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Preface:

International migration is an established global phenomenon. It has played a key role in Central Asia in both historic and contemporary terms, being closely linked with key socio-economic and political processes in the region. Migration patterns coupled with the unique geographical realities of the Eurasian continent have impacted the history and economy of Central Asian countries. The past century witnessed the peak of Russian expansion and influence in Central Asia, followed by the disintegration of the Soviet Union and establishment of independent states in 1991. Since independence, international migration has assumed a new and significant dimension with wide ranging implications at country, regional and international levels. The present political, economic and socio-cultural environment for international migration has and will continue to drastically change migration flows in the region. A better understanding of such migration flows and their ramifications for policy, legislation and cooperation among countries can provide the basis for approaches and strategies to address important current and emerging issues related to international migration.

UNESCO's longstanding interest in the area of international migration is well documented. The various activities undertaken by the organization in the past 50 years have included research publications, results of various conferences, symposia and expert meetings that have provided useful information in better understanding the phenomenon of social transformations and international migration. UNESCO has also undertaken considerable activities in the advocacy of migrants' rights and in encouraging support for the international conventions and their implementation.

After independence, in all Central Asian countries a major reconsideration and re-formulation of national identity has gained importance. However, some broad commonalities exist among the people of the region that lead to common interests as stakeholders in international migration policies. For example in addition to language, there is a shift towards market economies, a reconfiguration of international business opportunities, an increase in labour migration and the exodus of certain ethnic minorities.

The contemporary dynamics of international migration in Central Asia indicate a considerable increase in labour migration to the Russian Federation and, in recent years, to Kazakhstan - countries increasingly seen as ‘migration magnets’ for a high number of unemployed in some of these countries. Due to a shared history and language for more than seven decades, the migrants find it best to seek work there. Unfortunately however, the poor status of migrant labour has not yet been reflected in the migration policies of the newly independent states.

It is strongly felt that the international conventions that exist to address issues of human rights, labour migrants, remittances, Diasporas, etc. need to be translated into policies and laws at the country, regional and global levels.

It was with this brief background that an international conference was conceived with the cooperation of IOM, the organization that has been actively working to improve migration management in many CIS countries for ten years. The themes of the conference were developed keeping in view the contemporary scenario of international migration in Central Asia.

The present report is based on presentations and papers presented at the conference by participants from governments/agencies in four countries i.e. Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Participants also represented international organizations/agencies and NGOs. The most significant contribution was made by the four country studies (researchers from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan who had conducted original research and presented their findings at the conference).
It may be noted that the papers/presentations that were prepared/presented in Russian have been edited and translated into English. The presentations are annexed at the end of this report. However, there were some presentations for which the texts were not provided to the organizers, and some participants submitted power point presentations without descriptive text. They have been annexed as provided.

We hope that the proceedings of this conference will provide a useful knowledge base for future policy deliberations to move towards appropriate migration management policies in the region. The recommendations of the conference were the result of a consensus.

The organizers of the conference express their deep appreciation to all governments, institutions, non-governmental organizations, researchers and individuals who made valuable contributions to the conference through their presentations and participation in free and frank discussion on the themes. We give special thanks for the cooperation and collaboration of the Governments of the region namely, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, the dedicated work of the researchers that forms the platform for this conference, and the active cooperation and encouragement of UNDP, UNHCR, UNIFEM, ILO and OSCE.

Our thanks to the UNESCO Consultant, Ms. Sabiha Syed who worked over a long period of time to make the conference possible. Our thanks to our own staff, both at UNESCO and IOM, for their devotion and hard work.

We look forward to active interest and feedback on this report.

Ms. Anjum R. Haque,  
Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

Michael Tschanz  
Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty
Founded upon intellectual and moral solidarity, UNESCO’s mission is above all ethical, concerned with the human spirit. UNESCO aims to advance the educational, scientific and cultural understanding of the people of the world in order to achieve international peace and the common welfare of humankind. UNESCO’s mandate is to promote education and contribute to the fields of knowledge in the humanities, arts and culture, physical and biological sciences, and communication; extending its reach to all countries of the world, which are at different levels of cultural, social, economic and political development. UNESCO’s distinguishing feature is its focus on developing human potential and on promoting human values of freedom, dignity and justice.

Conceived to promote peace in the minds of men, UNESCO discharges its mandate through three main strategy thrusts:

1. Developing and promoting universal principles and norms based on shared values in order to meet emerging challenges in education, culture and communication, and to protect and strengthen the “common public good”.
2. Promoting pluralism through recognition and safeguarding of diversity together with the observance of human rights.
3. Promoting empowerment and participation in the emerging “knowledge society” through equitable access, capacity building and sharing of knowledge.

Its main functions are to serve as a

1. Laboratory of ideas
2. Standard setter
3. Clearing house
4. Capacity builder of member states
5. Catalyst for international cooperation.

(Reference document: 31 C/4, Medium-Term Strategy, 2002-2007.)

The Social and Human Sciences (SHS) Sector that covers the issue of migration under the umbrella of social transformations serves as a think tank, a standard setter and a catalyst for cooperation. As one of UNESCO’s five specialized sectors, its mission is to advance knowledge, standards and intellectual cooperation in order to facilitate social transformations conducive to the universal values of justice, freedom and human dignity. Social and human sciences have a vital role to play in helping to understand and interpret the social, cultural and economic environment. They provide research, identify and analyse trends and propose paths of action. UNESCO has set itself a number of tasks that should help reduce the gap between what is, and what should be. This also corresponds to the work of the Sector for Social and Human Sciences:

- Determine what should be (ethics and human rights)
- Anticipate what could be (philosophy and prospective studies)
- Study what is (empirical social science research)
UNESCO helps social scientists and decision-makers provide improved responses to societal issues of high complexity. Its inter-governmental programme, Management of Social Transformations (MOST), promotes the development and use of social science knowledge that contributes to better understanding and management of social transformations. It focuses on improving the links between research and policy-making including the formulation, monitoring and evaluation of development actions and processes, the dissemination of research results, best practices and capacity building.

UNESCO addresses three major areas:

- International migration and multiculturalism
- Urban development
- Democracy

The conference in question has been conceived within the broader framework of Social Transformations and Migration.
INTRODUCTION

Background:

International Migration has played an extremely important role in the recent formation of the demographic context in Central Asia. Emigration and immigration of ethnic groups have raised new questions related to citizenship and the rights of migrants. It has been observed that the continuous mobility of human resources presents a considerable loss in terms of human capital, sustainable development and the quality of life of people in the region. International migration of Central Asians, and the exodus of Russians is probably the result of economic factors (actual and anticipated declines in real incomes), but some political and social issues have also played a role (questions of nationality, status of ethnic minorities, linguistic problems, etc.). Therefore, in the case of the Central Asian Republics the link between culture, human capital and the mobility of populations is exceptionally close.

Historically Migration and Development form a positive relationship. However, when migration is associated with exploitative factors it has a negative impact on the national development of both sending and receiving countries. Often debates on international migration have been coloured by the negative perceptions of migrants and the significant contributions that migrants make to host societies is generally overlooked. Demands for reduced entry quotas and stricter border controls are growing around the region and globally. In many cases, the result is an erosion of the rights and protection of migrants. One sign of the lack of interest was the poor ratification record of the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. However, some governments in the region are taking steps towards the ratification of the International Migrants’ Rights Convention. Tajikistan ratified the convention in January 2002 and Kyrgyzstan signed it in September 2003. Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are in the process of discussions on the issue.

Given the importance of international migration for employment or labour migration, there is a need to examine further the effectiveness of the various institutions and procedures that have been established by a number of countries to protect the basic rights of migrants employed abroad. Countries that consider the export of labour as a vital part of their economic strategy also need to seek protection for the workers sent abroad, as well as to develop effective protection of their interests in their own countries. In general, a framework to ensure effective protection of migrant workers is of common interest to the sending as well as receiving countries in order to manage labour migration.

Many studies have indicated that migrants constitute a highly vulnerable social group. In host countries, when economic migrants are illegally employed, they are susceptible to being abused by their employers. Migrants often cannot enjoy social benefits like medical insurance, etc. In addition, there are many cases of the disappearance of migrants on their
way back home. Therefore international instruments as well as national policies should be promoted for protecting the human rights of migrants and their families.

Another aspect of international migration is the *remittances* sent by workers from abroad to their countries of origin. This forms an important source of income for many families in the countries of origin, as well as for the governments. Tajikistan, for example, is heavily dependent on guest workers’ remittances.

The negative feature of international migration in various cases has been associated with criminal aspects such as the trafficking of humans, or smuggling of illegal drugs and arms, etc. Unfortunately this phenomenon is also linked with discrimination, exclusion and xenophobia towards migrants. There is a need to develop effective policies to promote human rights, tolerance and social cohesion in society.

Over the past 5 decades UNESCO has promoted programmes to encourage the international scientific community to intensify research on migration issues. Projects included the establishment of regional migration research networks that constitute “centres of expertise” to provide research and advisory services on the role of migration and ethno-cultural diversity. Regional activities about topics such as the multicultural society and the impact of migration research on policy making have been an important focus of the research. Research on female migrants has also been part of the research programme.

UNESCO is currently an active participant in the global campaign for the ratification of the International Migrants’ Rights Convention, which brings together the major UN bodies concerned with migration issues, as well as other international organizations such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the International Labour Organization (ILO), and several international and national NGOs. UNESCO was recently invited to participate in developing new approaches and feeding the intellectual process in the field of international migration in the activities of the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), which was launched in December 2003.

**Objectives of the Conference:**

1. Assess the various approaches to international migration issues facing policy makers in origin and destination countries in the context of Central Asia.

2. Advance the knowledge required for better management of international migration in ways that are beneficial to both sending and receiving countries, including the early ratification of the Migrants’ Rights convention.

3. Share experiences on best practices in managing the various aspects of international migration.

4. Review the circumstances in countries of the region that hinder the implementation of international instruments such as the Convention on the Rights of Migrants and their families.

5. Encourage a social and human sciences approach to studying international migration and related issues such as Labour Migration, Forced Migration, Return Migration, Remittances, Diasporas, Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Human Trafficking.

6. Highlight issues and factors related to international migration such as multiculturalism, interethnic relations, tolerance and balance, and cohesion in society to combat discrimination and xenophobia.
Organization of the Conference:

The 2-day conference was divided into 7 themes, along with an Inaugural Session. The themes were as follows:

Inaugural Session
Session 1: Mapping International Migration in Central Asia: Trends and Future Directions
Session 2: A Review of National Statistics on Migration in Central Asian States
Session 3: Strengthening Policy-making Capacities through Research and Analysis
Session 4: Migration and Development
Session 5: Migrants’ Rights and the Role of Diaspora Communities in Central Asia
Session 6: Mainstreaming Migration Policies into Human Rights and Development Agendas
Session 7: The Way Forward: Opportunities for Developing a Regional Framework for Migration Management and Research in Central Asia

Four or five presentations were given in each of the themed sessions. These presentations were generally based on research and experience and were followed by remarks from the participants and a general discussion. This provided an opportunity for free and open deliberations among the participants. The four UNESCO sponsored country studies on International Migration in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan were presented in the first working session. These provided a basis to develop and build on the themes of the conference and to formulate recommendations.
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SCENARIOS FOR THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION IN CENTRAL ASIA

THURSDAY 12TH MAY 2005

09.00-09.30 Registration of participants

09.30-10.30 OPENING SESSION (Open to Press)

Announcements:
- Ms. Indira Konelbaeva, SHS Assistant, UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

Welcome remarks by:
- Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office, UNESCO Representative
- Mr. Jazbek N. Abdiev, Chairperson, Migration Committee, The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Mr. Diusen Kaseinov, Secretary General, National Commission for UNESCO, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Mr. Michael Tschanz, Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty
- Ms. Yuriko Shoji, UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP-UNFPA Resident Representative, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO, Geneva

UNESCO's Presentation:
- Ms. A. R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

10.30-11.00 Coffee break

11.00-13.00 PLENARY SESSION I:

Theme: Mapping International Migration in Central Asia: Trends and Future Directions

Chair: Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO, Geneva

11.00-11.15 Ms. Laura Yerekhesheva: “International Migration in Kazakhstan; Opportunities and Challenges”

11.15-11.30 Mr. Marat Khadjimukhamedov: “International Migration in Uzbekistan; Past Trends and Future Prospects”

11.30-11.45 Ms. Natalya Hajimuratova: “International Migration in the Kyrgyz Republic; Trends and Implications”
International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects

11.45-12.00 Ms. Saodat Olimova: “Current challenges relating to International migration in Tajikistan”

12.00-12.15 Discussant 1: Ms. Laura Kennedy, UNESCO (Discussion Paper of the four studies)

12.15-12.30 Discussant 2: Mr. Michael Tschanz/Ms. Alexandra Formanek, IOM Almaty

12.30-13.00 DISCUSSION

13.00-14.30 Lunch Break

14.30 - 16.45 PLENARY SESSION II:

Theme: A Review of National Statistics on Migration in Central Asian States

Chair: Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

14.30-14.40 “International Migration in Kyrgyzstan: Levels and Trends Revealed by Existing Data”
Ms. Ludmila Torgasheva, Head, Demographic Statistics Department, State Committee of Statistics, Republic of Kyrgyzstan

14.40-14.50 “Utilization of Migration Data for Policies and Programmes”
Ms. Bahtiya Mukhammadieva, First Deputy Chairperson, State Committee of Statistics, Republic of Tajikistan

14.50-16.00 “Comparing current national data on migration”
Prof. Ozat Ata-Mirzaev, Ijtimoiy Fikr Research Centre, Republic of Uzbekistan

16.00-16.10 “Identifying Methods to Improve Migration Statistics and Analysis, and Standard setting”
Mr. Yerbolat Mussabek, Deputy Director, Social and Demographic Statistics Department, Statistics Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan

16.10-16.20 “Debating data sharing mechanisms in Central Asia”
Mr. Claus Folden, TCC Coordinator, IOM Vienna

16.20-16.45 DISCUSSION

16.45-18.00 PLENARY SESSION III:
(Panel Presentations followed by general discussion)

Theme: Strengthening Policy-making Capacities through Research and Analysis

Moderator: Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Director, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant)

Panelists:

16.45-16.55 Mr. Anvar Babaev, Head of State Migration Service, Tajikistan Ministry of Labour and Social Protection

16.55-17.05 Mr. Michael Tschanz, Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty, Kazakhstan

17.05-17.15 Mr. Jazbek N. Abdiev, Chairperson, Kazakhstan Migration Committee,

17.15-17.25 Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova, Researcher, Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
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17.45-17.50 Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Director, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant), Moderator’s remarks

17.50-18.00 Ms. Laura Kennedy, UNESCO, Brief summary of the day

FRIDAY 13TH MAY 2005

09.00-11.00 PLENARY SESSION IV:

Theme: Migration and Development

Chair: Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO Geneva

09.00-09.15 “Establishing labour migration policies in countries of origin and destination”
Mr. Nilim Baruah, Head of Labour Migration Service, IOM Geneva,

09.15-09.30 “Enhancing the Development Impact of Migrant Remittances and Possibilities to Reintegrate Labour Migrants Through Microfinance Initiatives in Rural Areas”
Mr. Mahmoud Naderi, Chief of Mission, IOM Dushanbe,

09.30-09.45 “Labour Migration in Central Asia”
Dr. Elena Sadovskaya, Expert, Member of the Research Council for the CIS and Baltic States Migration Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

09.45-10.15 Discussant 1: Ms. Damira Sartbaeva, Regional Programme Director for CIS, UNIFEM Almaty

10.15-10.45 DISCUSSION

10.45-11.00 Coffee break

11:00-12.30 PLENARY SESSION V (PANEL FORMAT):

Theme: Migrants’ Rights and the Role of Diaspora Communities in Central Asia

Moderator: Mr. Claus Folden, TCC Coordinator, IOM Vienna

Panelists:

11.00-11.15 Mr. Bolat Sarygulov, Deputy Director of the Migration Service, Kyrgyz Ministry of Foreign Affairs
“The Modern situation and actual problems of labour migration in the Kyrgyz Republic: Alternative perspectives for its regulation”

11.15-11.30 Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO Geneva

11.30-11.45 Mr. Talaibek Usubalieiev, Deputy Technical Adviser, BOMCA/CADAP Project, Kyrgyz Republic

11.45-12.00 Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Director, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant), “Diasporas. A Central Asian perspective”

12.00-12.30 DISCUSSION

12.30-14.00 Lunch break
International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects

14.00-16.00

**PLENARY SESSION VI:**

**Theme: Mainstreaming Migration Policies into Human Rights and Development Agendas**

14.00-14.15  Mr. Talgat Umirzhanov, National Correspondent, ILO Almaty,  
"ILO Strategies for Europe and Central Asia region: outcomes of ILO 7th European Meeting"

14.15-14.30  Ms. Géraldine Salducci, Legal Advisor, CASWANAME Legal Affairs Unit, UNHCR, Geneva  
"Protection of refugees and asylum seekers in the context of broader migration movements in Central Asia"

14.30-14.45  Ms. Caterina Badikova, Regional Programme Coordinator, IOM Almaty,  
"Combating trafficking in persons in Central Asia: Experiences and Challenges"

14.45-15.00  Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova, Researcher, Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow:  
"Legal Migrants from Central Asia and Russia: Need to extend Legal Migration Space"

15.00-15.15  Mr. Bolat Tatibekov, Researcher on UNDP Oralmans Report

15.15-15.25  Discussant 1: Ms. Victoriya Tyuleneva, Head of Legal Assistance, Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law

15.25-15.40  Discussant 2: Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Director, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant)

15.40-16.00  DISCUSSION

16.00-16.10  Ms. Laura Kennedy, UNESCO  
Summary of sessions,

16.10-16.45  Networking Coffee break

16.45 - 18.00  

**SESSION VII: CLOSING**

**Theme: The Way Forward: Opportunities for Developing a Regional Framework for Migration Management and Research in Central Asia**

**Chair: UNESCO**

16.45-17.15  Presentation of Recommendations

17.15-17.45  Approval of recommendations/resolutions of the Conference.

