



Ad-Hoc Query on scientific research on costs and benefits of migration and integration

Requested by DE EMN NCP on 14th December 2011

Compilation produced on: 5 April 2012

Responses from Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden plus Norway (17 in Total)

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.




1. Background Information

As part of a feasibility study on the identification, measuring and comparing cost and benefit of migration and integration in Germany for different migrant groups (employees, high potentials, entrepreneurs, researchers, family members, students, asylum seekers and other humanitarian migrants) we are interested - commissioned by the Federal Ministry of the Interior - in corresponding scientific studies on the cost and benefit in member states differentiated also according to the mentioned groups of migrants. We would like to have an overview not only in the results but also in the methodology, data bases, mining, processing and using in an econometric analysis as well as in the time horizons of the studies (short- or long-term) with a longitudinal or cross-section approach.

We would very much appreciate your responses by **11 January 2012**.

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.



2. Responses¹

| | | Wider Dissemination? ² | Are you aware of studies, compilations, memos, and occasional papers elaborated, disseminated and possibly published over the past ten years on 1) <i>administrative costs</i> of migration and integration of foreigners on different levels of the state (central and local); 2) <i>macroeconomic</i> cost-benefit-analyses of migration and integration; 3) <i>microeconomic</i> cost-benefit-analyses of migration and integration on the level of corporate economy or small and medium enterprises resp.; if there is one or are more available please indicate the title, author(s) and institutions of the paper(s) and sketch the content in three or four main results. It would be very helpful to get hints to corresponding links. |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
|  | Austria | No | This NCP has provided a response to the requesting EMN NCP. However, they have requested that their response is not disseminated further. |
|  | Belgium | Yes | To our knowledge no such comprehensive, reliable and scientifically founded studies or papers have been produced so far in Belgium, mainly due to a lack of complete data. The only 2 pointers that we can suggest is a PHD-thesis (2006) on the effects of immigration on the Belgian labour market (see annex) and the multi-annual programmes produced in the framework of the SOLID-funds who mention some figures about invested national resources (but which do certainly also not give a complete picture). |
|  | Czech Republic | Yes | 1) No. 2) While it is not exactly what you ask for, there is a 2011 study exploring i.a. the so called immigration surplus (according to G. J. Bojars' methodology) of the Czech Republic. Attached you find English abstract and summary. There is also an ongoing research on remittances, which is a topic somehow connected to costs and benefits, albeit looked at more from the viewpoint of the migrants and their countries of origin. Similarly, the international |

¹ If possible at time of making the request, the Requesting EMN NCP should add their response(s) to the query. Otherwise, this should be done at the time of making the compilation.

² A default "Yes" is given for your response to be circulated further (e.g. to other EMN NCPs and their national network members). A "No" should be added here if you do not wish your response to be disseminated beyond other EMN NCPs. In case of "No" and wider dissemination beyond other EMN NCPs, then for the Compilation for Wider Dissemination the response should be removed and the following statement should be added in the relevant response box: "This EMN NCP has provided a response to the requesting EMN NCP. However, they have requested that it is not disseminated further."

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|---|---------|-----|---|
| | | | INTERFACE project (2009) explored cost and benefits of the migration experience for families. 3) No. |
|  | Estonia | Yes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No such analysis available. 2) No such analysis available. 3) No such analysis available. |
|  | France | Yes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Over the past ten years, a number of studies undertaken by French authorities has brought out the administrative costs of migration and integration of foreigners on the national level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P. Coste, H. Thouroude, M. Laroque et A. Sun, « <i>Mission d'appui sur les coûts des centres d'accueil pour les demandeurs d'asile</i> », Inspection générale des affaires sociales, November 2010. This report published by the General Inspectorate of Social Affairs (Inspection générale des affaires sociales = IGAS) analyses the cost of asylum seekers' accommodation centres (centre d'accueil de demandeurs d'asile = CADA) in France. It states that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The global cost of asylum seekers' accommodation per asylum seeker and per year represents on average 9 409€ in 2009; - The first three cost items are those linked with the accommodation, the monthly subsistence allowance (Allocation mensuelle de subsistance = AMS) and the management of the asylum seekers' accommodation. <p>Link: http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/var/storage/rapports-publics//114000327/0000.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French Senate, Rapport d'information n°516 (2008-2009) de M. Pierre BERNARD-REYMOND, fait au nom de la commission des finances, déposé le 3 juillet 2009, "<i>Immigration - la gestion des centres de rétention administrative peut encore être améliorée</i>". The senatorial report audits the management of the administrative detention centres (centres de rétention administration = CRA). It concludes that, in 2008, the global cost per year of administrative detention in Metropolitan France, excluding expenditures of questioning, removal orders and legal costs, represents 190.5 M€, that is 5 500€ per detention. <p>Link: http://www.senat.fr/rap/r08-516/r08-516.html</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French Senate, Rapport d'information n°353 (2006-2007) de M. Adrien GOUTEYRON, fait au nom de la |

