</li> <li>- filling in the registration form at the Local Registration Office (LRO) of the new residence (for deregistration due to emigration from Germany – at LRO of last residence)</li> <li>- LRO at new residence informs the LRO of the municipality of departure and inform the LRO of new dwelling if there are mistakes in data report</li> <li>- LRO at new residence sends copy of registration form (selected items) or electronic file to the Statistical Office of Federal State of new residence/destination municipality</li> <li>- Federal State Statistical Office (SOFs) at new residence informs SOFS at departure municipality (if new residence is in another Federal State)</li> </ul> <p>From January 2007 – electronic revolution in registration process – no paper circulating among registration offices – electronic communication only through Federal States Clearing points</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Registration process</p> <p><b>A. Czech citizens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- change of permanent residence</li> <li>- filling in the registration form at the registration office of new address (or registering cancellation of permanent residence in the Czech Republic at registration office of former address in case of emigration abroad) + till the end of 2004 cooperation with reg. office on filling in the statistical Enumeration of migration</li> <li>- registration office updates the data in the Population Record</li> <li>- Ministry of interior exports monthly file of migration (internal together with external) for all of CR Republic (from January 2005)</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Foreigners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- filling in registration of new residence at the local Foreign and Border Police's office</li> <li>- local FBP office updates residence items in Foreigners Information System</li> <li>- Directorate of FBP monthly exports data on new, cancelled and changed residencies of selected categories of foreigners (bold in point 5) to the Population Record and to the Czech Statistical Office</li> </ul>

(End of table)

	Germany	Czech Republic
Order 9.	<p>Registered items (bold go to the Statistical Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- family name, first name</li> <li>- address of former and future residence</li> <li>- <b>former and future municipality (country)</b> (if one of them abroad, country is recorded for that purpose)</li> <li>- <b>sex</b></li> <li>- <b>marital status</b></li> <li>- <b>date of birth</b></li> <li>- place of birth</li> <li>- <b>citizenship</b></li> <li>- <b>religion (catholic/evangelic/other)</b></li> <li>- labour force participation</li> <li>- <b>status of dwelling (mah-sole/further)</b></li> </ul> <p>Date of migration derived from the date of delivery to the Statistical Office</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- family name, first name</li> <li>- <b>ID number</b></li> <li>- <b>date of birth</b></li> <li>- <b>sex</b></li> <li>- <b>marital status</b></li> <li>- <b>citizenship</b></li> <li>- <b>address of previous and new residence (when within the Czech Republic)</b></li> <li>- <b>date of migration</b></li> </ul> <p>no country (in case of external migration)</p>
10.	<p>Statistical processing</p> <p><b>Current population adjustment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- population stock in municipality X to term t-1 by citizenship (nationals/non-nationals), sex, age, marital status (from NUTS3 up only for marital status)</li> <li>- ± current population adjustment (processed by flow statistics between t-1 and t): + births - deaths + inflows - outflows ± marriages ± divorces ± changes of citizenship ± changes of regional borders</li> <li>- = population stock in municipality X to term t by citizenship (nationals/non-nationals), sex, age, marital status (from NUTS3 up only for marital status)</li> </ul> <p>Monthly adjustment for sex, annually for other items</p>	<p>Statistical processing</p> <p><b>Population balance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- population stock in municipality X to term t-1 by sex, age, marital status (country level only for marital status)</li> <li>- ± population balance (processed by flow statistics between t-1 and t): + births - deaths + inflows - outflows ± marriages ± divorces ± changes of citizenship ± changes of regional borders (regional borders are being changed only at the beginning of the year for stat. purposes)</li> <li>- population stock in municipality X to term t by sex, age, marital status (country level only for marital status)</li> </ul> <p>Monthly balance for sex, annually for other items</p>
11.	<p>Deviations from UN Recommended Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- migration flows not number of migrants (no personal identification available → statistical office is not able to recognise multiple migration of one person</li> <li>- lengths of stay (intended/realised) not available → overall migration, not only long-term is reported (overvalued numbers on migrations)</li> <li>- double-counting due to system of local registers and system of deregistration dependent on the will and discipline of migrant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Czech citizens - permanent residence change only and dependent on the will of person to inform authorities → undervaluation of external migration flows</li> <li>- EU citizens - temporary residence - based on will → undervaluation of external migration flows</li> <li>- Country of previous/next residence for external migrants not available in the Population Register (problem from January 2005)</li> </ul>

Comparison of reported migration flows between the Czech Republic and Germany

from where → to	Specification	According to:	2001	2002	2003
Czech Republic → Germany	Total	CSO*	701	1 087	950
		SBA**	12 206	11 150	9 258
		Difference	-11 505	-10 063	-8 308
	Czech citizens	CSO*	328	406	298
		SBA**	10 907	10 029	8 265
		Difference	-10 579	-9 623	-7 967
	German citizens	CSO*	371	659	642
		SBA**	908	799	702
		Difference	-537	-140	-60
Germany → Czech Republic	Total	CSO*	470	987	1 228
		SBA**	9 304	9 691	8 909
		Difference	-8 834	-8 704	-7 681
	Czech citizens	CSO*	214	164	360
		SBA**	8 355	8 694	7 914
		Difference	-8 141	-8 530	-7 554
	German citizens	CSO*	244	807	826
		SBA**	669	688	710
		Difference	-425	119	116

Note: \*Czech Statistical Office, \*\*Statistisches Bundesamt Deutschland.