17.45-18.00  Concluding remarks: Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office
Part I
Conference Proceedings
Inaugural Session

Chair: Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

Chief Guest: Mr. Diusen Kaseinov, Republic of Kazakhstan

Speakers:
Mr. Michael Tschanz, IOM, Almaty
Mr. Jazbek Abdiev, Republic of Kazakhstan
Ms. Yuriko Shoji, UN Resident Coordinator UNDP-UNFPA, Republic of Kazakhstan
Mr. Patrick Taran, ILO, Geneva
Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office
(UNESCO Presentation on behalf of Mr. Paul de Guchteneire, Chief, International Migration Programme, UNESCO)

Ms. Anjum R. Haque
Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office
Republic of Kazakhstan

In her welcome remarks Ms. Haque thanked the Government of Kazakhstan for hosting the conference, and the participants from various countries and organizations for attending.

She highlighted the seminal role of UNESCO in emphasizing the importance of migration policy and research. As part of its Social and Human Sciences programmes, she elaborated as to how UNESCO had supported research in four countries of the region. The studies carried out in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan provided a useful benchmark to initiate fruitful discussion on the subject of the conference. She reiterated that the researchers had worked hard for over a year in undertaking and analyzing the study on migration in each of the four countries. She thanked IOM, UNDP, UNIFEM, OSCE and UNHCR, for their participation in the conference and looked forward to continued collaboration in this important area.

Mr. Jazbek N. Abdiev
Chairman of the State Committee on Migration
Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population
Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Abdiev thanked UNESCO for organizing the conference on the important topic of international migration in the context of social and economic development in the region. He stated that migration was a complex issue in Kazakhstan and that a scientific analysis was needed to understand the factors affecting this phenomenon. He mentioned some of the projects being undertaken by IOM, UNDP and UNHCR in the area of migration and development as well refugees.
Mr. Michael Tschanz
Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty
Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Tschanz welcomed the participants to the conference. He emphasized the context and status of current migration issues in the region and pointed out that migration was a key global challenge of this and the future decade. It had a wide-ranging impact on matters of governance, welfare and social cohesion in societies in the region. He elaborated that the movement of goods and people would lead to an increase in international migration. He stated that recent estimates indicated that over 200 million people live outside their countries of birth or citizenship; however, this did not include temporary migrants. He emphasized his point with the illustration that since an estimated 3% of the world’s population is migrants, if one were to put all of them together, migrants would form the world’s sixth largest country in terms of population. He explained that various factors motivate people to move, while others force people to move as a result of the globalization process. One could say that a big failure of globalization was the failure to provide jobs where people lived. In brief, job creation has not kept pace with the disappearance of jobs.

The IOM Chief of Mission in Almaty explained the strength of pull factors as illustrated by the presence of 8-11 million irregular migrants in the US. It was noted that the US did not press law enforcement in these cases because such workers are needed in agriculture and manufacturing. In the case of the Russian Federation, he mentioned ILO estimates indicate that the Russian workforce would decline by 750,000 workers this year alone, and by 2010 Russia may have an estimated deficit of five million workers. Half of the 200 million migrants living outside their home countries are economically active. It is clear that policy responses are inadequate to handle migration today. Many governments are restricting their border policies in response to migration. There are high levels of abuse and exploitation in the labour markets and a lack of legal channels leading to consistent abuse of irregular migrants.

This conference, along with other meetings such as the Issyk-Kul Dialogue, have brought together policy makers and planners in Central Asia and proved useful in helping to regulate and manage migration in the region. The conference also showed that there is recognition throughout Central Asia that migration presents a challenge, and it provided an opportunity to initiate dialogue on migration. He cited ILO conventions as a legislative basis and foundation for the rule of law. National policies needed to be improved, encouraging national diversity, and preventing trafficking and illegal migration.

The agenda of the conference coincided with IOM’s mandate to bring stakeholders (employers, businesses and trade) to the table to discuss issues with governments and the international community.

Despite his initial scepticism, based upon a fear of thematic repetition, Mr. Tschanz appreciated UNESCO’s initiative. Often migration discussion is distorted because of the way migration is perceived: as a problem, a failure on the part of sending countries, illegality, trafficking, extremism, and terrorism. Migrants have been portrayed as terrible humans, or at least as wanting to take jobs away from locals. IOM has developed information campaigns to raise awareness about migrants. To discuss immigration objectively, it must be seen as neither positive nor negative, but a phenomenon. Arnold Schwarzenegger is a migrant success story, and now that he has become Governor, he is calling for stricter border controls with Mexico.

Migration should be viewed within the context of trade. States see trade as a necessity and establish policies for promoting and regulating it. Similarly, there was also a need to establish
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migration policies. IOM was helping to establish migration policy in the region. However, trade was more widely discussed than migration policy.

Mr. Tschanz ended by recognizing the necessity for holding this conference on international migration.

Ms. Yuriko Shoji
UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP-UNFPA Resident Representative
Republic of Kazakhstan

Ms. Shoji congratulated UNESCO, the countries of the region and IOM on holding another conference on migration. She felt that it was an excellent opportunity to have discussions on the subject. Migration is increasingly becoming a relevant issue. For some, it reflects the need for protection of vulnerable groups. The UN is interested in the root causes of migration, which could be related to poverty, etc. She felt that migration should be voluntary, risk free and protected. It should be remembered that human suffering is involved in migration and there was a need to protect migrants. She appreciates the multicultural population of the host country. Labour migration is an important phenomenon and it is good that the conference had brought together people from various areas.

Mr. Patrick Taran
Senior Migration Specialist
ILO Geneva, Switzerland

Mr. Taran thanked the organizers of the conference for their invitation. He has a long record of experience with migration and with Central Asia and thought that the conference would provide a good platform for sharing experiences and discussion. He felt that this was an important time to discuss migration in this part of the world.

Mr. Diusen Kaseinov
Secretary General, National Commission for UNESCO
Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Kaseinov welcomed the participants on behalf of UNESCO and the Government of Kazakhstan. He said thank-you for the warm welcome he received. He recognized UNESCO as a special institution because of the diversity of its mandate. Kazakhstan has a lot of resources and is located at the crossroads of Europe and Asia. As such it plays an important role in the region with its peculiar demographic situation, social and cultural cohesion and its development towards a market economy. Migration has thus become an important consideration for Kazakhstan. While Kazakhstan has a healthy economy with a stable level of income that is the highest in the region (US$110 per month), it faces an unstable situation with regards to migration, especially illegal labour migration. Migration inspection, borders, smuggling, etc. were problems, as were questions related to the rights of migrants and information provided to them. There is a need to balance the internal and external policies of the country. Kazakhstan needs concrete suggestions and programmes for domestic use.

Ms. Anjum Haque presented the UNESCO paper, which was prepared by Mr. Paul de Guchteneire, Chief, International Migration Programme, Multicultural Society, SHS, UNESCO Headquarters. The full text of the presentation can be found in Annex VII.
1. Mapping International Migration in Central Asia: Trends and Future Directions

Chair: Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO, Geneva

Presenters:
- Ms. Laura Yerekesheva, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Mr. Marat Khadjimukhamedov, Republic of Uzbekistan
- Ms. Natalya Hajimuratova, Republic of Kyrgyzstan
- Ms. Saodat Olimova, Republic of Tajikistan
- Ms. Laura Kennedy, UNESCO Almaty

Ms. Laura Yerekesheva
Researcher, National Academy of Sciences
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Ms. Yerekesheva’s survey on “International Migration in Kazakhstan; Opportunities and Challenges” gave a brief introduction on the importance of international migration in the country and the background of the UNESCO sponsored study. She identified the various stages of population movement since independence in 1991, the peak of movement from Kazakhstan, which was reached in 1993-94. These estimates might have been a response to the large number of people who migrated in 1994, though this trend stabilized later. Ms. Yerekesheva reviewed the “push” and “pull” factors for international migration in Kazakhstan and mentioned the importance of the ‘Oralmans’ programme, a government repatriation strategy.

Ms. Yerekesheva reported how the present study has helped in obtaining some basic information. For instance, it is generally perceived that migration is ‘bad’, indicating a ‘low migration potential’. With regard to human trafficking the study shows how respondents believe that it is the government’s responsibility to protect people from such practices, linked to which respondents feel that strong legislation would be required to combat illegal migration. It was also observed that labour migration would continue to rise in Kazakhstan. For Ms. Yerekesheva, the key issue is the need to work at an inter-regional level in order to achieve better results to address the social adaptation and protection of the human rights of migrants.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex VIII)

Mr. Marat Khadjimukhamedov
Researcher, Ijtimoiy Fikr Research Centre
Tashkent, Republic of Uzbekistan

His study on “International Migration in Uzbekistan; Past Trends and Future Prospects” offered several facts of migratory tendencies in the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The main findings of the study indicated that in Uzbekistan the number of people seeking employment abroad is increasing every year; as a result migration is considered to be crucial to the country’s economy. Russia appears to be the most popular destination country, together with a new migration flow towards South Korea, as a consequence of Uzbekistan’s international labour agreement with this country. An important reason for migration seems to be
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unemployment and, to a lesser extent, the wish to join relatives or to marry abroad. Although the search for high paying jobs in new destinations is predominant, the majority would accept any kind of work, including low paying jobs such as construction workers, etc.

Mr. Khadjimukhamedov highlighted the low level of knowledge about migrants’ rights among the respondents to the questionnaire that was used in the survey, and how this was a critical issue as migrants would not know whom to approach if their rights were violated. The fact that they would rely on private organizations for assistance on migration and not on official ones constitutes one of the main reasons for irregular migration.

In terms of future trends, Mr. Khadjimukhamedov expressed that 15-30% of the population had ‘potential for migration’ in the future, mostly males from rural areas, which will, most likely lead to a decline in the male population, causing social problems in some areas.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex IX)

Ms. Natalya Hajimuratova
Researcher, Consulting Firm Granat
Bishkek, Republic of Kyrgyzstan

In her presentation on the study “International Migration in the Kyrgyz Republic; Trends and Implications”, Ms. Hajimuratova explained how Kyrgyzstan has been witnessing out-migration since the 1970s, and how every 7th person has left the country since then. The peak years of out-migration took place in 1991-93, stabilized after 1993, and increased again in 1997. However, Ms. Hajimuratova stated that another wave of out-migration is expected.

She explained the methodology of the study and the questionnaire used for data collection, and discussed some responses to certain questions. For example, in Kyrgyzstan 54% of respondents had migration intentions, of which 4% were already migrants. In all of the regions studied people had some migrant family members, which was said to be an important source of income and a way of providing jobs to their families. Russia was mentioned as the primary destination country, followed by countries such as Turkey and Korea. Among the reasons for migration, economic, social, legal and cultural factors were highlighted, being specifically the status of the economy, the low standard of living and the inability to get good jobs. Surprisingly, corruption and nationalism were less frequently cited. Reasons such as the wish to travel or to receive a better education were expressed by a large number of the younger respondents.

Ms. Hajimuratova also pointed out the very low level of information on migration issues among respondents. While word of mouth was still the best source of information regarding how to migrate, 21% of respondents stated that they obtained information from the Internet, which turned out to be an important information source. Yet migration was mainly seen as positive and some migrants affirmed having been helped in Russian cities where the Kyrgyz migrant population was significant. Two Kyrgyz consulates have been opened in Russian cities where there are large groups of working migrants.

Ms. Hajimuratova’s recommendations included several for policy level measures as well as the importance of further research analyses. She concluded that in order to improve the state of migrants, continuous dialogue between government, international organizations, stakeholders, NGOs and research organizations was needed, giving special attention to the role of UNESCO in this area.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex X)
Ms. Saodat Olimova  
Researcher, Sharq Research Centre  
Dushanbe, Republic of Tajikistan

Ms. Olimova presented the findings of her research study: "Current challenges relating to International migration in Tajikistan". She started by mentioning the tremendous gap of knowledge at the regional level, mainly due to the lack of coordinated migration studies, and the importance that this subject has for economists, social scientists and development planners. She explained that the study in Tajikistan looked at all regions, not just "migration regions" or migrant sending areas. And through a brief overview of the migration background in Tajikistan, she concluded that ethnic migration has been most prevalent after the fall of the USSR, when high levels of labour migration were observed, as well as rising occurrences of human trafficking. Yet, the current orientation in the country is towards 'temporary migration'.

Going through the study, she found that the migrants' profiles indicated that younger and less educated people wish to emigrate temporarily while older persons want to emigrate permanently. Women have 10 times greater potential for permanent migration compared to men. The ethnic factor was observed in that it was mostly Russians that have left the country permanently.

As explained by Ms. Olimova, the overall study showed that the majority of respondents think of migration as a positive experience, despite all of the difficulties imbedded in the migration process. However the question that needs further investigation and research is that of the rights of migrants. This should be addressed soon, in order to redress the sufferings of migrants and that of their families.

In her recommendations Ms. Olimova remarked that first and foremost it was important to establish a dialogue between Central Asian Countries and Russia, as this also appeared to be the main destination country for Tajik migrants.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex XI)

Before the end of the first session that was devoted to the UNESCO sponsored studies, Ms. Laura Kennedy, an international consultant for UNESCO Almaty Office, presented a detailed comparative analysis of the four country studies, summarizing the main findings of the surveys. This enabled the participants of the conference to get a more comprehensive understanding of the differences and similarities amongst the four countries in the region.

The paper is presented hereby in its entirety.
Introduction and Research Methodology

This paper is an attempt to highlight the results of the four UNESCO-supported case studies on international migration in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. The research was undertaken using stratified, cluster sampling methodology, meaning that it is not a representative sample for these countries, but a purposive sample using qualitative research methods. Efforts were made to identify the major cluster groups in the population in all geographic regions in the four countries. The research was conducted during the period September-November 2004.

UNESCO developed a core questionnaire to be used in the studies. A sample population of 600-700 respondents in each country was selected reflecting the ethnic, geographic and gender distribution in the populations. The studies focused on the migration potential of respondents, their awareness of illegal migration and human trafficking, and their perceptions on the rights of migrants, etc. Besides the core questionnaire, researchers were encouraged to obtain additional information to enrich the studies by reflecting each country's unique migration-related concerns. For example, the Kyrgyzstan report included a detailed demographic profile of potential migrants and the increasing migration potential of ethnic Kyrgyz, both unskilled and professional workers. The Tajikistan report has stressed the role of remittances in the country's economy and migrant documentation issues. The Kazakhstan report emphasizes the Kazakhstani government policy regulating labour migration into Kazakhstan and also the difficulties associated with repatriating ethnic Kazakhs, who earlier, under Soviet rule, were forced out of the country, the so-called "oralmans". The Uzbekistan report focuses discussion on the migration patterns of respondents' family members and how these might affect the perceptions and migratory intentions of respondents themselves.

The researchers were requested to conduct interviews with experts and officials on migration issues to enhance available migration data. This information also has been summarized in all four country reports.

It has become evident that by launching and analyzing these studies, UNESCO has created a unique data set across four countries that will be useful for comparative analysis on migration; this data set also has the potential to launch future research for policymaking.