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>commission des finances, déposé le 27 juin 2007 « <i>Trouver une issue au casse-tête des visas</i> ». The senatorial report audits the visa departments of French consulates. According to Gouteyron, the visa activity does not constitute a net cost to the State budget.</p> <p>Link: http://www.senat.fr/rap/r06-353/r06-353.html</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secrétariat Général du Comité interministériel de contrôle de l'immigration, Rapport au Parlement, « <i>Les orientations de la politique de l'immigration et de l'intégration</i> », March 2011 <p>This document published by the General Secretariat of the Interministerial Committee on Immigration Control, (Secrétariat Général du Comité interministériel de contrôle de l'immigration = SGCICI) moderates Gouteyron's comments on the cost of visa activity. Indeed, according to its authors, the increasing cases of litigation following rejected visa applications have led to important government expenditures in France. In 2009, if the visa refusal is voided, the State has to pay 395 200€ of legal fees. Actions for damages seeking compensation for harm also increase with requests to the amount of 100 000€.</p> <p>Link: http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/var/storage/rapports-publics//114000189/0000.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French National Assembly, Rapport d'information n°2448 de Mme Marie-Hélène des ESGAULX fait au nom de la commission des finances, déposé le 6 juillet 2005, « <i>L'évolution des coûts budgétaires des demandes d'asile (hébergement, contentieux, contrôle aux frontières)</i> ». The parliamentary report brings out all budgetary costs attributed to applications for asylum (accommodation, litigation, border control) from 2004 to 2005 in France. Between 2004 and 2005, the global budgetary cost attributable to the reception of asylum seekers and the procedure treatment represents 900 M€, before inclusion of expenditures undertaken by local authorities. <p>Link: http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/12/rap-info/i2448.asp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French National Assembly, Rapport d'information n°3524 de MM. Claude Goasguen et Christophe Sirugue fait au nom du comité d'évaluation et de contrôle des politiques publiques, déposé le 9 juin 2011 sur l'évaluation de l'aide médicale d'Etat. The parliamentary report aims at assessing the State medical assistance (Aide médicale d'Etat = AME). According to the authors, the principle of the State medical assistance for migrants with low income should be maintained. However, they also underline the need of |
|--|--|--|--|




Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>reforming the management of the system. In other words, the rise of the costs of the State medical assistance does not justify its withdrawal, which would provoke counterproductive sanitary and financial consequences. In 2011, such costs represented 640 M€ with a majority of hospital expenditures. The report draws the attention on the risk of a national debt for health insurance.</p> <p>Link: http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/13/rap-info/i3524.asp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Cordier (Inspection générale des finances) et F. Salas (Inspection générale des affaires sociales), « <i>Analyse de l'évolution des dépenses au titre de l'aide médicale d'Etat</i> », Novembre 2010. <p>In this document, the General Inspectorate of Finance and the General Inspectorate of Social Affairs analyse the evolution of the expenditures in the State medical assistance (Aide médicale d'Etat = AME). Two main observations can be brought out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The massive increase of beneficiaries cannot explain the important rise of expenditures in State medical assistance; - It is not possible to establish a statistical link between the evolution of the expenditures in State medical assistance and the observation of frauds. <p>Link: http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/var/storage/rapports-publics//104000685/0000.pdf</p> <p>2) Over the past ten years, some scientific studies have been undertaken by national authorities on the effects of migration on the French economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X. Chojnicki, C. Defoort, L. Drapier et L. Ragot for the French Ministry of Labour, Employment and Health, « <i>Migrations et protection sociale, étude sur les liens et les impacts de court et long terme</i> », July 2010 <p>The report analyses the influence of migration flows on public finances and the social welfare system in France. In a nutshell, the effects of migration flows on public finances and the social welfare system are slightly positive, particularly when it concerns qualified migration. However, the financial gains for a more ambitious and selective immigration are relatively moderate compared to the demographic changes it implies.</p> <p>Link: http://droit.univ-lille2.fr/uploads/media/Rapport_Drees_EQUIPPE_V3_02.pdf</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French Ministry of Economic Affairs, Finances and Industry, « <i>Immigration sélective et besoins de l'économie française</i> », February 2006. <p>This study presents the effects of migration on different macroeconomic indicators, income distribution and public finance in France. The main result is that immigration has a positive effect on the mechanical activity and growth, without major impact on the GDP/capita. However, immigration creates a slight depressing effect on wages, and therefore, on the employment rate of the host country. However, these negative effects are reduced or even offset, in the case of qualified migration.</p> <p>Link: http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/rapports-publics/064000160/index.shtml</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Audit des parlementaires de la politique d'immigration, d'intégration et de co développement</i>, Association des parlementaires pour l'audit de la politique d'immigration, d'intégration et de co développement, May 2011. <p>The report was published by an association of French MP in 2011 in order to audit the immigration, integration and co development policy in France.</p> <p>Concerning the macroeconomic effects of immigration in France, the conclusions of the report are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labour force participation rate between foreigners from 30 to 49 years old and French nationals of the same age is substantially identical (90% and 95% respectively); - Migrants are present in all sectors of the economy but especially in the labour market, where there are various skill needs. According to the authors, a migration policy with the aim to recruit only qualified people is therefore of economic and social nonsense; - If immigration is not the only solution against aging, it partially helps to offset the deficit of birth in France. If French authorities opted for a "zero immigration" policy, the study points out that rather 5 % instead of the initial 3 % extra of the GDP should be allocated to the financing of social protection in 2050; - Concerning the labour market effects of immigration, the audit shows that labour migrants would only "compete" with a fraction of the wages of the earlier waves of immigrants. <p>Link:</p> |
|--|--|--|---|





Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|---|---------|-----|---|
| | | | <p>http://issuu.com/smazetier/docs/rapport_de_l_audit_de_la_politique_d_immigration_?viewMode=magazine&mode=embed</p> <p>3) To our knowledge, there is no such microeconomic cost-benefit analyse of migration and integration on the level of corporate economy or small and medium enterprises in France.</p> |
|  | Germany | Yes | <p>1) In Germany, no such cost analyses relating to the administration expenditures of the migration and integrations of foreigners altogether has been conducted apart specific areas as e.g. the cost of language courses (since 2005 after its introduction) on the federal level. It is to assume that there are also remarkable costs on the state and local level that are widely unknown due to lack of appropriate data for the 16 <i>Länder</i> and some thousands local municipalities. This is important because integrations concepts and strategies have been developed not only in the metropolitan cities and areas but also in small and medium towns.</p> <p>2) In Germany there are some scientific studies in the past ten years undertaken by universities and economic research institutes indicating for the whole economy that the balance of cost and benefits of migration and integration are remarkably positive in cross-section analyses as well in longitudinal studies and that the economic and societal cost of non-integration of migrants are much more higher than the cost of structural integration of foreigners.</p> <p>3) In Germany, there are no such cost-benefit analyses due to lack of comprehensive data for the corporate economy or small and medium enterprises.</p> |
|  | Hungary | Yes | <p>1-3) In Hungary there have been no such comprehensive analyses on migration and integration. Because of the complexity of the target group (third country nationals, beneficiaries of international protection, EU nationals), the differences in the terms used in the various related fields and lack of comprehensive data it would be difficult to conduct a well-established research on this topics. Even in the field of international protection, where the costs and benefits are easier to point.</p> |
|  | Italy | Yes | <p>In Italy the first attempt to study the economic aspects of migration could date back to 2005, when Professor Massimo Livi Bacci organised a conference on the topic. The first exhaustive publication was the chapter “Il contributo finanziario degli immigrati” within the Caritas/Migrantes, <i>Dossier Statistico Immigrazione 2008</i>, Idos, Rome, 2008, pp. 306-312 (www.dossierimmigrazione.it). This analysis has been continuously enhanced and updated in the following years (2009, 2010, 2011 editions). This topic was also analyzed by Ismu Foundation</p> |

