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Contextualization and Goals of the Book

1. Document changes in flows with the crisis
2. Analyse policy responses by Member States

• Springer Publishers (Imiscoe Series)
• Open access book can be downloaded at: http://bit.do/EUmigration
Available on 30/11/16

Some Results: Flows

• Remarkable increase in South-North mobility
• Main destination countries: UK & Germany
• BUT lower than expected
• Underestimation of flows by official statistics?

Some Results: Socio-economic Profile

• Different type of new mobile EU citizens: circular migrants, long-term migrants, posted-workers
• Young age
• Strong participation of highly-skilled in new flows
• One exception: Portugal
• Brain drain?
Challenges with the data

Data used in the book:
1. EU LFS
2. National LFS
3. Alternative sources: Censuses, social security databases, registers
4. Sources for specific phenomena: posted workers and expelled EU migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources used per case study (+ EU-LFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security / National Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative records &amp; municipal registers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consular registers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. EU-LFS microdata: opportunities and restrictions

- Main data source for EU-wide studies
- Strengths
  - Comparable methodology
  - Regular update
  - The 2008 and 2014 ad hoc modules

1. EU-LFS microdata: opportunities and restrictions

- Weaknesses
  - Some categories of migrants not covered
  - High level of aggregation of basic indicators
15 groups provided for variables “Nationality” & “Country of birth”

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>National / Native of own Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>EU15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>NMS10 (10 new Member States of 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>NMS3 (3 new Member States of 2007 and 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>EFTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Other Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Near and Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>South and South East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Central America (and Caribbean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Australia and Oceania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. National LFS

- Examples: Micro-census in Germany & UK LFS
- Provides **disaggregated data** on:
  - Country of origin & Nationality
  - Socio-demographic characteristics

- **BUT** issues with:
  - Subsample too small for specific categories
  - Specific types of migrants not covered by sampling frame

3. Alternative Data Sources (1/2)

- **BE & FR**: LFS subsample size is too small
- Use of **population censuses** as alternative
- Limitations are well-known
  - Limited number of variables
  - Temporal gaps
  - Some migrant categories are left out
- **Social security database** used for BE case:
  - Rich data on socio-demographic profile and labour market participation
  - Unregistered migrants invisible

3. Alternative Data Sources (2/2)

- **Consular registers** of sending countries
  - Italian *AIRE*
  - Spanish *PERE*
  - Spanish Municipal register

- Severe limitations:
  - Uncertainty of citizens about duration of stay abroad
  - Negative consequence of change in residence on welfare entitlement
4. Sources on Specific Mobility-related Phenomena

- **Posted workers**: limits of the analysis of portable social security documents PD A1
- **Expelled EU migrants**: limited data on politically-sensitive issue

**Conclusion: Lessons from users’ experience**

1. Put more effort on **lower level of aggregation** for some variables of EU LFS
2. Address **fragmentation** of national registers and population surveys that hurts comparability
3. Improve **accessibility** of publicly-funded research
4. Increase attention towards **new mobility-related phenomena** (posting, expulsions, mobility of naturalised EU citizens born outside the EU...)

---

**Thank you for your attention!**
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