Current Legal Atmosphere for Migration in Central Asia

The reports describe the current legal climate in the four countries as inadequate to suit the demands of growing migration in the region. Researchers summarized individual legal situations variously: from the absence of a comprehensive law or programme to address migration - in the case of Uzbekistan - to an extensive migration policy with vaguely formulated laws and often contradictory amendments that focus more on the responsibilities of migrants rather than their rights - in the case of Kazakhstan. IOM research confirms that the absence of a unified migration policy in the region (including the Russian Federation) presents a fundamental legal
The lack of agreement on basic migration terms and contradictory policies in sending and receiving countries fuels illegal migration and trafficking.

The country studies do note a few positive developments taking place in the legal picture, for example Tajikistan’s acknowledgement of trafficking and illegal migration, and attempts to improve remittance transfer mechanisms. In Kazakhstan some attempt has been made to amend outdated migration policies. And in Kyrgyzstan, the opening of Kyrgyz consulates in two Russian cities where labour migrants concentrate has had a noticeably positive effect on the quality of life for migrants there. Still, the overall legal climate for migrants in the region remains limited at best.

Major Findings

The results of the studies also provide the following general information on migration in the region: a highly mobile demographic of younger, unskilled workers from rural areas with secondary or technical education, most of whom intend to migrate temporarily for work. They know little about illegal migration and trafficking, their rights as migrants or the laws governing them in the destination countries. They feel that migration is a good thing (except in Kazakhstan), although the majority acknowledge that migrants abroad are not treated very well and do not work in professional jobs. While non-titular nationalities, in particular Slavs, remain highly mobile, indigenous nationalities (i.e. ethnic Kyrgyz in Kyrgyzstan), both unskilled workers and professionals, are showing increased mobility levels. Poor economic conditions, the lack of ability to earn a decent wage and the lack of a future for respondents and their families are cited as the prime motivating factors for migration.

Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan are predominantly migrant-sending countries; the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan are the primary migrant destinations for migrants. For the three major migrant-sending countries, remittances constitute a considerable contribution to the national economies. The Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan governments officially encourage labour migration from the country. Kazakhstan receives migrants from throughout Central Asia, and also sends some number of migrants to Russia and other countries, making it both a source and destination country for migrants.

Beyond generalities, however, the survey results reveal interesting trends on specific migration issues:

Migration Potential by Country. Mobility among respondents ranges from approximately 15 percent in Tajikistan up to around 50 percent of respondents in Kyrgyzstan who expressed intentions to migrate. Figures for Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan were 20 percent and 28.5 percent, respectively. These figures include those respondents who expressed a desire to migrate permanently as well as temporarily for work or study. Of those who state their intentions to migrate, the majorities in all countries wish to do so for temporary work abroad.

One perhaps surprising statistic from the survey is that the lowest indicator of desire to migrate was found in Tajikistan, not in Kazakhstan. The low level of expressed migration potential in Tajikistan, despite its difficult economic conditions and high labour migration levels, indicates that migration takes place out of sheer economic necessity. Alternatively, it may indicate reluctance on the part of respondents to openly discuss the issue with interviewers.

Kyrgyzstan, high migration potential confirms a general level of dissatisfaction among the country's populous, as witnessed in the recent political unrest there.

Urban-Rural Residence. In Kazakhstan, individuals from urban areas showed a higher potential for migration. In the other countries, individuals in rural areas showed higher intentions to migrate. The researcher explained this variance as due to the higher migration potential of Slavic and other non-indigenous nationalities residing in urban areas of the country. Kazakhstan also has a higher urbanization rate than the other countries in the survey.

Age and Gender. The Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan reports provided specific data on migration potential by age group. Younger potential migrants (ages 16-29) were far more likely to show interest in temporary labour migration. Older respondents (30 years and older) were more inclined towards permanent emigration. Many of these individuals expressed the desire to join family members already living abroad.

With regard to gender, the higher mobility rates reported among men in the traditional society of Tajikistan were as expected. Comparative data on gender were not provided for respondents in Uzbekistan, though data collected by IOM shows a similar pattern of predominantly male migration in Uzbekistan.

A perhaps unexpected result from the Tajikistan study indicates that women who showed migration potential were ten times more likely to emigrate permanently rather than temporarily for work. In contrast, men and women in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan showed strikingly similar migration potential. Women in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan were also, on the whole, slightly more inclined towards permanent emigration than men.

Education/Qualifications. Respondents who prefer to emigrate permanently are more likely to have at least some higher education, indicating a brain drain of educated professionals from countries that can ill-afford to lose intellectual resources. The Uzbekistan report revealed that potential migrants there have educational levels that are higher than those in the general population. It is indicative of the current economic challenges facing Uzbekistan that at the time of the survey about half of the respondents there had no regular employment.

Sources of information on migration. In three of the four studies family members and friends served as the primary information source on migration for the majority of respondents. In fact, a high number of respondents reported a desire to join family members or friends already living abroad. Only in Kazakhstan was the media cited as the respondents' primary information source on migration. The Kyrgyzstan report mentioned that the Internet also now serves as a major source of information for Kyrgyzstanis. Some 21 percent of respondents reported receiving information on migration via the Internet.

Opinions on Migration. Only in Kazakhstan, a country that receives high numbers of labour migrants and where mobility tends to be lower, do respondents see migration to other countries as a bad thing. It is interesting to note that Kazakhstans remain largely undecided as to whether the presence of migrants in their own country is good or bad. The researcher sees this lack of bias against migrants as a good opportunity for the Kazakhstani Government to shape public opinion to favor migration as enriching the country's multiethnic population.

Level of Knowledge/Actions for Departure. Despite their stated intentions to migrate, in all the case studies except Tajikistan (where a large share of labour migrants appear to be experienced and knowledgeable in terms of what they need to do), respondents’ knowledge of migration laws and migrants’ rights in the sending and receiving countries is strikingly low.
Furthermore, roughly half of the respondents who voiced intentions to migrate had done nothing to further this goal (again, this figure is lower in Tajikistan). This may be interpreted as a lack of serious intention to migrate, a lack of knowledge as to how to go about migrating or even as a sign of hopelessness or fatalism on the part of respondents. Certainly migrant knowledge about rights’ awareness and actions for departure, etc. are key areas for further research.

**Labour Migration.** Labour migration is by far the most common type of migration in the region. For researchers in sending countries, the legal protection of migrants in both sending and receiving countries was cited as a priority. In Kazakhstan, as a major receiving country, the report stressed the need for clarification of laws and the dissemination of information to migrants on their responsibilities but also on their rights.

Labour migrants in all countries indicated a low level of official assistance, preferring instead to use informal channels such as family, friends or unofficial agencies to migrate. They cited excessive time, cost and bureaucracy of official channels as barriers to migration.

In both Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, researchers stressed that government migration strategy has been to adopt legislation to encourage labour migration to other countries because labour migrant remittances are a major source of income in these countries; governments do not discourage emigration for work purposes or implement controls on migration.

In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (and according to estimates in Uzbekistan), labour migration provides such a large source of remittances that emigration is essential for many in these countries seeking to support themselves and their families. The Tajikistan survey showed overwhelmingly that respondents feel migrants working abroad should send remittances back to family members who remain in Tajikistan.

**Illegal Migration and Human Trafficking.** Some of the more alarming data from the country surveys pertained to the respondents’ levels of knowledge on illegal migration and human trafficking. All the reports indicate a very low rate of awareness among respondents (averaging approximately half) regarding illegal trafficking in persons and the rights of migrants. Here respondents in larger urban areas tend to be better informed than their rural counterparts. It is disconcerting that many individuals in poor rural areas are those who are the most likely to migrate and prove to be the least informed of their rights and of the dangers of illegal migration and trafficking. Most notably, the Kyrgyzstan report mentioned that because respondents were unaware of the migration process, their rights and responsibilities, they would in fact have to take any job offered to them. This is a dangerous attitude that leaves these individuals most vulnerable to trafficking.

Interestingly, in all countries except for Uzbekistan, the studies reveal inadequate, vague and contradictory migration laws as the major contributor to the respondents’ low level of knowledge about legislation, especially related to international migration.

**Responsibility for Protecting Migrants’ Rights.** Responses in the four countries varied regarding the protection of migrants’ rights. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan (both migrant sending countries) more than half of the respondents felt the sending country should be responsible; in Kazakhstan, a migrant receiving country, 40 percent of respondents felt that the receiving country should be responsible, while 31 percent gave this responsibility to international organizations. In Kyrgyzstan responses were almost evenly divided on the issue of responsibility between the sending and receiving countries along with international organizations (with slightly more respondents favoring the sending country). The data supports an acknowledgement of international organizations working on migration issues in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, implying that these organizations are playing an active role on migration issues in these countries.
Russia’s Role is Key

No progress on migrants’ rights and the rights of their families in Central Asia can take place without the active participation of the Russian Federation. A region that sent millions of migrants into the Central Asian republics during the Soviet era, Russia is now the primary destination for all types of migrants from Central Asian countries, most of them illegal. The figures are sobering: among Russia’s 3.5 million illegal foreign labourers (year 2000 estimates), nearly one-half come from these four Central Asian countries. These include 600,000-700,000 from Uzbekistan, 600,000 from Tajikistan, 300,000-350,000 from Kyrgyzstan and 30,000 from Kazakhstan. By contrast, 4.7 and 4.3 percent of Russia’s legal foreign labour force came from Tajikistan and Uzbekistan respectively.

Statistics for 2003 show that nearly 97 percent of all labour migrants from Tajikistan, 75 percent of those from Uzbekistan and 70 percent of those from Kyrgyzstan worked in the Russian Federation. Survey data and continued economic stagnation in the region indicate that this trend will continue, if not accelerate. These figures overwhelmingly testify to the need for a unified approach to migration policy, including multilateral agreements for managing labour migration in the region, with Russia taking a lead role.

The four studies confirm that beyond the Russian and Slavic populations, respondents of all nationalities showed significant migration potential for both temporary labour migration as well as for permanent residence. The Russian Government will need to address the implications of changing migration realities for social integration and multiculturalism in post-Soviet Russia.

Lessons Learned

The four migration case studies have fulfilled the basic goals of the project, addressing current migration issues in the region. The depth of analysis varies by issue and country. Through the migration surveys researchers have uncovered general levels of migratory intentions and respondent perceptions on key migration issues such as illegal migration, trafficking and the role of governments in protecting migrants.

As is common with pioneering research endeavours in transitional countries, this exercise has been an educational one. The latitude given to researchers in their approach to the reports often resulted in analysis gaps. The diverse nature of the reports does not always lend itself well to country comparison and data synthesis. For the future researchers might be given more detailed methodological guidelines and specific relationships between variables for comparison across the four country cases (the percentages of women in all countries who plan to migrate for work but know nothing about trafficking, for example). It is possible that such gaps may be filled by going back to the raw data with specific inquiries; UNESCO’s next step with these studies may in fact be to identify key areas of interest and request the researchers to follow up with requested survey data for all countries. Similarly, the researchers may have benefited from receiving a focused set of questions on current migration policies in their respective countries to keep the reports more or less comparable.

Several reports gave abundant data on the demographic characteristics of respondents themselves that were not subsequently brought into the analysis. Again, for example we may

2 Ibid., pp. 74-77. Figures are for 2002. Data were not provided for Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, as these countries were not among the top source countries of legal migrants to Russia.

3 Ibid.
have learned what percentage of respondents is currently unemployed, but we did not learn a potentially more meaningful piece of data - the percentage of those who intend to migrate and who are currently unemployed. For the future, this kind of research will be much enhanced by gathering the researchers together to ensure that all are on the same methodological playing field. The researchers’ recommendations were numerous and far-reaching; a shorter, more focused list of recommendations may have been more appropriate to the given research task.

Finally, researchers seem not to have evaluated the use of a survey questionnaire as a tool for data collection on migration, mobility potential and perceptions. Nor did they speculate on the validity of these survey results - the extent to which respondents gave true and accurate representations of the populations as a whole. This is a topic much debated in transitional countries where social science research is a relatively new phenomenon and it would be instructive to know the researchers’ impressions on this issue.

Conclusion: Advocating Migration as Development

Policy Recommendations from the Case Studies

Despite country differences, the four reports gave strikingly similar policy recommendations. Above all, researchers called for better information sharing, dissemination and collaboration on migration laws and practices to protect migrants and their families both in sending and receiving countries. Researchers stressed that the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral treaties on migration is essential to improving the rights of migrants in the region. Regarding UNESCO’s role, researchers proposed that UNESCO, in collaboration with other organizations, should play a key role in capacity-building for further research, training and information dissemination on migration issues in the Central Asian region.

The data generated by these must now be reframed in the context of migration as development. By approaching migration from a developmental perspective, states move beyond tackling problems of human movement towards enriching the fabric of their societies. Researchers, governments, NGOs and international organizations must collaborate towards a regional migration scheme that recognizes migration and the protection of migrants’ rights as a positive tool for economic and social development.

The results of the country studies recommend the following actions for mainstreaming migration into development:

1. Legislative Measures:
   - Adopt updated migration laws.
   - Resolve contradictions in migration legislation and its amendments.
   - Make laws and migration policies compatible between migrant sending and receiving countries, especially the Russian Federation, being a major migrant receiving country.
   - Adopt and adhere to international conventions governing migrants’ rights and those of their families.

2. A regional migration network of governments, academic institutions, NGOs and international organizations in the Central Eurasian region.
3. Integration of *return migrants* into national social and economic development programmes:
   - Provide economic incentives for investment of migrant earnings.
   - Encourage the creation of returnee/migrant professional networks.
   - Assist migrant self-help organizations to share experiences and information.
   - Provide appropriate loans for return migrant small-medium enterprises, etc.

4. Organize *information dissemination and awareness* campaigns in sending and receiving countries on:
   - Migration laws and migrants’ rights in source and destination countries.
   - Illegal migration and human trafficking.
   - Opportunities and services for labour migrants in destination countries.
   - Prevention of discrimination against and harassment of migrants, xenophobia and "migrantophobia".

5. Promote the “positives” of migration, including *multiculturalism* and social integration. Kazakhstan, a migrant source/destination country that celebrates diversity and ethnic tolerance has a unique opportunity to serve as the standard bearer for multiculturalism, integration and migrants’ rights in the region.

6. Encourage the positive role of the *mass media* in developing and implementing migration strategies. The role of the media, including the Internet to inform citizens’ perceptions on migrants is vital.

7. Regional and international cooperation to develop an equitable and contradiction-free *coordinated, comprehensive migration policy*. The participation of the Russian Federation is essential to enhance the creation of a comprehensive migration policy.

8. Support regional *capacity-building* on migration in Central Asia:
   - Social science research to improve tools for data collection, reliability, information and dissemination.
   - Policy-oriented research for government, NGO and international organization use.
   - Establishing a reliable, systematic migration data collection network.
   - Training for law-enforcement agencies, border officials and other relevant government functionaries on migration laws and migrants’ rights.
   - Regular training programmes for potential migrants and returnees.

9. Improved border arrangements between countries to ensure *mobility* rights of people, adequate management of migration and to discourage illegal migration, trafficking and corruption.
Discussion

**Ms. Alexandra Formanek**
International consultant
IOM Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

In her intervention, Ms. Formanek gave an overview of the essential difference that, according to her, exists between migration in Central Asia and Russia versus that in Europe. She explained how migrants from these countries do not migrate and ask for social benefits in destination countries, as is the case with most European migration. On the other hand, she stated that there is considerable xenophobia in the region and therefore, it is important to challenge some of the assumptions made in the studies about the basic rights of migrants. There is, as she stated, a lack of knowledge about their rights in origin and destination countries, and for that reason one needs to consider that the policies might be vague on this matter.

Ms. Formanek also drew attention to corruption issues, which seem to be institutionalized in the process of migration. For her, it is important to think carefully as to why things are the way they are in the region.

She raised some methodological questions on the studies and recommended that more organizations should support policy relevant and representative research. She concluded her intervention by stating that information on gender issues, migrants' perceptions and awareness about the migration process appearing in the studies is very interesting and therefore needs to be followed up by suitable interventions.

**Mr. Michael Tschanz**
Chief of Mission
IOM Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Tschanz's intervention put some relevant issues on the table. He elaborated that it should be possible for such conferences to make some radical recommendation like considering 'fully' legalizing labour migration in Central Asia. Legalizing labour migration would free the police to chase criminals, not migrants; in this case the political would need to be translated into policy.

He shared some of IOM’s own research findings, which showed that potential migrants have a low level of information on legal issues regarding the migration process and their rights. It seems that the level of knowledge in Uzbekistan is especially low on migration and its legal implications.