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | <p>based in Milan in its last 2 “immigration reports”: Fondazione ISMU, <i>XVII Rapporto sull’immigrazione</i>, Franco Angeli, Milano, 2010 and 2011 (www.ismu.org).</p> <p>On the topic of tax analysis, it’s important to report the innovative initiative of the Foundation Leone Moressa (based at Venice Mestre) to publish a bimonthly magazine and an annual report on the economy of immigration: www.fondazioneleonemoressa.org/rivista/FLM-economia-immigrazione1.html.</p> <p>Moreover, the Union of Chambers and Tagliacarne Institute have estimated in 2008 an added value from foreign occupation (EU and non-EU workers) equal to 157 billion euros, it means 11.1% of GDP. The contribution to the added value of the foreign workers is particularly evident in the construction sector (22.8% of total value added) and agriculture (14.4%). See: Unioncamere, <i>Rapporto Unioncamere 2010</i>, Rome, May 2011 http://www.unioncamere.gov.it/download/725.html (page 315 and following). According to the same source, in 2009 the added value from foreign occupation increased to 12.1% of GDP.</p> <p>With reference to insurance Idos Study and Research Centre (member of the Italian NCP) is implementing with the National Institutes for Social Insurance an annual report: www.inps.it/portale/default.aspx?sID=%3b00%3b6969%3b7090%3b&lastMenu=7090&iMenu=1&iNodo=7090&p4=2</p> <p>Thanks to some specific information on administrative expenditures for the following sectors: health, accommodation, education, pensions, justice, detention for irregular migrants and so on (gathered by several public sources such as: Public Treasury, Bank of Italy, Revenue Agency, National Institute of Statistics, etc.) Dossier Statistico Immigrazione Caritas/Migrantes could elaborate the following estimate (Dossier 2011, p. 308):</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">Income</th> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #fce4d6;">Expenditure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>National insurance</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.5</td> <td>Medical care</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other taxes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.5</td> <td>Schooling</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Of which Natural persons tax (Irpaf)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.8</td> <td>Municipal social services</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Justice and prison</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Reception and expulsion</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>National insurance</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total income</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12.0</td> <td>Total expenditure</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center; background-color: yellow;">Positive balance 1.5 billions</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Income | | Expenditure | | National insurance | 7.5 | Medical care | 3.1 | Other taxes | 4.5 | Schooling | 3.0 | Of which Natural persons tax (Irpaf) | 2.8 | Municipal social services | 0.5 | | | Housing | 0.4 | | | Justice and prison | 1.5 | | | Reception and expulsion | 0.5 | | | National insurance | 1.5 | Total income | 12.0 | Total expenditure | 10.5 | Positive balance 1.5 billions | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|--|--------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------------|-----|-----------|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|--|--|---------|-----|--|--|--------------------|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-----|--|--|--------------------|-----|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Income | | Expenditure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National insurance | 7.5 | Medical care | 3.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other taxes | 4.5 | Schooling | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Of which Natural persons tax (Irpaf) | 2.8 | Municipal social services | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Housing | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Justice and prison | 1.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Reception and expulsion | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | National insurance | 1.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total income | 12.0 | Total expenditure | 10.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Positive balance 1.5 billions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|--|
|  | Latvia | Yes | In Latvia no such cost analyses has been made. |
|  | Lithuania | Yes | No such studies were undertaken in Lithuania. |
|  | Luxembourg | Yes | <p>1. In Luxembourg, no such cost analyses relating to the administration expenditures on immigration and integration had been conducted globally by the government. However, the Luxemburgish Reception and Integration Agency had published in its annual report (2009 and 2010) the expenditures made by the OLAI, on voluntary returns, medical expenditures for asylum seekers and other expenses. Nevertheless, there are not additional reports from other ministries in that sense. The OLAI annual reports can be find in: 2009: http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/publications/rapports/rapport_activites_olai/rapport_activite_olai_09.pdf 2010: http://www.olai.public.lu/fr/publications/rapports/rapport_activites_olai/rapport_activite_olai_10.pdf</p> <p>2. In Luxembourg there are not specific and detail studies on the macroeconomic cost and benefits of migration and integration. However, there are general studies on the subject on the economic impact of migrants in Luxembourg. It is important to mention that migration is very important to the Luxemburgish economy to the point that immigration policy respond to economic needs (see EMN-NCP-LU (2011), Satisfying labour demand through migration). These studies were made by the UNIVERSTIY OF LUXEMBOURG, CEPS/INSTEAD, CEFIS, STATEC and other institutions. Also, STATEC (Central Service for Statistics and Economical Studies), includes migration movements, especially CBW movements, as part of the equation of a macro-econometric model (MODUX). There are not cost/benefits analyses on integration of foreigners. Two of those studies are: KIEFFER, Robert, « L’impact des travailleurs étrangers sur le financement de la sécurité sociale luxembourgeoise ou Comment les travailleurs étrangers ont sauvé la sécurité social de la faillite », ASTI 30 +, 2010, PP. 238-247, and LANGERS, Jean, « Immigrés, haro sur les moins qualifiés ? ». On the macro-econometric model MODUX, see : http://www.statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/economie-finances/conjoncture/2009/02/20090220/07EndogenousForeignLabourSupplyModux.pdf</p> <p>3. In Luxembourg there are not cost/benefits analyses at the microeconomic level.</p> |
|  | Netherlands | Yes | <p>1. Muysken, Joan; Ziesemer, Thomas, The effect of net immigration on economic growth in an ageing economy: transitory and permanent shocks UNU-MERIT, Maastricht 2011. http://arno.unimaas.nl/show.cgi?did=27981 This paper argues that immigration can help to alleviate the burden</p> |