Mr. Tschanz remarked how the studies have correctly indicated that not a single case (respondent) would go to the police or trade union if their rights were violated. This is meaningful in terms of intervention activities to mitigate problems regarding international migration. He affirmed that there is a need to improve information and its dissemination to the migrants at all stages of the migration process in order to have a suitable approach to manage migration. He observed that overall these studies provided a useful launching point for discussions in the conference, on the basis of which participants could deliberate effectively during the following sessions.
Open Discussion

During the open discussion the participants generally agreed that sound policy requires a sound information and database to enhance the real knowledge on international migration.

It was observed by some participants that working with different institutions in the government to undertake migration research in the past has been difficult. Although certain statistical databases are available in government institutions, not much analysis is being undertaken to develop policies. Therefore, it is important to strengthen the research component in these organizations so that scientific and analytical research is conducted on migration related issues.

The participants mostly commended the work of the researchers and stated that the presentations were found to be interesting and comprehensive compared to some previous studies. There was a consensus that the representation of Russian Federation in such conferences is very important because it was felt that Central Asian countries should establish comprehensive migration policies in collaboration with this country.

In the view of some participants it was felt that the government should play a key role to encourage migration research. Concerned officials and researchers should be trained and made aware of the importance of research on international migration issues. Lawmakers should be encouraged to acquire the appropriate knowledge to assist in the international migration process. Furthermore, the participants stated that there are many social and cultural issues that need to be addressed in this area. For example, in Russia the children of Tajikistani migrant workers do not attend school because they are considered "irregular" and therefore have no right to education. Some participants recommended that UNESCO should take note of this and similar situations in order to develop special programmes in the field of education.

It was observed that Russia is gradually moving towards developing some policies on migration, based on its experience with labour migrants. They are reported to have some official and unofficial services associated with migration. However, it was felt that there needs to be an effective mechanism through which the various governments in the region could interact on issues related to international migration.

Ms. Anjum Haque informed the participants that representatives from the Russian Federation were invited; however, due to some unavoidable conflicts they could not attend the conference.

Mr. Taran, as Chair of the session, concluded by complementing the organizers and stated that the conference agenda was well-structured. It provided a series of building blocks for participants to evolve the conceptual framework on the first day through a detailed review of country studies, statistics and analyses, followed by discussions on migrants’ rights, Diasporas, and the link between migration and development. The idea was to work through the knowledge base generated from this conference. He emphasized that the in-depth analysis undertaken by the researchers and their recommendations would make it possible to reach some common goals and solutions that would be applicable to the Central Asia region and improve the situation of international migration.
2. A Review of National Statistics on Migration in Central Asian States

Chair: Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

1. Ms. Ludmila Torgasheva, Republic of Kyrgyzstan
2. Ms. Bahtiya Mukhammadieva, Republic of Tajikistan
3. Professor Ozat Ata-Mizaev, Republic of Uzbekistan
4. Mr. Yerbolat Mussabek, Republic of Kazakhstan
5. Mr. Claus Folden, Vienna, Austria

Ms. Ludmila Torgasheva
Head of the Demographic Statistics Department
State Committee of Statistics
Bishkek, Republic of Kyrgyzstan

In her presentation on "International Migration: Levels and Trends Revealed by Existing Data," Ms. Torgasheva stated that demographic and migration statistics in the Kyrgyz Republic indicate that migrants are mostly going to and coming from Russia; ethnic Russians have been continuously leaving the country, while the number of those arriving is smaller every year. The local labour market is characterized by a lack of demand for workers. As a consequence, many people emigrate to find work, most of whom are well educated men. Yet, she admitted that it is difficult to get an accurate estimate of migration flows in the country, as the system regarding migrants' records and cards is weak. She concluded that the country is witnessing a change in the ethnic composition of the population as a result of migration trends.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex XII)

Ms. Bahtiya Mukhammadieva
First Deputy Chairperson, State Committee of Statistics
Dushanbe, Republic of Tajikistan

In her presentation: "Utilization of Migration Data for Policies and Programmes," Ms. Mukhammadieva reviewed the statistical registering methods of the migration activity among the Tajik population. International migration has become common in Tajikistan. She stated that previously migration was mostly internal in nature, whereas from 1991-97 political instability caused out-migration from the country. Nevertheless, she pointed out that current reasons to leave the country seem to be the lack of opportunities for study and career development.

Ms. Mukhammadieva also touched upon the issue of refugees. Statistics on refugees in the country have been available since 1993. From 2000, the country has been keeping track of citizens who are working overseas. Statistics have been available since 1994 on the age and gender of migrants. Immigration cards have been introduced and it is expected that the next step would be to analyze the migration data. She said that the registration of migrants who leave for study or for short-term migration constitutes a problem in the registering process. Consequently, the actual numbers appear to be much higher than those collected by the statistical agencies. However, in 2003 migration figures seemed to decline in relation to previous years.
Conference Report

Professor Ozat Ata-Mirzaev
Ijtimoiy Fikr Research Centre
Tashkent, Republic of Uzbekistan

During his presentation: “Comparing current national data on migration,” Professor Ata-Mirzaev stated that no census has been undertaken in Uzbekistan since independence. In 1990-2000 some bulletins were published with demographic data and nowadays, access to these has become easier. However, the publication of these booklets was discontinued after 2000. In 2002, demographic booklets started being published. In his view, what has changed in Uzbekistan is not only the population in general but also demographic processes.

He explained that migration is not only a social process, but also a political one. During the Soviet period migration was a “one way street” in Uzbekistan. ‘Labourers’ were brought from Russia and Ukraine to respond to the Soviet Union’s needs after several production facilities were built in the country in order to import/export materials processed there.

A trend of out-migration started in 1976. Peak years of migration outflow began in 1990. In 1989-90 more than 500,000 people left the country. Then, up to the year 2000, trends slowed to around 30-40 thousand. But in 2000, outflow started once more. During a 12-13 year period almost one million people left the country. An illustrative example is the drastic decrease of the Russian population whose percentage dropped from 9% to its current 4.5%. Surprisingly, Tajiks are now the second most populous ethnic group in Uzbekistan.

Mr. Yerbolat Mussabek
Deputy Director, Social and Demographic Statistics Department
Statistics Agency
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

His presentation, “Identifying Methods to Improve Migration Statistics and Analysis, and Standard setting” stated that migration has great significance in Kazakhstan. The Central Asian states were big immigration countries - colonies of the Soviet era. Mr. Mussabek cited interesting data related to Kazakhstan from Soviet times. For example from 1954-67, net immigration was more than 1 million people. From 1968-2004 the negative migration balance was 4,000,800 people. 2004 was the first time in 36 years that there was a positive migration balance with migrants from the CIS estimated to be 90-95% of the total arrivals in Kazakhstan. The number of those leaving decreased 2.5 times.

Mr. Mussabek quoted from the Kazakhstan study on the numbers of those who want to leave the country. The study showed that five years ago opinions were different, with many people wanting to leave. Similarly, the ‘oralmans’ scheme is contributing to immigration in the country. Immigration from Uzbekistan and Tajikistan seems to be the largest, with around 58% of migrants from Uzbekistan. Outside the CIS the other popular countries of origin are China, Mongolia and Turkey.

He concluded his presentation with a few statistics on international migration by age, sex and marital status in the population pyramid, which revealed the potential population growth in Kazakhstan for future years.
**International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects**

*Mr. Claus Folden*
IOM Technical Cooperation Centre Coordinator
Vienna, Austria

Mr. Folden’s paper on “Debating data sharing mechanisms in Central Asia” introduced the capacity building programme on statistical data sharing mechanisms in Central Asia that is being implemented by IOM.

He said it is very important to have a clear understanding as to what is useful in terms of data collection and how best to share it for policy formulation. He stated that in order to build capacity in twelve CIS countries, IOM is now encouraging and supporting exchange of reliable, timely and objective data on migration. The goal is to promote dialogue through information between countries. He explained the project through which data sharing is possible on a national or bilateral basis.

He highlighted the need to map out the available data and compare relevant issues, even if the data are not collected in a comparable form. This comparison would ultimately be easier to achieve if facts were described in detail.

Mr. Folden shared the experience of Kyrgyzstan, where a national approach and a working group have been established to develop a data sharing mechanism. One of the working group’s goals is to meet regularly and discuss emerging issues and indicators. This mechanism should be useful for avoiding overlapping with other international agencies’ work, such as UNHCR’s.

He also stressed the need to develop training modules for researchers, as IOM is currently doing, and presented IOM’s website (for further information visit www.tsm.migration.net). A portion of the web site is open for public viewing, while another part is open only to those who are part of the project, for data sharing, discussion, etc. If members wish, they can have a private web-based exchange that is secure for the users.

In conclusion he reiterated the importance of establishing focal points for the main issues, to know whom to call for particular type of data. He acknowledged the conference as a good opportunity to establish contacts for data sharing.

**Open Discussion**

During the open discussion participants observed that because there is a scarcity of research data, one is limited to using official published material. Independent data collection needs to be encouraged, because official figures can sometimes miss some critical information. In order to obtain close to real information, it was suggested that researchers should develop in-depth studies and analysis that could supplement official information. That would also positively affect migration policies, which are based on scientific analysis.

In conclusion Ms. Anjum Haque, as Chair of the session, commented on the significance of reliable statistical systems in the policy formulation process. She welcomed the fresh and innovative efforts that are being made to improve data collection, analyses and dissemination in the area of international migration. She remarked how national institutions need to work in co-ordination with the relevant stakeholders at national, as well as regional levels. Given that certain mechanisms are being developed to address the problems of data collection, analysis and dissemination, it could be useful to continue the capacity building efforts in the region.
3. Strengthening Policy-Making Capacities through Research and Analysis

**Moderator:** Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant)

**Panelists:**
- Mr. Anvar Babaev, Republic of Tajikistan
- Mr. Michael Tschanz, IOM Almaty
- Mr. Jazbek Abdiev, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova, Russian Federation

**Mr. Anvar Babaev**
Head of State Migration Service
Ministry of Labour and Social Protection
Dushanbe, Republic of Tajikistan

Mr. Babaev presented the Tajikistan experience in labour migration. Labour migrants were a highly vulnerable group and subjected to inhumane treatment by employers. In 1998 the Government of Tajikistan adopted a migration policy for the protection of migrants, which is a basic document regulating migration in the country. An agreement with Uzbekistan has been signed and is expected to be ratified soon.

According to official statistics, 24,000 labour migrants from Tajikistan were registered in Russia in 2004. The national migration service worked with other agencies in Tajikistan, including international agencies. Tajikistan was dealing with many kinds of migrants, including refugees. Efforts were underway to improve the legal framework for migration. In policy developments, Tajikistan had held joint meetings with the Russian Government and the Tajikistani Diasporas for creating information awareness. Uzbekistan and Tajikistan were co-operating in order to combat irregular migration. A draft action plan had been prepared but so far it has not received the required attention from international organizations.

**Mr. Michael Tschanz**
Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty,
Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Tschanz stated that one of the major goals of IOM was strengthening the capacity of governments and partners through research and analysis. It was not possible to get complete data on irregular migration, especially from governments. This situation unfortunately leads to policy mapping based on limited data. IOM has proposed to the EU that half-yearly studies on labour migration in Central Asia be conducted, including statistics and analysis for updates. He went on to elaborate six main points in his presentation:

1. Freedom of movement is a basic human right that is not fully respected in Central Asia. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that it is a fundamental right to leave and to return, including to one’s own country. One still needs a propiska (residence permit) to live in certain cities in Russia, for example. Sometimes it is easier to go abroad than to take jobs and make a living in one’s own country. Some countries have exit visa problems - it is difficult to leave and easier to get a fake passport than an exit visa from the country.
2. A greater level of attention is required to the need for labour migration and defending migrants’ rights.

3. The phenomenon of over-regulation was visible. There is new legislation each time a new problem arises. There are 232 laws and by-laws on migration and these clearly need to be streamlined.

4. IOM is involved in several programs to improve border management. Central Asian borders are becoming similar to those of the Iron Curtain era. Tightening borders does not prevent criminals from getting involved in migration. “Private” checkpoints exist for a fee. Border officials are getting more money from the criminal borders than from the government.

5. Some migrants have been forced into slavery because they have outdated passports. Every human must have access to basic documents.

6. Migration should be seen as a part of globalization. It is important to look at cyclical migration.

He concluded that IOM has been working extensively in capacity building in migration and its management in the region.

Mr. Jazbek N. Abdiev
Chairperson of the Migration Committee
Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Abdiev said that migration is a national security issue for Kazakhstan because its population density is low. Planners were worried about a possible brain drain. Internal migration had also taken its toll, with problems resulting in environmental disasters and rural citizens moving to cities. However, a positive migration balance was developing and out-migration was declining. Over 97% of migrants to Kazakhstan come from the four countries of the region, with most immigrants coming to Almaty and Astana. Current migration policy should be made to address problems of negative migration trends and improve the population’s living standards. Freedom of movement for goods and labour is important; people should be able to earn more through regular migration. From 1991-2004 about 96,000 families or 374,000 oralmans immigrated to Kazakhstan.

He said that Kazakhstan had ratified, and was compliant with, the UN convention on Refugees. 304 refugee families currently reside in Kazakhstan. He elaborated that the country has a policy of inviting back ethnic Kazakhs to live in Kazakhstan.

Ms Elena Tjurjukanova
Researcher, Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russian Federation

Ms. Tjurjukanova stated that Russia is a country that receives immigrants and that this situation was likely to continue. Immigration was now perceived as a necessity, due to the labour shortage in the country. There was a difference in the attitudes of people because of prevailing demographic factors. A reduction in the work force is now noticeable and population projections showed limited growth in the population, which some see as an emergency situation. At the time of the last Soviet census, birth rates were down, and now those people are of reproductive age but birth rates have again fallen to extremely low
levels. The Russian economy was moving in the same direction as other migrant-receiving nations. In some sectors 30-50% of jobs were taken by migrants. This was particularly true in Moscow. Russia’s demand for labour would increase. Migration was a strategy of survival and a key to social and political stability in the region.

Regarding remittances, she stated that one-quarter of migrants polled said that they met their families’ financial needs through remittances. It was a human right to allow migrants to send remittances. The education level of migrants was decreasing. Most migrants were uninformed about their rights; hence they were vulnerable to exploitation, especially since only a small percentage came through the correct channels. She stated that estimates showed that Russia had a 5% migrant population, which is indeed higher than in many countries.

She argued that a policy of deportation of irregular migrants did not solve the problem and that better measures were required to address this phenomenon. Explaining some forms of exploitation, she said that there were cases of abuse, forcing migrants to become sex workers, threats of deportation to irregular migrants, physical beatings, confiscation of documents, etc. She said that the Government was only one of the players - some others are corporations, businesses and labour unions, and criminal gangs engaged in human trafficking. They all played a part in the process of irregular migration.

Open Discussion

During the discussion, it was noted that a demand for labour existed in Russia and Kazakhstan. In Russia there was a quota for migrant labour that was approved annually. Many Uzbek migrants were known to have a second family in Russia, which was not a secret. The participants felt there was a need to undertake research on assimilation and socialization of migrants. A comprehensive set of issues was associated with this phenomenon.

In her concluding remarks Dr. Sabiha H. Syed observed that during the session we had heard of some progress made regarding the development of migration policies in the region. At the same time, several current challenges regarding international migration in countries of the region had also been brought to light. Issues of legislation, border management, over-regulation, documentation and several constraints on the freedom of movement required the attention of policy makers, as well as other stakeholders in the area. She said that it had become evident that real information and data on the plight of migrants’ rights was still missing. Migration policies needed to take into account contemporary factors, such as globalization, social transformations and policy interventions to address the challenges of managing international migration.
4. Migration and Development

Chair: Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist, ILO Geneva

Presenters:
Mr. Nilim Baruah, IOM Geneva
Mr. Mahmoud Naderi, IOM Dushanbe,
Dr. Elena Sadovskaya, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; Centre for Conflict Management, Almaty

Discussant:
Ms. Damira Sartbaeva, UNIFEM Almaty

Mr. Nilim Baruah
Head of Labour Migration Service
IOM Geneva, Switzerland

In his paper “Establishing labour migration policies in countries of origin and destination” Mr. Baruah stated that migration is linked to development. ILO estimated that although there were 80 million migrant workers in the world, they still remain just a small percentage of the workforce, except in the Arab Gulf states. Almost 50 percent of labour migration takes place regionally, i.e. to neighboring states. Labour migration is expected to grow and continue to be an important phenomenon due to labour shortages and wage differentials in certain countries.

Due to the realities concerning migration, Mr. Baruah affirmed that there is a need to formulate a state policy in this regard. The state has an obligation to protect and support its labour force at home and abroad, especially vulnerable categories of workers such as migrant workers. He highlighted three areas of concern:

1. The development of a regulatory framework to prevent abuse in recruitment; it was important to engage private recruitment agencies in the labour migration process. Unfortunately, these agencies were also responsible for a lot of the abuse. These agencies needed to be regulated through licensing and monitoring.
2. Ensuring minimum standards in employment contracts.
3. Support services and empowerment of workers, through education, information, and suitable pre-departure orientation.

It would be useful to create a migrant welfare fund in order to provide social insurance for migrants. Also, it is important to have labour attachés in embassies of destination countries and to give migrants a voice on labour migration in sending countries. All these would contribute to optimizing the benefits of organized labour migration. Managing labour migration, he stated, is essential for this optimization. Post-immigration challenges include bilateral agreements, protection of migrants, prevention of irregular migration, benefits for migrants and interstate cooperation. He concluded that labour migration issues are increasingly becoming part of manpower planning and forecasting.

Mr. Mahmoud Naderi
Chief of Mission
IOM Dushanbe, Republic of Tajikistan

During his presentation on “Enhancing the Development Impact of Migrant Remittances and Possibilities to Reintegrate Labour Migrants through Micro-finance Initiatives in Rural
Areas”, Mr. Naderi gave some details on the remittances of Tajik migrants. He said that remittances are a specific type of international capital flow, like goods and services. Consequently, they are linked to development. In Tajikistan remittances come in non-cash form, e.g. goods, which makes the flow of remittances hard to quantify. Every family has at least one person migrating. The use of remittances in a country is a test of labour policy in that country. Generally, labour migration usually originates in poorer areas.

According to Mr. Naderi, experience indicates that remittances cover the immediate needs of the families, i.e. food, repair, housing, essential goods and medicines, etc. A minimum is spent on investment or productivity. Money brought home is normally spent quickly, and the family is soon out of resources. This engenders a cycle of labour migration and remittances. Some argue that remittances raise the living standards of families. Others say they do not have a clear impact on the economy and only help at the family level.

As Mr. Naderi explained, the issue of remittances in Tajikistan is two-fold. While it provides an important source of cash flow to the country, it also poses challenges. He stated that IOM is undertaking a pilot project in poor areas of the country to give small loans to families that depend on remittances. IOM provides matching funds to them. The idea is to help poor families to start small enterprises. The mid-term impact review showed that there was some diversion towards investment. Such experiences have also been observed in other countries. However, he concluded, it is important that this intervention can be coordinated with government policy on the use of remittances.

Dr. Elena Sadovskaya
Expert, Member of the Research Council for the CIS and Baltic States Migration Studies
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russian Federation
President, Centre for Conflict Management, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Dr. Sadovskaya’s paper on “Labour Migration in Central Asia” presented the results of an IOM study on labour migration. The research was undertaken in 2003. She noted the methodology of the study and explained that the information was collected through research, interviews with experts, and interviews with migrants.

She emphasized that there have been major changes in migration flows since 1990, i.e. from the previous forced migration of Russians/Slavs, to the current labour migration. In the post-Soviet period, regional migration has become international, subsequently demanding fresh legislation. The study indicated that most migrants do not work legally, even if they enter through the regular channels. There is also seasonal and temporary migration in the region. The volume of all types of migration within the region is quite large, and is estimated to be almost 2 million.

It was observed that many migrants were first-time workers lacking education or skills. Therefore they need training to improve their skills. In this context, she stated that a recommendation for UNESCO would be to encourage research on migration.

Ms. Damira Sartbaeva
Regional Programme Director for the CIS
UNIFEM Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

In her discussion, Ms. Sartbaeva stated that the regional UNIFEM office is only four years old; some of its work is on migration issues related to women in Central Asia. She said that
gender aspects of migration are very important and one needs to look at researching specific aspects of gender. Unfortunately there is no research or data on gender related migration issues.

According to Ms. Sartbaeva, women migrate for a number of varied reasons, and the country study conducted by UNIFEM states that in Tajikistan women want to migrate permanently. There is room for comparison with other countries in the region. For example the information on the rights of women on land ownership in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan is limited. Few know about land reform and how to register, obtain their rights to land, etc. She said that UNIFEM is setting up free legal services to assist women in this process.

Sexual exploitation of women and trafficking are now major concerns. Ms. Sartbaeva expressed that UNIFEM would like to cooperate in sharing statistics and research in this area. Atrocities such as the trafficking of women and children are taking place in Tajikistan, but as yet no legislation has been enacted to combat this menace, while in Kazakhstan a law has been adopted in this regard. In general, women suffer more as illegal workers and faced severe forms of exploitation.

Seasonal migration of men is also a problem in Central Asia. This process leaves women and children behind to take care of the family and other obligations at home. One needs to work with governments in this field to protect the rights of women, for which coordination is essential between governmental and international organizations.

Ms. Sartbaeva concluded that there has to be coordination between migrant sending and receiving countries. Through coordinated efforts unnecessary duplication of work could be avoided.

Open Discussion

During the discussion the issues of gender and migration, combating human trafficking, remittances, and coordination amongst various stakeholders were discussed in detail. Participants observed that in the area of gender and migration, much needed to be done at the policy and programme levels. As far as combating human trafficking was concerned, there is an urgency to enact relevant legislation. In the area of remittances, most participants spoke on the importance of this income to the migrants’ families at the micro-level and to the economy at the macro-level. Current practices were considered to be neither sufficient nor appropriate for the migrants. Therefore, the need was to address the issue of remittances in a comprehensive manner in order to eliminate all forms of exploitation. Coordination at all levels was considered key by the participants.

It was mentioned that the UN postal agency has recently decided that it would use its resources to transfer remittances around the world. One of the injustices was that most agencies have been charging 15-20% for their services in the area of remittances.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Taran said that ILO has made projections on future economic performance under current economic trends, and if present demographic and other factors remained the same, by 2050 European economic performance would be 22 percent lower than it was today due to labour shortages. Thus international migration is important and an essential feature of development for both sending and receiving countries.
5. Migrants’ Rights and the Role of Diaspora Communities in Central Asia

Moderator: Mr. Claus Folden, TCC Coordinator, IOM Vienna

Panelists:
Mr. Bolat Sarygulov, Kyrgyzstan
Mr. Patrick Taran, Switzerland
Mr. Talaitbek Usubaliev, Kyrgyzstan
Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Pakistan

Prof. Bolat A. Sarygulov
Deputy Director of the Migration Service
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

His paper on "The Current situation and actual problems of labour migration in the Kyrgyz Republic: Alternative perspectives for its Regulation" threw some light on the role of labour migration and Diasporas in Kyrgyzstan. He described how transition towards a market economy is having a tremendous impact on the country and how, on the other hand, international migration has become a destabilizing factor. In his opinion, migration, both internal and international, has deeply affected all areas of the economy. To illustrate this statement, Prof. Sarygulov shared an example. The capital city of Bishkek has an influx of internal migrants that is causing problems of rapid urbanization. This seems to be unsustainable. Unfortunately, reliable data is not available on internal migration. But in terms of international migration, qualified human resources have been leaving the country, which has adversely affected the quality of the workforce. Furthermore, the out-migration of ethnic Slavic groups has endangered ethnic diversity. Through international migration, workers have been able to find employment abroad and send remittances back home. According to unofficial estimates, remittances serve as an important source of income for a large number of families. These also contribute to the economy as foreign exchange.

According to Prof. Sarygulov, the Kyrgyz government developed some concepts towards a migration policy, following which an action plan for activities was approved in 2003. Labour migration is recognized as a priority, and the government is making efforts to enact relevant legislation. Yet, some questions need to be improved, as there is an urge to create a legal framework that addresses visa issues in the country and in the region, in order to assist labour migrants on that matter. Even though a legislative draft on labour migration has been prepared, cooperation amongst destination countries for migrants still needs to be implemented. Since migrants often follow irregular channels to seek employment abroad, it is essential to make it easier for them to go through regular channels.

Mr. Sarygulov also elucidated the topic of Kyrgyz Diasporas. The government has been able to establish some links with these groups in order to assist and monitor the situation of labour migration in receiving countries. In this regard, meetings concerning the treatment of migrants have been held with relevant bodies dealing with migration and those representing Diasporas in Kazakhstan and Russia. He pointed out that migrants face several problems with law-enforcement agencies. Therefore, educational and information material should be prepared and distributed to migrants before they leave the country. He recommended a vital harmonization of legal frameworks on international migration among sending and receiving countries.
Mr. Patrick Taran  
Senior Migration Specialist  
ILO Geneva, Switzerland

In his presentation, Mr. Taran focused on nine key points for consideration in the discussion on labour migration.

1. Deterioration of human security, leading to displacement.
2. Increase in demand for migrant labour.
3. Feminization of migration (estimated to be 50% in the world).
4. Competition resulting in exploitation.
5. Increase in xenophobia and racism.
7. Loss of talent and skills through brain drain.
8. Role of remittances.

He argued that migrants are either willing or compelled to take dirty, dangerous and degrading jobs ("three D's"), and the number of jobs with such conditions is growing. In this process, irregular migration also increases, as it becomes the only available option for many migrants. He stressed that ILO recommendations regarding labour migration, emanating from the participation of its 177 member countries, need to be implemented. In order to assure transparency of the situation of migrant workers, it is essential to develop institutional mechanisms with the representation of migrants, labour unions and governments.

He said that Diasporas play an important role in providing useful information to intending migrants. Therefore, they should be involved in the facilitation of regular migration.

Mr. Taran concluded that since labour migration will continue to increase, it is important for all stakeholders to cooperate and coordinate their efforts.

Mr Talaibek Usbaaliev  
Deputy on Technical Issues  
BOMCA/CADAP Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

Mr. Usbaaliev presented an overview of the Border Management Project in Central Asia, funded by the European Union, and implemented partly by UNDP and IOM. The latter currently has 10 projects underway to improve the information base on international migration. The projects, through their various activities, provide a variety of services, such as legal assistance, training, infrastructure development, training of border staff, control at checkpoints, creation of mobile units in border pilot zones, renovations and training of border crossing points in pilot regions, dog units in pilot border regions, coordination of border security, and security assistance, etc. in Central Asia.

The program has two main elements to simplify the process of border management: security, and improving the quality of border controls through latest technological developments. He stated the importance of integrated border control mechanisms requiring inter-agency cooperation, in order to reduce corruption and other problems of international migration.

Since independence, the Central Asian states have faced the challenge of establishing appropriate border control and management procedures. Some of the Soviet-era ways persist, jeopardizing human security, and the dignity of migrants. He concluded that the BOMCA project is a solid contribution to helping improve the regional situation as well as facilitating regular migration.
Dr. Sabiha H. Syed
Director of Migration Research Centre
Islamabad, Pakistan

In her presentation: "Diasporas. A Central Asian Perspective", Dr. Syed described briefly the history and concept of Diasporas around the world - Diasporas such as the Jewish, Chinese, Indian, Irish, Filipino, Hispanic, African, etc. She stated that different factors have led to these migratory flows, including victimization and imperialism. She went through the concept of Diasporas, stating how it is constantly evolving, resulting in a dynamic definition of the term.

In the Central Asian context, she stated that people were forcibly transferred to other areas under repressive Soviet policies. She referred to figures on annual migration to Russia since 1989, indicating that it was especially high during the early years, i.e. up to 1 million people migrating. Data shows that Kazakhstan has been sending the biggest number of migrants to Russia, consisting of both ethnic Russians and other groups.

She brought forward the issue of Diaspora engagement in development activities in sending/destination countries, as well as the challenges facing Diasporas. Migrants are contributing to the growth of Diasporas as they move and settle abroad. Therefore, Diasporas are alive, expanding, and continuously evolving, and a similar trend is observed in the Central Asian region. In this respect, she said there is a need to build a sound statistical base for Diasporas, which can provide relevant information that can be used to enhance bilateral and multilateral relationships between countries. Such databases should give priority to the Diaspora perspectives on development and cooperation among regions and globally.

During the presentation, Dr. Syed elaborated that Diasporas have formulated their own approaches towards development. For example, the large African Diasporas in the United States and Brazil assist in development activities in several African countries. They prefer the development model in which self-help and self-reliance is institutionalized amongst beneficiaries. Usually they prefer small-scale local, and community-based development activities. In such projects, identifying with locals is important. Therefore, she said that it is essential to emphasize a new development model where the role of Diasporas stresses human factors, processes of community development, and the upholding of human rights.

She observed that there have been some difficulties between governments and Diasporas. The relationship has often been stated as that of an ‘unholy alliance’ or ‘common hypocrisy’, in which governments blame migrants for the brain drain resulting from their departure, but at the same time, are happy to receive remittances. Similarly, governments of receiving countries criticize the onslaught of migrants, while it is still convenient for them to have people willing to do jobs that their own citizens refuse.

As a conclusion, Dr. Syed pointed out the fact that certain countries, in which populations are ageing, as birth rates continue to decline, would require migrants for ‘survival’ in the future. Taking this into consideration, it would be useful to prepare projections of labour force demand in receiving countries, and study the supply of labour in sending countries. The Diaspora networks can and should play a useful role in regional and global inter-linking of migration.
Open Discussion

During the open discussion, there was a consensus among participants that Diasporas are a valuable resource for sending and receiving countries. In some countries such as Canada, migration policies appear to be linked to Diasporas. This creates a nexus that links Diasporas to official development assistance.

As for definitions, there was a consensus on the need to clarify exactly what is a Diaspora, as opposed to a national minority in a country. A Diaspora is considered to be a self-organized ethnic, religious, or national community willing to have links with its country of origin.

However, governments need to define as to what falls in the category of a Diaspora, and how to maintain its relationship with them. Information on two IOM programs on Diaspora communities was shared and discussed. These programs are working on encouraging the return of qualified nationals to their countries of origin to contribute in development.

In the case of Kazakhstan, it was explained that the oralmans formed a Diaspora in other countries, while a large Uzbek Diaspora is residing in the country. It is considered that the Uzbek Diaspora can play an important role to build links between Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

The discussion concluded that in order to protect the rights of migrants, the role of Diaspora communities can be an important factor. Their role can also be significant in other development activities.
6. Mainstreaming Migration Policies into Human Rights and Development Agendas

Chair: Mr. Nilim Baruah, Head of Labour Migration Service, IOM Geneva

Presenters:
- Mr. Talgat Umirzhanov, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Ms. Géraldine Salducci, UNHCR, Geneva, Switzerland
- Ms. Caterina Badikova, Republic of Kazakhstan
- Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova, Russian Federation
- Mr. Bolat Tatibekov, Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr. Talgat Umirzhanov
National Correspondent
ILO Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

In his presentation: “ILO Strategies for Europe and Central Asia region: Outcomes of ILO 7th European Meeting”, Mr. Umirzhanov described the relevant ILO conventions and stressed the need to ratify them. He said that both sending and receiving countries should be equally responsible for labour migration issues and that a regional consensus was needed amongst them. ILO, he said, was ready for cooperation and technical assistance in this area.

Ms. Géraldine Salducci
Legal Advisor, CASWANAME Legal Affairs Unit
UNHCR Geneva
Switzerland

Ms. Salducci presented a comprehensive paper on the “Protection of refugees and asylum seekers in the context of broader migration movements in Central Asia”. She remarked that migration policy is about finding practical areas of convergence among states, including the areas of refugee and asylum policy. UNHCR’s mandate is to address the needs of vulnerable and threatened people, in accordance with international obligations to protect refugees.

She brought up the current debate about the core mandate of ‘protection’. It is considered equally important that ‘protection’ should lead to a better future for refugees as humans who need education, healthcare, community services, etc.

(The text of the presentation can be found in Annex XXII)

Ms. Caterina Badikova
Regional Programme Coordinator
IOM Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

In her paper “Combating trafficking in persons in Central Asia: experiences and challenges” Ms. Badikova gave a detailed description of IOM’s project on countering human trafficking. She stressed that human trafficking is a complex phenomenon, which should not only be linked to sexual and other forms of exploitation. It is a violation of basic human rights.
Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova
Researcher, Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russian Federation

Her presentation on “Legal Migrants from Central Asia and Russia: Need to extend Legal Migration Space” emphasized how we should be able to extend the legitimacy of migration. Ms. Tjurjukanova touched upon the issue of the feminization of migration. She also mentioned the lack of official services for (Diaspora) migrant networks as opposed to the traditional and institutionalized Diaspora.