Disclaimer: *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>ageing presents for the welfare states of most Western Economies. They develop a macroeconomic framework which deals with the impact of both ageing and immigration on economic growth. This is combined with a detailed model of the labour market, to include the interaction with low-skilled unemployment. The empirical relevance of some crucial model assumptions is shown to hold for the Netherlands, 1973 - 2009, using a vector-error-correction model. The conclusions from the analysis of transitory and permanent shocks are that immigration will help to alleviate the ageing problem in the long run, as long as the immigrants will be able to participate in the labour force at least as much as the native population. Moreover, the better educated the immigrants are or become, the higher their contribution to growth will be.</p> <p>2. Roodenburg e.a. Immigration and the Dutch economy, Central Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis, 2003. http://www.cpb.nl/publicatie/immigratie-en-de-nederlandse-economie</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The gross domestic product will increase, but this increase will accrue largely to the immigrants in the form of wages; the overall net gain in income of residents is likely to be small and maybe even negative; 2. Residents with skills comparable to those of immigrants will lose; residents with skills complementary to those of immigrants will win in the long run; 4. The effects of immigration on public finances are assessed by calculating the net lifetime contributions of immigrants and their effects on future budget balances. We conclude that: The fiscal impact of an immigrant depends very much on his or her age at entry and social and economic characteristics (labour market performance). The outcomes are most favourable for the immigrants who are 25 years of age at entry and perform well on the labour market. For all entry ages, however, immigrants turn out to be a burden to the public budget if their social and economic characteristics correspond to those of the present average non-Western resident. Accordingly, budget balances are affected negatively. 6. This average negative contribution of immigrants is not fully the result of a lagging performance. It is partly also the reflection of the generous system of Dutch collective arrangements. 8. Immigrants who perform better on the labour market than average Dutch residents alleviate public finances over a wide range of entry ages. Accordingly, an inflow of such immigrants would positively affect the budget balance. 9. The results indicate that immigration can not offer a major contribution to alleviate public finances and thus to become a compensating factor for the rising costs for government due to the ageing of the population. 10. An increasing population density brought about by immigration might affect the economy. After a rough assessment, we come to the following conclusions: accommodating an increasing population and associated |
|--|--|--|---|