As a conclusion, she expressed her expectations of the conference. For her it was necessary to initiate a process of dialogue through regular working meetings at regional as well as ministerial levels. In addition, she would like to see more in-depth research on migration issues, as there is a need to increase the legal space of migrants in order to provide them with some minimum standards. A visa-free regime would be a progressive move for Central Asia.

Mr. Bolat Tatibekov
Researcher on UNDP Oralmans Report
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

In his presentation Mr. Tatibekov gave a brief introduction to the Oralmans report that he has prepared for UNDP Almaty. His paper: “Oralmans in Kazakhstan: socio-economic status and paths toward integration into Kazakhstani Society”, overviews the Kazakh repatriation programme that has been launched by the Government of Kazakhstan. He affirmed that immigration of ethnic Kazakh oralmans to Kazakhstan is especially significant within the migratory movements of the country. Its support by the Kazakhstani Government is a response to several factors, including the decrease in the population as a result of high levels of out-migration during the country’s post-Soviet transitional period and the economic improvements that the country has experienced in the last decade, which make repatriation more attractive for Kazakhs living abroad.

Mr. Tatibekov examined some of the problems faced by this programme. The quota issue - a quota imposed by the government to keep a reasonable influx of repatriates - does not seem to be sufficient, and the successful integration of oralmans in Kazakh society depends strongly on their linguistic, cultural and psychological adaptation. In this regard, he concluded that in order to facilitate the integration of oralmans, the Government must develop an adaptation programme.

Discussion

Discussant 1: Ms. Victoriya Tyuleneva, Head of Legal Assistance
Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law

Discussant 2: Dr. Sabiha H. Syed, Director, Migration Research Centre
Islamabad, Pakistan (UNESCO Consultant)

Ms. Victoriya Tyuleneva and Dr. Sabiha Syed highlighted that unfortunately there is a violation of the principles of human rights when it comes to migrant workers. They discussed the importance of embedding migration policies into the human rights and overall sustainable development agendas. They outlined the need to establish humane and development-oriented approaches to deal with matters on labour migration, including the protection of
migrants and simplified transmission of remittances in sending and receiving countries. To achieve these objectives it was considered necessary to ensure harmonization of policies between migration sending and receiving countries.

Open Discussion

During the open discussion important points were made by the participants on the need for coordination of the various agencies working in migration to avoid the usual duplication of efforts. The issue of border control in Central Asia was debated and there was a general consensus that the humanitarian aspects of border management are of vital importance to ensure the human rights of migrants. This includes raising the level of training and professionalism of border personnel. Participants made important suggestions regarding the need for regulation of labour migration that is corruption free. The importance of a regional approach to manage labour migration was stressed repeatedly. The participants observed that integrating migrants in the workplace is essential for social peace and cohesion.

Refugee protection was emphasized as a separate issue, with its own international obligations; panelists agreed there are common concerns regarding the need to protect migrants' rights as well as those of refugees.

Participants voiced the pressing need for coordination among governmental bodies, non-governmental agencies and international organizations to promote human rights issues, to avoid overlapping of activities and to maximize the programmes' efficiency.

The establishment of migrant protection networks is necessary to provide dignity of migrant labour at local, regional and global levels.

The session was chaired by Ms. Anjum R. Haque, Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office. The recommendations prepared by the participants were tabled and discussed for addition or deletion. A set of 15 recommendations were thereby discussed by all and finally approved as follows:

1. Promote and uphold the human rights of migrants, and compliance with the obligations deriving from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and with international standards and instruments.

2. Stimulate and support balanced social and labour integration of migrants into host societies, and respect for multicultural and cultural diversity resulting from growing international migration.

3. Promote the affirmative role of international migration with emphasis on managing migration as part of development and globalization processes in both origin and ‘host states’.

4. Take necessary legislative measures with the aim to guarantee freedom of movement and to legalize labour migration. In this connection it is important to:

   • Adopt and adhere to international conventions governing migrants’ rights and those of their families.
   • Resolve contradictions and gaps in migration legislation by making these laws and policies compatible in migrant origin and host states, especially the Russian Federation as a major migrant receiving country in the region.
   • Initiate inter-parliamentary dialogue on issues of international migration and utilizing parliaments within the CIS, thereby continuously working to improve migration laws.
   • Simplify registration procedures; support a visa-free regime for migrant labour in the region.

5. Encourage coordination of efforts on international migration issues among parliaments, government agencies, international and inter-governmental organizations using a country team approach as a basis to address national and regional challenges:

   • Formation of a regional forum on immigration to strengthen cooperation on migration and development policies.
   • Support efforts aimed at developing a common approach for data collection, sharing and application of migration data.
   • Encourage the creation of inter-ministerial groups on migration issues to facilitate dialogue on migration policy coordination and its implementation between concerned government ministries, departments and key stakeholders.
   • Encourage UN and international partners/donors to initiate inter-agency dialogue on migration issues by supporting a team of international organizations, NGOs and governments to develop a common migration strategy particularly focused on labour migration for the region.
6. Expand existing information dissemination and awareness campaigns in origin and host countries through:

- Prevention of discrimination against and harassment of migrants, xenophobia and "migrant phobia".
- Provide information on migration laws regarding migrants' rights and obligations in origin and host countries, including opportunities and services for labour migrants in destination countries.
- Training for government officials, including law-enforcement agencies, border officials and other relevant government functionaries on migration laws and migrants' rights.

7. Adopt strong measures to combat human trafficking and irregular migration, to discourage corruption and the exploitation of women and children.

8. In recognition of the feminization of migration, further research must be undertaken on the causes and consequences of migration of women and families and on women migrants' rights. Action-oriented research could also focus on women and children in migrant families who are left behind to manage family and public affairs in the countries of origin.

9. Highlight the role of Diasporas in the discourse on migration and development. Support Diasporas and return migrants through social and economic development programmes to reduce the dependence on migration to sustain livelihoods:

- Provide economic incentives for investment of migrant earnings through the provision of financial and advisory services.
- Encourage the creation of returnee/migrant professional networks.
- Assist migrant self-help organizations to share experiences and information.
- Encourage the use of migrant remittances in the development of local community initiatives.
- Provide appropriate loans for return migrant small-medium enterprises, etc.

10. Encourage the role of communications media in accurately reporting on migration phenomena, in presenting positive images of migrants, and in developing constructive migration policies. The role of the media, including the Internet is important in portraying fair and accurate images of migrants and building positive perceptions.

11. Encourage policy and strategic research on migration. Support regional capacity-building on migration research and training through supporting existing regional resource centres on migration, including the Regional Centre for Migration and Refugee Affairs:

- Facilitate social sciences research to further develop reliable, systematic data collection entities and networks, including improvement of national statistics and analysis on migration.
- Emphasize scientific, in-depth research on specific topics such as migrant exploitation, remittances, Diasporas, etc.
- Provide training for social partner organizations.

12. States should examine and take relevant measures for the provision of support services to migrant workers. These can include pre-departure orientation, placement of labour attachés and the creation of a Migrants' Welfare Fund on the basis of good practice elsewhere.
13. Support active regional cooperation and mechanisms for transmission of migrant remittances to ensure that migrants have fair access to secure, low cost methods to transfer their earnings to their countries of origin.

14. Refugees are not migrants, however, acknowledge the asylum-migration nexus and in connection with this, encourage states in the Central Asia region:

- to carry out their border management programmes that regulate migration flows in a way that upholds their international obligations towards refugees and asylum seekers, including the principle of non-refusal;
- to strengthen their co-operation among themselves, and with international agencies in relation to the registration of migrants, displaced persons, asylum seekers and refugees, in order to have reliable and compatible information and statistical systems.

15. Encourage discussions of future-oriented policies towards facilitating legal migration, including the consideration of concepts such as “migration without borders”.
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Welcome Remarks by Ms. Anjum R. Haque
Head of UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office

Mr. Abdiev, Chairman of the National Migration Committee, Government of Kazakhstan, Mr. Kaseinov, Secretary General of the Kazakh National Commission for UNESCO, Ms. Yuriko Shoji, Resident Coordinator of the UN system in Kazakhstan, Mr. Michael Tschanz, IOM Representative, researchers, participants, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a matter of great privilege and pleasure for me to welcome all of you to this International Conference on Migration, which has been organized together by UNESCO and IOM. We have also received active collaboration from our co-host, the Government of Kazakhstan, along with a number of UN agencies and international organizations interested in the issue. These agencies include ILO, UNHCR, UNDP, UNIFEM and OSCE. I would like to express my gratitude to all of them for their interest, cooperation and support.

Let me begin by introducing the panel at the head table. We have the Mr. Abdiev, Chairman of the National Migration Committee, Government of Kazakhstan; Mr. Kaseinov, Secretary General of the National Commission for UNESCO, Kazakhstan; Ms. Yuriko Shoji, Resident Coordinator of the UN system; Mr. Michael Tschanz, IOM Representative; and Mr. Patrick Taran, Senior Migration Specialist from ILO, Geneva.

It is also my privilege to acknowledge the support of all the countries of the Almaty cluster, namely, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan for their interest, cooperation and support. We have the Migration Committees from all the countries making presentations at the Conference, except in the case of Uzbekistan, which is represented by distinguished scholars.

This conference is based upon solid research work, which was commissioned in all the countries of the Cluster and I would like to acknowledge the work of the researchers who worked devotedly to complete the studies. The studies conducted in the four countries of the cluster are the main platform for the conference and will form the foundation for this event.

I would also like to thank the participants who have agreed to present papers, for their support. Their observations will help enrich the regional picture and place it in a global perspective. To those participants who are not presenting papers but are with us, my appreciation for their interest and their participation. I hope they will be able to contribute to the discussions.

UNESCO sees migration as a very important issue in the region and for us at UNESCO, a major force in the process of social transformations. With UNESCO’s strong mandate in upstream work, we see a great potential for contributing to the development of the region by developing and providing inputs that will help legislation and policy making. We also hope that we will be able to forge partnerships with other agencies who are engaged in this area, so that together we can enrich and support each other’s work to impact development in the region.

UNESCO remains committed to human rights concerns and the implementation of international instruments.

This two-day conference is divided into six thematic areas, namely:

- The Opening
- Mapping International Migration in Central Asia: Trends and Future Directions (Research Studies)
- A Review of National Statistics on Migration in Central Asian States (Migration Committees and an Expert from IOM Vienna)
- Strengthening Policy Making Capacities through Research and Analysis - Panel Discussion
- Migration and Development (International Experts)
- Migrants Rights and the Role of Diaspora communities in Central Asia

UNESCO looks forward to an interesting and productive conference; one that will give us focused recommendations to take our own work further.

I will be making a presentation on UNESCO’s work after the opening remarks in this session as we have encountered numerous queries on “Migration - Why UNESCO?”
Welcome Remarks by J.N. Abdiev  
Chair, Migration Committee of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population, Republic of Kazakhstan

Dear ladies and gentlemen!  
Dear organizers of this conference!

First of all I would like to thank the organizers of this meeting for the opportunity to speak in such a stately forum on issues concerning population migration. Please allow me to describe briefly the current migration situation in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Today international migration is a multi-faceted event, influencing every aspect of societal development. Migration regulation is an area of social policy shaped by administrative, legal, organizational, economic, informational and other means. Mass international migration plays an important part in international cooperation, integration processes and globalization.

As a member of world community, Kazakhstan cannot escape from migration, either internal or external. Given its geographic and geopolitical position, our country has become an active migration state.

It is generally known that migration during the transitional period caused considerable damage to Kazakhstan’s population. Migration losses were enormous: departures outnumbered arrivals 4-5 times, leading to a decrease of almost two million people, or 20 percent of the population.

In general during this period, people of active reproductive age were leaving, causing a substantial brain drain. The negative demographic indices in the 1990s changed the population structure. Internal migration also contributed to this situation; every year about 300,000 people move within and between districts, a process that needs to be regulated by the government.

By the end of 1990s migration decreased, and for the last two to three years external migration has stabilized. Since the end of 2002, the negative migration balance has become positive; this, together with the improving natural population growth indices has resulted in a net population growth in the country today.

At present, a growth in immigration and sudden increase in emigration has emerged as a result of the improving economic situation in Kazakhstan.

It also is necessary to note that a substantial percentage of immigrants are returning migrants.

In terms of international migration links, as previously, the most important relationships are with Russia, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Kyrgyzstan: 97.5% of emigrants from Kazakhstan, and 96.2% of immigrants to Kazakhstan are from these countries.

Immigrants settle mostly in South Kazakhstan, Almaty and Mangistau. The largest numbers of emigrants are from East Kazakhstan, Kostanay and areas of Northern Kazakhstan.

Among those who arrive, 54.4% are from Uzbekistan, 26.9% from Russia, 4.3% from Turkmenistan, 4.2% from China, 3.8% from Kyrgyzstan and 2.1% from Mongolia.

The largest number of emigrants goes to Russia - 66.9%, and to Germany - 26.4%.

It is necessary to note one more positive tendency - the growth in the number of migrants who are children and those of working age.

Also, every year the magnitude of internal migration increases. Movement inside the country in 2004 was 319,652. This number includes 127,861 who migrated between geographic districts and 191,791 within districts.
The largest positive internal migration balance has been seen in Almaty and Astana. The areas with the heaviest regional migration traffic were South Kazakhstan, Jambul, Almaty and East Kazakhstan.

Among departures from Kazakhstan, most were ethnic Russians (59.1%) and Germans. Ethnic Kazakhs numbered 69.9% of all immigrants, Russians 17.6%, Ukrainians 2.1%, Uzbeks 1.3% and Germans, 1.3%.

Kazakhstan, with its low population density, vast resources and large capacities for economic growth and development needs to increase its population, and contemporary national policy is focused towards this end.

The following measures are priorities for population growth:

- Elaboration and realization of complex decisions for overcoming negative migration tendencies, and making positive changes in this regard;
- Improving the living standards of the population;
- Reaching a positive migration balance;
- Assisting returning ex-citizens of Kazakhstan to their native land and facilitating their adaptation;
- Control of internal migration.

The main purpose of immigration policy in the republic is to increase reception of the oralmans and to assist them with social adaptation.

There has been constant growth in the number of oralmans arriving in the country over the last few years. In 1999 some 2,668 families (9,732 people) moved back to Kazakhstan, in the year 2000 - 5,490 families (12,686 people), in 2001 - 9,105 families (28,726 people), and in 2002 - 10,337 (34,625 people). In 2003 16,026 families arrived (42,327 people) and in 2004 - 18,955 families (67,587). Each year the number of oralmans arriving is 2-5 times greater than the government oralmans quota. In 1999 this quota was 500 families; in 2000 - 500 families; in 2001 - 600 families; in 2002 - 2,655 families, 2003 - 5,000 families, 2004 - 10,000 families and in 2005 - 15,000 families.

The limited quota is connected to the state’s capacity to provide benefits and compensation for oralmans who arrive by quota, according to the law of Kazakhstan “On Migration of the Population”.

For the period from 1991 to 2004, a total of 97,761 oralmans families arrived (374,000 people).

At present more than 298,000 people have become citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan. In addition, documents for 23,000 people are currently under consideration in the Department of Internal Affairs and another 10,000 people live in Kazakhstan with a residence permit.

There is positive progress in the employment levels of oralmans. Of the 192,956 working-aged oralmans currently living in Kazakhstan, 118,684 are employed (61.5%); at the beginning of 2000 this number was only 32%.

Internal migration continues from rural areas to cities because of a decrease in the number of workplaces in agricultural production and as a result of relocation from ecologically dangerous areas.

The total number of people who migrated inside the country in 2004 was 319,652; of these 127,861 migrated between geographic districts, and 191,791 moved within districts.

However, illegal migration still exists due to the geopolitical situation of Kazakhstan, the transparency of borders with CIS countries, the lengthy process of elaborating a common migration policy for CIS countries and gaps in the legislative base.

According to Republic of Kazakhstan data, illegal migration channels have been organized.

Illegal migration also occurs because of a lack of conscientiousness of employers who still use illegal migrant labour. There is an increase in the foreign labour force working in the Republic of Kazakhstan. To protect the internal labour market, the Government of Kazakhstan sets annual quotas for foreign labour coming into the country, according to the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On employment of the population”.
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For 2004 the foreign labour quota was 0.21 % of the economically active population (15,884 people). As the 2004 quota did not satisfy employers’ requirements for highly qualified foreign specialists, the foreign labour quota for 2004 was increased to 0.28 % of the economically active population (21,179 people) by resolution of the Government of Republic of Kazakhstan (18th November 2004 № 1215).

Rules for attracting foreign labour and conditions for issuing work permits are fixed by the Kazakhstan Government resolution (17th March 2004, № 322). During the last three years employers attracted about 10,500 foreign citizens within the limits of the government quota.

Every year about 19,000 foreign citizens work in Kazakhstan illegally, without the appropriate permits or registering with the Department of Internal Affairs. Most of these are citizens of other CIS countries (Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), especially during the summer season.

Kazakhstan’s geographic situation and its stable social and economic growth, and political stability draw refugees to the country (304 families, or 646 people).

As of January 1, 2005, 304 families (646 people) in Kazakhstan were officially registered as refugees, including 250 families (551 people) in Almaty. Only one refugee lives in a rural area.

In Almaty, 39% of all refugees are children under the age of 15. 57% are working-aged people and 4% are above working age. 3.9% of all working-aged refugees are illiterate and 96.1% have higher education, incomplete higher, secondary, or elementary education. 35% of all refugees are residing in South Kazakhstan and 65% of these are illiterate.

Refugees in Kazakhstan are mostly Tajiks, Pushtuns, Hasars and Uzbeks.


We look forward to cooperation with international organizations like UNESCO, UNHCR, the UN, IOM and OSCE and we appreciate help and support to improve the legal basis for migration policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Thank you for your attention!
Welcome Remarks by Mr. Diusen Kaseinov
Secretary General, National Commission for UNESCO in the Republic of Kazakhstan,
Ambassador at Large/Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Dear Conference participants!

On behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the National Commission for UNESCO in Kazakhstan, let me extend my greetings to you at the International Conference on Migration, which is being held for the first time held under the auspices of UNESCO and IOM in Almaty.

First of all, I would like to thank the UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office in Kazakhstan for the warm reception and good organization of this international conference.

Kazakhstan considers UNESCO as a special institute within the UN system; one that strives to establish a consolidated intellectual basis to develop specific actions for new urgent needs faced by mankind through improved education, technological progress, the study of cultural heritage and the development of communications.

Our country occupies a convenient geopolitical location at the junction of Asia and Europe, and possesses significant economic potential and natural resources; in the current international relations scheme it is a large regional player, interested in friendly relations with our neighbors based on principles of mutual respect, security and territorial integrity.

At the same time a high level of interdependence among the CIS economies, integration of economic and transport links and demographic peculiarities have predetermined a single migratory system in the post-Soviet space and thus, the existence of migration.

With its economic reforms, and the size and growth of its GDP, Kazakhstan is undoubtedly a leader in Central Asia. Today the republic is the first, (and for a time is unique) among Central Asian states to be officially recognized by the US and the EU as a country with a market economy. As such, during the last four years the GDP of Kazakhstan has been constantly growing by an average of 10%. Salaries are also showing stable growth; today the average salary is around 155 US$ per month. This has enabled the republic to ensure the highest living standard in the region.

On the other hand, a stable economic, political and social situation and liberal migration legislation has turned Kazakhstan into a regional centre for attracting migrants, with growing numbers of labour migrants, including illegal migrants.

With migration problems worsening, our country is paying due attention to the practical implementation of initiatives aimed at consolidating the efforts of CIS countries to solve the problem of regulating migratory flows. Kazakhstan takes an active part in coordinating efforts aimed at regulating spontaneous labour migration at both national and regional levels.

Migration at the regional and global levels has various aspects, including border control and immigration inspection, labour migration and human trafficking for labour and sexual exploitation.

Joint measures also include assistance with the voluntary return of migrants to their countries of origin, and raising public awareness on the risks of illegal migration and human trafficking. Also important is the legal regulation of the conditions under which migrants work and live, respect for labour migrants' rights, tolerance and integration in the receiving countries.

Kazakhstan's well-balanced foreign and domestic policies aim at developing mutually beneficial cooperation within the CIS and other countries with the active cooperation of the UN and UNESCO. One of the major areas of foreign policy is to ensure Kazakhstan's full participation in the migration activities of international, regional and sub-regional cooperation structures.
In this connection, and taking into consideration the global nature of these problems, I would like to express my hope to further enhance cooperation in this area and a readiness for active interaction to implement specific project proposals.

Kazakhstan is deeply convinced that a collective solution for migration problems is the way to ensure long-term stability, not only in one country but also for the region as a whole.

I am sure that this international conference will contribute much towards resolving migration problems.

Thank you for your attention.
Welcome Remarks by Michael Tschanz  
Chief of Mission, IOM Almaty

Dear organizers, dear participants

It is a pleasure for me to be with you today and tomorrow to discuss current migration issues in Central Asia. I would like to thank all of you for taking the time to come to Almaty for this occasion.

It was in September 2003 that IOM was approached by UNESCO with the proposal to cooperate on organizing a conference on migration in Central Asia. I have to admit that initially, when the UNESCO expert Dr. Sabiha Syed and the head of the UNESCO Cluster office in Almaty Anjum Haque approached me with this idea, I wondered if another conference on migration was really needed.

On the other hand, you would be probably disappointed if the representative of IOM in Kazakhstan would tell you that we should stop talking about migration. Migration is indeed an important topic. When I had my initial doubts about the usefulness of such a conference, I wondered if it would be possible to avoid having a conference that would be more than a repetition of earlier conferences.

During almost six years in Central Asia, I have witnessed that the migration discussion is often fundamentally distorted because of the way migration is initially perceived.

Migration is often seen as a danger, as a problem, or as a consequence of failure in sending countries. In the media and in political texts, “illegal migration” is often mentioned with threats like terrorism, narcotics trafficking, and extremism. Migrants are usually portrayed as potentially dangerous human beings that come with bad intentions or at least with the determination to take away jobs from the local population. Our organization - IOM - is warning about the risks of irregular migration and human trafficking. As a consequence of all this, a negative image about migration as such is created.

But probably, if we want to discuss migration in a more objective way, we should see that migration as such is not negative and not positive. It is just part of an objective reality, it is a topic, a phenomenon. Migration can be positive and there are many success stories around migration - e.g. the poor immigrant from Austria Arnold Schwarzenegger becoming a Hollywood star and Governor of California, quoted in the media because he is asking for tougher border controls with Mexico...

Trade, which we could call the migration of goods, can also have problematic consequences, for instance for people who produce goods for a cost that is not competitive with imported goods. But few people today would consider trade as an intrinsically negative phenomenon. States just recognize the necessity of trade as a reality and they establish politics around this reality. Similarly, states need to establish migration policies.

Human beings are incredibly complex, and therefore, we can expect the migration of human beings to be a more complex and more widely discussed issue than trade. But interestingly enough, it’s not the case. If we have a look at the media, we probably find more articles on membership of the WTO than on membership of IOM. Thinking about this, I come to the conclusion that it was certainly right to organize another conference on migration. I would therefore like to thank UNESCO for the idea to bring us together today and for the good cooperation in the preparation of this conference.
Welcome Remarks by Yuriko Shoji  
Resident Coordinator of the UN/UNDP-UNFPA Resident Representative, Kazakhstan

Mr. Abdiev, Chairman of the Migration Committee of the Ministry of Labour, Mr. Kaseinov, Secretary General, Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the UNESCO/Migration Committee/IOM Central Asia Conference on International Migration in Almaty. It is an excellent opportunity to have representatives of the countries in the region and experts together for an opportunity to discuss this very important subject.

Migration in all forms, including labour migration, or trans-border crossings of a different nature, is becoming a very relevant issue today. For some in the audience, it is an issue of security, for others it includes issues of protection and vulnerable groups.

In the UN family we are especially concerned and interested in: the root causes of migration, which may include poverty, discrimination and environmental degradation. We should join our efforts to combat the causes of forced migration, so that as much as possible migration occurs voluntarily, in a risk-free and regulated environment.

There are many concerns surrounding migration, in particular security issues such as the trafficking of narcotics and humans, including women and children. However, we should remember the human suffering involved in such forced migration and remember the need to protect the vulnerable population. Today the spread of epidemics, such as HIV/AIDS and TB may be another cause of concern that is often associated with migration.

I would like to salute the host Government of Kazakhstan, which has a wonderful heritage of mixed ethnicity and harmony, as well as a long history of movements of people, for political, ethnic or economic reasons. We would like to draw on the legacy of our host and their expertise.

Labour migration is an important issue, especially ensuring that the regulatory frameworks are in place. It is encouraging to note the enthusiasm and participation of governments and institutions in the region, which are here to share their experience and lessons learned.

I wish the participants a fruitful debate so that we can capture the latest thinking on this very current issue, and to be able to work for a better future on the question of migration.
On behalf of the International Labour Organization, I would like to add my welcome to participants in this conference and congratulate the initiative of UNESCO in organizing the timely and important event.

Migration is the key global challenge of this decade for economic welfare, social cohesion and governance.

Globalization has opened borders for trade and freer flows of capital, goods, services and technology. Elementary economics suggests that movements of capital, goods and services not only depend on movement of people, but they also drive further cross-border movements of people. Globalization is clearly accompanied today by accelerated push-and-pull factors for migration.

Today some 200 million people, or two and a half percent of the world's population are living outside their countries of citizenship. This population would constitute the world's fifth largest country if put in one territory.

Features of globalization are clearly compelling out-migration. As a recent ILO study put it, "The evidence points to a likely worsening of migration pressures in many parts of the world. Processes integral to globalization have intensified the disruptive effects of modernization and capitalist development. Many developing countries face serious social and economic dislocation associated with persistent poverty, growing unemployment, loss of traditional trading patterns, and what has been termed a 'growing crisis of economic security'."

The ILO Director General, Juan Somavia, put it in these terms: if you look at globalization from the point of view of peoples' concerns, its single biggest failure is its inability to create jobs where people live.

Traditional livelihoods are simply disappearing as cheap imported goods replace national industrial and agricultural production. Structural adjustment programmes have folded state-supported safety nets—food subsidies, state-run industries and government agencies themselves. ILO data suggest that job creation has not matched job losses due to downsizing governments.

At the same time demand for migrant labour also is increasing. Demographic trends and aging workforces in many industrialized countries mean that immigration is becoming an increasingly important option to address changing labour force composition and needs, and future economic and social security performance. The native workforce of the Russian Federation will decline by an estimated five million workers by 2010; it will already lose some 750,000 this year to aging and retirement not replaced by young nationals entering the work force.

Nearly 100 million people - half of the total 200 million outside their countries of origin - are economically active, that is to say employed, self-employed or otherwise active in a remunerative activity. We can say that most adult migrants of working age are involved in the world of work, given that children and aged people are included in that total. Decent work issues in the context of globalization are thus fundamental to migration today.

But the dominant policy responses - or lack of responses - to this increasing labour mobility have been barriers to movements that essentially link supply and demand. The consequences include abuse, exploitation and trafficking of migrants and destabilization of national labour markets.

No region is unaffected. This conference and the preceding meetings since the year 2000 of the Issyk-Kul Dialogue on migration policy for Central Asia, the Caucasus and neighboring countries, are clear...
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manifestations of the importance of migration for Central Asia. The characteristics of migration in this region will be described in the next session.

Migration is a key question for governance, national and regional. Effective governance starts with, and is sustained by a firm foundation in the rule of law. This foundation establishes the responsibility and the credibility of governments, as well as cooperation with key stakeholders in society.

This conference starts in the right place, offering governments and stakeholders in this region with the point of entry and the basic tools, notably the key international conventions - the legal norms - on which to base policy. These are the ILO Conventions 97 and 143 on migration for employment, and the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. These instruments provide governments with texts for necessary national legislation. They deal with the protection of migrants - decent treatment - which is the guarantor of social cohesion. These norms are much more than that; they establish the basis for national dialogue on migration and for international cooperation on facilitating regular migration and discouraging irregular movements across borders.

This normative foundation provides for this event - and governments and other stakeholders - to move on the other objectives laid out for this conference: improving national policies, respecting cultural diversity and the prevention of trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

This agenda coincides with the broad renewed ILO commitment and Plan of Action on migrant workers, mandated by our membership at the International Labour Conference in 2004. Representatives at the ministerial level, together with national leaders of employer and trade union federations adopted unanimously Conclusions and a Program of Action. The latter spells out activity on promotion of the normative framework, technical cooperation, social dialogue, cooperation with partner organizations, building the knowledge and data base, and elaborating a non-binding, multilateral framework of policy guidelines for labour migration management.

I conclude these remarks by reiterating appreciation to UNESCO for bringing government and non-government actors to this table for dialogue and exchange. Our appreciation also goes to the government and people of Kazakhstan for their generous hospitality in hosting this event, and to IOM for co-organizing this important conference.
Managing International Migration: Towards a Right to Mobility?

Today, migration has become a central issue on the agenda of the international community. The number of migrants worldwide has reached 175 million, representing approximately three percent of the world’s population. This figure has more than doubled since 1975. In the meantime, one can witness a globalization of migration. Nearly all countries are concerned by migration, which is no longer a simple South-North process. 45 percent of the world’s migrants and 70 percent of refugees live outside Western Europe and North America. Accordingly, more and more states face the challenge of developing adequate migration policies. Responding to a UN survey, 44 governments - including 30 in less developed regions - indicated that levels of immigration in their country were too high, and 78 governments - including 57 in less developed regions - had policies meant to reduce immigration levels.

A few decades ago, migration was hardly a topic of concern, but today it has become a major issue not only in Europe and North America, but also in Africa, Central Asia, the Asia Pacific Region and Latin America.

This means that managing migration and facing the challenges it poses constitute relevant issues for most countries, not only for the richest and most developed ones. Of course, not all countries have the same problems or the same interests, but improving the way migration is handled benefits all and calls for genuine international collaborations. In his recent report 'In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all', Kofi Annan mentions international migration as one of the two issues which, along with terrorism, should be specifically addressed by the UN General Assembly. Acknowledging the current shortcomings of the international approach to migration, the UN Secretary General established the Global Commission on International Migration to provide guidance on how the international community, and the UN in particular, should address migration issues. The high-level dialogue on migration, to be held by the General Assembly in 2006, will also provide an important opportunity for the Declaration on the Future of Refugee and Migration Policy, and similarly illustrate the growing awareness surrounding the need for a global approach to international migration.

A major tool in this international approach to migration is the UN Convention on Migrant Workers’ Rights. This Human Rights treaty is one of the most important initiatives taken so far by the international community with respect to migration. It sets a standard for the rights that should be granted to all migrant workers and to the members of their families throughout the world. It establishes migrants as a recognized category of people who need particular protection. Most importantly, the Convention addresses the situation of both documented and undocumented migrants, and stresses that even undocumented migrants are human beings who deserve respect for their fundamental human rights. While the Convention came into force in 2003, the number of state parties remains limited and future efforts to manage migration on the basis of the Convention will therefore imply the ratification of this treaty by many more states, including major Western receiving states.

It nevertheless remains that, despite calls for a broad approach to migration to manage migration flows harmoniously and protect migrant workers’ human rights, current policies are often restrictive, mainly tending to limit and control migration. Western countries tend to fortify their borders to protect themselves from ‘unwanted’ people and to stop flows of undocumented migrants. In most receiving societies, migration control has become a hotly debated issue, and governments seek to address public concerns by developing tough measures to keep migrants from entering the country, to identify those who have managed to enter illegally and to expel them. While these policies are a legitimate expression of states’ sovereignty over their territory, one should not dismiss their costs. Migrants are indeed the first victims of such policies. Controls make illegal migration more risky, and hundreds of people die on their way to Western Countries. Those who eventually arrive, end up living precariously, constituting cohorts of vulnerable workers with little access to basic welfare provisions such as health services. This is a major threat to social cohesion and creates conditions for human rights abuses, exploitation, frustrations, racism and xenophobia.

This restrictive evolution of contemporary migration approaches raises a number of important policy issues. First, there is a problem of coherence: to what extent should states stick to their ambitions of control despite the factual evidence that they do not achieve this goal? The very presence of
Article 13-2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, 'Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country'. But what is the actual meaning of the right to leave one’s country if one has no right to enter other countries? In order to be fully respected, the right to emigration should be completed by the right to immigration. Moreover, mobility is a privilege that is unevenly distributed among human beings: citizens from developed countries may travel and settle down almost anywhere in the world, while their fellow human beings from less developed countries depend upon the uncertain issuance of visas and residence permits to migrate. In this respect, citizenship is a birthright privilege that is difficult to justify. Migration policies also make a distinction between skilled and unskilled migrants, between the rich and the poor, and sometimes between men and women. But the line between preference and discrimination is thin, and restrictions on mobility violate the principle according to which people should have equal opportunities.