Disclaimer: *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>economic activity, given a fixed amount of land, may have a negative impact on gross domestic product per head, but not necessarily on the average income of the resident population; the further population density increases, the more economies of scale are likely to be outweighed by negative external effects related to such phenomena as traffic congestion, pollution, and loss of open space, landscape and nature.</p> <p>3. Nyfer, Budgettaire effecten van immigratie van niet-westerse allochtonen, 2010. http://www.nyfer.nl/documents/rapportPVVdef_001.pdf This is a study on the administrative costs of immigration from non-western countries to the Netherlands. The study concludes that migration costs Dutch society 7.2 billion euros per year. The study was commissioned by the Geert Wilders' Party for Freedom. Main conclusions are that non western immigrants are more likely to use more of the Dutch welfare institutions than residents and they pay less taxes than residents. Therefore the public sector pays around 50.000 euros more per immigrant during his or her lifetime, than what they receive from the immigrant through labour.</p> <p>Non western immigrants, the study continues, are more likely to be jobless and on the dole. They are also more likely to be associated with criminal activity, and receive extra money for renting an apartment. On the other hand, they cost the state less money than Dutch residents because they receive less child support and student grants.</p> <p>4. Is it now enough?. Speech prof. Joop Hartog made on the occasion of his retirement, 2011. http://www1.fee.uva.nl/pp/bin/popularpublication239fulltext.pdf Prof. Hartog, who is a professor on labour market economy with an interest in demography, says that immigration only benefits societies if immigrants have skills that differ from the skills of residents. If immigrants do not have other skills the only thing that happens is that the available labour increases, which is not a collective benefit. He concludes that current research on the effects of immigration does not indicate any aggregated benefits of any kind. Available land size is a restrictive factor in acquiring benefits of immigration. A small increase in population size reduces country wealth, while doubling the population may increase the wealth of a country by 3-8%. Costs to society from immigration are, according to Hartog, damage to environment, congestion, noise, psychological problems and criminal activity.</p> <p>5. Summary from phd-thesis of Jan van den Beek: Knowledge, power and morals, 2011. http://dare.uva.nl/document/172227 This dissertation is a meta study that investigates how scientific knowledge was produced about the economic effects of immigration to the Netherlands during the period 1960- 2005. The turn</p> |
|--|--|--|--|


Disclaimer: *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

| | | | |
|---|----------|-----|---|
| | | | <p>of the century is a breaking point in several ways. Firstly, a booming economy and labour shortages give rise to the so-called profitability perspective. In this perspective, labour migration is seen as a means of economic policy, to ease the financial burden of aging and create a 'knowledge economy'. Furthermore, immigration and especially the number of asylum seekers is reduced drastically by a new 'Aliens Act' (2000). At the same time, the share of labour migrants and foreign students rises. The admission policy seemingly becomes slightly more selective on human capital and more emphasis is put on the socio-economic aspects on immigration. Simultaneously, there also is a development in the opposite direction. Due to 9/11 and the rise and murder of the politician Pim Fortuyn, the political climate towards immigration changes drastically. Also, depolitisation of immigration in the media came to an end. The cultural and religious identity of immigrants was more and more seen as problematic. Many politicians deemed it an electoral necessity to take firm or even harsh positions on immigration and integration. Furthermore, due to the internet and the fact that the lifting of moral and legal restrictions on collecting data on immigration came to a full effect, the availability and accessibility of data improved a lot. In addition, economists started to produce statistical data themselves.</p> <p>All those developments are reflected in the knowledge production, which rose due to better data availability and the fact that with the profitability perspective an economic dimension was added to public debates on immigration. Some authors explicitly refer to the change in political climate as a factor in their decision whether or not to produce certain migration-economic knowledge, for example research on the (external) costs of immigration that result from an increase in population size and density.</p> <p>More importantly, the WRR issued a report on immigration that, unlike earlier reports, contained a chapter on the economic aspects of (labour)migration and the effects of immigration on the sustainability of the Dutch welfare state. However, the WRR did not allow the author of the chapter, Harry van Dalen, to add recommendations to make the welfare state more 'immigration proof', with the argument that immigrants would be blamed for the restructuring of the welfare state. Discontent with the functioning of the council, Van Dalen left the WRR and published an article with much the same content, but which contained the recommendation to temporarily exclude immigrants from the welfare state and create financial incentives that link immigration to integration.</p> |
|  | Portugal | Yes | PT NCP indicates above some studies promoted by the Immigration Observatory and the High Commission for |



Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------|---|
| | | | <p>Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI), that falls into the category of macroeconomic studies (available on the website of the Immigration Observatory):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - André Corrêa d'Almeida. <i>The Impact of Immigration in Portugal on State Finances</i>, May 2003, Immigration Observatory, 1, High Commission for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities (ACIME); - André Corrêa d'Almeida and Pedro Duarte Silva. <i>The Impact of Immigration in Portugal on State Finances</i>, December 2007 (2nd edition, updated version), Immigration Observatory, 1, High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI); - João Peixoto, (coord.); Carolina Marçalo; Nancy Tolentino. <i>Immigrants and Social Security in Portugal</i>, December 2011, Immigration Observatory, 49, High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI); - Edite Rosário; Tiago Santos. <i>How Much Does It Cost to Be an Immigrant?</i>, April 2008, Immigration Observatory, 26, High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI). |
|  | Slovak Republic | Yes | In the past ten years, with regard to the above-mentioned topics, any studies or papers have been published in the Slovak Republic. |
|  | Slovenia | Yes | No, unfortunately we are not aware of any studies or similar papers on subjects listed above to be conducted in Slovenia. |
|  | Sweden | Yes | <p>The SE EMN NCP is not aware of any scientific studies on the costs and/or benefits of immigration to Sweden that would differentiate between different categories of immigrants. From the SE EMN NCP's perspective, a reliable longer-term calculation of the overall socioeconomic costs and benefits arising from immigration and integration is not possible. To the SE EMN NCP's knowledge, only rather few studies on the topic at hand have been published in Sweden throughout recent years. Usually, they do not provide an overall assessment of socioeconomic costs and benefits associated with immigration and integration, but instead tend to focus on particular aspects, such as the effects of immigration on public finances. One example is given below under 2).</p> <p>1) <u>Administrative costs:</u> The annual report of the Swedish migration Board contains a financial statement, providing an overview of costs that have arisen in relation to the various different tasks of the Migration Board, as for instance asylum (examination of asylum applications, reception of asylum seekers), examination of applications for residence permits (for work, studies, family reunification etc.), and examination of applications for Swedish citizenship. The annual report does not, however, contain any information on costs that have arisen for other</p> |

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>public authorities (government agencies, local and regional authorities) dealing with particular aspects of immigration, nor does it provide any information on wider socioeconomic impacts of immigration.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> arsredovisning_2010.pdf.pdf</p> <p>2) <u>Macroeconomic cost-benefit-analyses:</u> In 2009, the Swedish Ministry of Finance published the report “Invandringen och de offentliga finanserna” (Immigration and public finance) which was produced in the framework of a government expert group on studies on public economy (“Expertgruppen för studier i offentlig ekonomi”). The primary aim of this report was to study the fiscal significance of changes in migration patterns. Based on simulations with a detailed model of public sector economics, the report quantifies the effects of changes in migration and the significance of the integration of migrants into the labour market. The analysis relates both to the redistribution of income between the migrant population and the native-born population that occurred during one particular year (2006), and future redistribution up until 2050 based on population forecasts produced by Sweden’s national statistics office. The calculations, however, only relate to the redistribution of income via the public sector. Other economic consequences of immigration, such as its impact on economic growth, have not been calculated and are only discussed in passing. In brief, the report shows that the public sector redistributed income generated by migrants to native-born individuals every year until about 1980. During this period, immigrants enjoyed a healthy employment situation and had, from this perspective, a favourable age structure. Annual net revenue seems to have culminated at the beginning of the 1970s, when it amounted to about 1 per cent of the gross domestic product (GDP). As the employment situation for immigrants deteriorated, annual revenue decreased and reached a zero-point in the mid to late 1980s. During the 1990s, the net revenue became a net cost, i.e. income was redistributed from native-born individuals to migrants. Since the 1990s, this situation of redistribution towards migrants has not changed much. The report concludes that the costs and benefits arising from immigration essentially depend on the integration of migrants into the labour market.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

| | | | |
|---|--------|-----|---|
| | | | <p style="text-align: center;"> Rapport_expertgrupp_2009.pdf (The report contains a summary in English on pages 15-21.)</p> <p>3) <u>Microeconomic cost-benefit-analyses:</u> The Swedish EMN NCP is not aware of any microeconomic cost-benefit-analyses of migration and integration on the level of corporate economy or small and medium enterprises.</p> |
|  | Norway | Yes | <p>1) We are not aware of analyses specifically addressing the issue of administrative costs. The recent report to the Storting (Parliament) entitled “Better Integration” (NOU 2011: 14 “Bedre Integrering: Mål, strategier, tiltak”), undertaken by the Integration Commission led by Osmund Kaldheim, includes cost-benefit analyses of the measures proposed in the report (including with regard to administration expenditures), but these measures are not at present implemented in integration policy. An English language summary of the report can be found at: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/BLD/Inkluderingsutvalget/Oversettelse_av_sammendrag_NOU_Bedre_integrering.docx</p> <p>The Directorate of Integration and Diversity, IMDi, commissioned consultants from Econ Pöyry to do a cost-benefit analysis of the “New Opportunity” programme (“Ny sjanse”) in 2007-8. This programme seeks to help immigrants enter the labour market. The 2007 report “Det lønner seg! En samfunnsøkonomisk analyse av Ny Sjanse” (“It pays off! A cost-benefit analysis of Ny Sjanse», IMDi report 10, 2007) concludes that the programme has a positive economic impact. This report also sought to develop a framework for further such analyses. In 2011, IMDi put out a call for applications to do a follow-up study.</p> <p>2) In 2011, a report to the Storting assessing the Norwegian welfare state in light of immigration, “Welfare and Migration: the Future of the Norwegian Model” (NOU 2011: 7 “Velferd og Migrasjon: Den norske modellens framtid”) was published, written by a commission lead by Grete Brochmann. Statistics Norway carried out macroeconomic analyses on behalf of the Commission. Chapter 12 of the report specifically discusses macroeconomic analyses of the economic effects of immigration.</p> |

Disclaimer: *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The analyses contained in the report suggest that the overall costs and benefits of immigration are affected by how well immigrants are integrated into the labour market. The Commission concludes from this that the composition of immigration flows may be as important as the overall number– if new arrivals have qualifications that are demanded in the Norwegian labour market, a high number of arrivals is not necessarily a problem. They further suggest that the short-term economic impact of immigration is positive, especially because immigrants are quite young. Migration from the EEA to Norway is highlighted as economically beneficial, but there are concerns about a more divided labour market. Long-term effects are more difficult to assess and will depend on the labour market participation of different immigrant groups.</p> <p>An English language summary of the report is available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/BLD/IMA/nou_2011_7_perspective_andsummary.pdf Statistics Norway (SSB) also published a comprehensive report in 2011 (available in English) entitled “Effects of immigration policies on immigration to Norway 1969-2010” which may be of relevance. It is available at: http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/02/20/rapp_201140/index.html/rapp_201140_en.pdf 3) we are not aware of any such studies.</p> |
|--|--|--|