One should then start thinking of a right to mobility. This right would usefully and logically complement the human right to emigration. It would enable all people, whatever their nationality, skills or wealth, to have access to mobility and to the resources brought by migration. One often hears that we live in a world of flows: in such a world, mobility becomes a central resource to which all human beings should have the same access. A right to mobility is grounded in the normality of migration: human movement is a permanent feature of history; it is not an abnormal fact that should be controlled and ideally stopped. It is essential to see migration as a positive and emancipatory process to which all human beings should have access.

The second approach is based on economic considerations. The world labour force is unevenly distributed, and migration is the principle way to compensate for this situation by allowing workers to move wherever they are needed. States have sometimes established labour migration schemes to address their needs. But today, even though migrant workers are needed in several sectors of the economy, most receiving countries are reluctant to open their borders. This results, among other
things, in the development of shadow economies in which migrant workers do not enjoy the same degree of legal protection as they would if they were regularly employed. There is a fundamental contradiction inherent to border controls: in a globalized world, goods, information, money and ideas circulate easily throughout the world, but the movement of people remains restricted. In this respect, restrictions on migration, far from being a normal feature of state policies, rather constitute an anomaly. The strong trends towards free trade should encompass people flows: this would not only be logical, it would also, as many economists believe, represent a more efficient way of fostering development and reducing inequalities between countries. Borders used to stop everything, but today they stop mostly people.

Human rights and economic considerations may not always be compatible. People are not goods: when they move, they generate much more socio-cultural complexity. Moreover, migrants are not only a source of labour: while they may be needed for their work capacities, they must also enjoy basic human rights. This points to the numerous uncertainties surrounding a liberalization of people flows. It is indeed honest to say that one does not really know what would happen if borders were to be opened.

1. Would receiving countries be destabilized by uncontrollable population movement?
2. Would sending countries suffer from the loss of young and skilled people?
3. Would there be positive effects on the development of the global economy, as economists predict?
4. Would receiving countries find ways to manage the impact of newcomers on society?
5. Would racism and xenophobia further increase, or would increased multiculturalism lead to more harmonious and tolerant societies?
6. Would the existing concepts of citizenship, nation-state and national identity still be valid?
7. Would it still be possible to envisage stable national communities, and how could one conciliate people's right to mobility with the social cohesion and common interests that lie at the core of democratic societies?
8. How could non-nationals participate in the life of the society in which they live?
9. What would be the impact of free movement on welfare systems?

The numerous questions raised by the Migration Without Borders (MWB) scenario show the necessity of a careful exploration of the consequences of increased human movement. They call for what could be named a governance of free movement. The MWB scenario does indeed not imply a total laissez-faire approach to human movement. In the short term this would probably lead to social chaos and to an even greater rejection of migrants. On the contrary, we need multilateral approaches that carefully examine the introduction of a right to mobility and monitor its social consequences. Current concerns over security threats also call for a cooperative approach to migration that would help seize its opportunities while reducing the risks it presents. Again, the EU is an inspiring example. The international agreements or institutions that would help coordinate human movement are still largely to be invented, despite recent calls for the creation of a World Migration Organization. Defining the ways in which the international community could address this challenge collectively on the basis of human rights principles is one of the most useful and exciting tasks ahead.

Those who dismiss the scenario of opening the borders as simply unrealistic and utopian may be correct in the short-term. But we should however remember that free movement within EU countries was a utopia a few decades ago. Who would have thought, in the eighties, that traveling from Poland to Portugal would become as easy as it is today? In other words, today's utopia may be tomorrow's reality. We should also remember that no country has advanced by closing its borders: all too often, closure leads to socio-economic stagnation and to human rights abuses.

Finally, even if free movement may be difficult to put into practice, this is not a good reason to give up the exploration of this scenario. We will always need innovative ideas for the future of migration to help us view critically current policies and practices, and see beyond the present. Most importantly, the MWB scenario offers a coherent and morally défendable way of envisaging migration policies for the long-term. A scenario that is just and compatible with human rights principles should not be ignored, irrespective of the challenges it raises. It should, on the contrary, constitute a stimulating source of ideas to imagine fairer migration policies.
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION IN KAZAKHSTAN
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Abstract

This project provides an updated picture on international migration and migrants’ rights in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The following issues were highlighted: 1) major international migration trends in Kazakhstan based on age, gender, nationality, occupation and place of residence; 2) key issues regarding migrants’ rights and their legal status; 3) national, bilateral and multilateral migration policies adopted and implemented by the government; 4) policy recommendations for effective migration policy regulation in Kazakhstan.

The study combined an opinion survey, official statistical data and scholar interviews. Fieldwork was carried out in August-September 2004 in five regions of Kazakhstan - Aktau, Almaty, Astana, Semey, Shymkent and nearby rural settlements; 600 respondents were interviewed using a UNESCO-approved questionnaire.

Results of the study show that international migration in Kazakhstan is characterized by the following:

1. High emigration potential mostly among the Russian-speaking, Slavic, German and certain segments of the Kazakh populations. These are highly qualified, working-aged people with higher and secondary education, a trend that indicates a possible brain drain in the country. Migration potential is high among urban men and urban women from the Astana, Aktau and Semey regions and is relatively low among rural women in the Almaty region. The data reflect the general official migration and ethnic dispersion data in Kazakhstan.

2. Immigration is a result of factors such as the return of oralmans, labour migration from other Central Asian countries, and refugees. The countries “pushing” migrants to Kazakhstan are primarily Russia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Mongolia.

3. A generally negative opinion of migration among the population. Respondents perceive migrants as being poorly treated while abroad, and unsatisfied due to their low paid, unskilled positions. The mass media plays the largest role in shaping respondents’ perceptions of migrants.

4. Potential for a shift in Kazakhstan’s demographic balance in the mid-term. The Slavic and German populations continue to flow from the country; in addition, a growing number of migrants from other Central Asian ethnic groups entering Kazakhstan (predominantly Uzbeks and Tajiks) could change the ethnic balance in the southern part of the country. The potential emigration of ethnic Kazakhs from Kazakhstan (more women than men in both urban and rural areas) is a new development. Rural Kazakhs previously migrated only within Kazakhstan.
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1. Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to provide a complete, updated picture of international migration and migrants’ rights in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The researcher identified the following tasks with regard to this objective:

- To define major international migration trends in Kazakhstan based on age, gender, nationality, occupation, residence and other factors.
- To identify social, economic, psychological, political and other factors that motivate the population to migrate.
- To determine the major labour migration trends in the country.
- To define key issues of concern regarding migrants’ rights and their legal status.
- To analyze the official government migration policies adopted and implemented at the national, bilateral and multilateral levels.
- To formulate policy recommendations on effective migration policy in Kazakhstan.

2. Methodology

The researcher combined field interviews and official statistical data to make a comprehensive and current analysis of migration policy in Kazakhstan.

In September 2004, 600 field interviews were conducted in five regions of Kazakhstan; these included regional centers (Aktau, Almaty, Astana, Semey and Shymkent) and nearby rural settlements. Respondents were selected in proportion to their place of residence (rural-urban) and ethnic background. Personal interviews were conducted using a UNESCO-approved questionnaire, based on route selection. The collected data were processed with the help of an SPSS™ statistical programme. Average republic indicators were determined taking into account specific population numbers in each region.

Official statistical data were taken from publications (annuals, bulletins, references, special issues, etc.) of the Kazakhstan Statistics Agency, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), official materials of the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC), the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Migration”, The Concept of Migration Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the Kazakhstan Migration Policy Programme for the years 2001-2010.

Migration experts were also consulted, particularly during the international conference on migration sponsored by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), held in Almaty on 30 November 2004.
3. Background

Over the last 150 years migration problems have gained special attention as a result of various social, political or economic cataclysms across the globe. From the 1990s onward the world has experienced a so-called “third wave” of migration. According to the “Global Tendencies of Human Development 2015” report produced by the US National Intelligence Council, demographic and migration problems will continue to be a primary factor in the development of the international system. The report predicts that by 2015 the world’s population will be some 7.2 billion people (up from 6.1 billion in 2000); at the same time 95% of the world’s population surplus will live in developing countries, nearly all of it in rapidly growing urban areas.1

Today, world migration flows are enormous. Political and economic instability, demographic pressures and the formation of a global labour market all contribute to the fact that today legal and illegal migrants comprise more than 15% of the population in more than 50 countries of the world.2 According to the United Nations, the number of displaced persons across the globe in 1998 exceeded 22 million; in Europe migrants comprised 5-10% of the entire population, or about 20 million people.3

Migration directly affects, and is affected by demographic, political, economic and social processes. Migration has economic, social and political consequences in both “pushing” (sending) and “pulling” (receiving) countries. The following problems are sometimes the result: poor governmental regulation of migration, reduced political and social cohesion in receiving countries, increased awareness of identity among both migrants and native populations (connected to problems of assimilation, acculturation and ethnic and religious tensions), pressures on the labour market and local infrastructure, brain drain, formation of Diasporas, and political tension in interstate relations.

Migration, however, also produces positive results. For “pushing” countries migration can decrease unemployment levels; migrants generate income flows to the home countries through remittances, and the formation of ethnic lobbies in receiving countries act on behalf of the home states. For “pulling” countries migration can increase demographic resources and decrease labour shortages.

In today’s world of shrinking international borders and the global economy, migration problems will increasingly be tackled at the multilateral and regional levels rather than on a state-to-state basis.

Labour migration (both legal and illegal) is a product of the general political and economic climate in both “pushing” and “pulling” countries. Labour migration is a primary form of migration in the world today, both in Kazakhstan and throughout Central Asia. As the republic becomes more actively involved in global economic, political and labour relations, it will increasingly experience problems associated with migration. The economic integration of the post-Soviet space, Kazakhstan’s entry into the WTO (scheduled for 2006), its geographic proximity to the great powers of China and Russia, as well as to conflict zones (for example, Afghanistan) could all provide demographic challenges to Kazakhstan.

All these factors make an analysis of migration in Kazakhstan timely. It should also be noted that a full analysis of migration policy in Kazakhstan cannot made without considering the role of other Central Asian nations, Russia, and to a lesser extent, China, Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan.

3.1 Migration in Kazakhstan. General Trends and Issues

Migration processes in Kazakhstan, and in the whole post-Soviet space accelerated rapidly after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Many factors contributed to this situation, including porous national borders, the ability to choose one’s place of residence, low living standards and serious economic deterioration. The increase in religious and ethnic identity among so-called “titular” ethnic groups (ethnic Kazakhs in the case of Kazakhstan) also was crucial.

Migration takes place both within Kazakhstan’s borders and internationally. Internal migration was characterized by population movement from less to more developed areas and from rural to urban areas. A dramatic flow of mainly young to middle-aged citizens left economically depressed regions to find work in urban areas, predominantly Almaty (the capital until 1997, and still the largest city in

---

2 Ibid. p. 31.
Kazakhstan. The state could not provide job security or social guarantees for the people (especially villagers), or subsidies for less developed industries and agriculture. High unemployment in the early to mid-1990s, the loss of positive trade relations with the former Soviet republics, and economic stagnation marginalized many internally displaced people, especially those who could not adapt to economic hardship.

International migration from Kazakhstan occurred both to other CIS countries and to the so-called “far abroad” (Europe, the USA, etc.). In the early to mid-1990s, there was an outflow of ethnic Russians, Germans, Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews emigrating because of an economic and social deterioration in Kazakhstan. The peak emigration years for highly qualified middle-aged people were 1993 and 1994. In 1994 nearly 500,000 people left Kazakhstan. During the period 1992-2000 the number of emigrants from Kazakhstan totaled 2,586,400. By the end of the 1990s migration was more or less stabilized, though Kazakhstan continued to experience a negative migration balance.

For most of the 1990s Russia, Germany, Belarus and Ukraine were the main destination countries for emigrants from post-independence Kazakhstan. In the year 2000, 70% of emigrants from Kazakhstan went to Russia, 23% to Germany, 2% to Belarus and 1% to Ukraine.

For most of the 1990s Russia, Germany, Belarus and Ukraine were the main destination countries for emigrants from post-independence Kazakhstan. In the year 2000, 70% of emigrants from Kazakhstan went to Russia, 23% to Germany, 2% to Belarus and 1% to Ukraine.

---

6 Ibid., p. 102
Among immigrants to Kazakhstan in 2000, 57% arrived from Russia, 19% from Uzbekistan, 6% from Turkmenistan, 5% from Kyrgyzstan and 2% from Mongolia. These figures show that although Kazakhstan’s migration balance with Russia remained negative for Kazakhstan in 2000, the balance with Central Asian republics became positive.

A large percentage of migrants from Russia to Kazakhstan in 2000 consisted of ethnic Kazakhs who had previously left Kazakhstan, but unable to find better prospects in Russia then returned to Kazakhstan. Many people changed their countries of residence to establish joint ventures (usually small enterprises) along the vast Kazakhstan-Russia border (6467 km).

At present, within the countries of the Eurasian region, the “pulling” (migrant accepting) countries are mainly Russia and Kazakhstan, while the “pushing” (migrant sending) countries are Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. A lack of economic resources, along with poor economic and political performance lead to unemployment and low wages, and provide economic motivation for emigration of the labour surplus from Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. This is especially the case in Uzbekistan, which has nearly 40% of the labour force of the entire Central Asia region.

The generally favorable economic climate in Kazakhstan and lower wage levels in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan point to Kazakhstan as a preferred destination country for migrants in the region. In 2000 Kazakhstan received 33,621 migrants; while in 2001, according to official data, 46,044 migrants came to Kazakhstan. The majority of these were from Uzbekistan (16,029 in 2001 versus 6,355 in 2000, an increase of about 2.5 times in one year), Turkmenistan (2,962 people) and Kyrgyzstan (2,092 people).

Kazakhstan is an attractive country for Uzbek migrants because of its geographical proximity, relatively loose border control and ease of communication, especially for those who come from rural non-Russian speaking areas of Uzbekistan to the predominantly Kazakh-speaking southern parts of the country. Kazakhstan’s vast territory, its relatively small population of about 15 million, and the recent economic boom have heightened labour demand. It is worth noting that during these prosperous economic times Kazakhstani are not interested in low paying jobs, and instead are looking for highly paid positions. Correspondingly, immigrants from other Central Asian countries become the source of cheap labour.

Another important factor influencing migration in Kazakhstan are the so-called oralmans - native Kazakhs who live outside Kazakhstan, primarily in China, Mongolia and in Central Asian countries. The repatriation of oralmans to their native land was a controversial process. Having been encouraged by the Kazakhstan Government in the early 1990s to return and start an entirely new promising and happy life in the motherland, these people have faced considerable hardships and obstacles upon their arrival in Kazakhstan. Apart from the psychological stress involved in such a move, administrative support, financial and other resources, and housing assistance have been lacking from local governmental bodies.

---

7 Ibidem.
8 Ibid. p. 76.
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Oralmans, according to Article 1 of the Republic of Kazakhstan law “On Migration” is a person of native, or “titular” nationality who was expelled from the historical motherland and was deprived of citizenship due to mass political repression, illegal requisitions, violent collectivization or other inhuman actions and who, with his descendants, voluntarily moves to the Republic of Kazakhstan for permanent residence.

The oralmans problem was high on the Kazakhstani governmental agenda at the beginning and middle of the 1990s. The repatriation of ethnic Kazakhs seemed to be a relatively quick and promising measure to at least maintain the balance of migration at a time when the migration balance was the most negative in the country’s history (minus 2.3% in 1994-1995). Starting from 1993 some 170,802 ethnic Kazakhs (or 38,899 families) came to the country under the presidential oralmans quota. A lack of preparation and institutional support on the part of Kazakhstani authorities however, led to an outflow of oralmans back to their previous countries of residence. Since 1994 about 20,000 oralmans have migrated from Kazakhstan back to Mongolia.

Currently however, there is a second wave of migration of oralmans to Kazakhstan taking place. This time native Kazakhs believe that the economic boom in Kazakhstan could help them to adjust better. In other cases, specific policies (the one child per family policy in China, for example) or difficult climatic conditions (such as heavy winters for the past three years in Mongolia) have prompted oralmans to reconsider migrating to Kazakhstan.

Refugees have been a smaller source of migration into post-independence Kazakhstan. Since the 1990s, unstable political regimes in Afghanistan, Tajikistan and Chechnya caused an outflow of refugees from these countries to Kazakhstan. Proportionately, the number of officially registered refugees in Kazakhstan is not high, although according to the UNHCR data there are more than 17,000 refugees on Kazakhstani territory. Refugees from Chechnya form the majority (12,000 people), followed by Tajikistan (more than 4,000 people) and Afghanistan (about 2,350 people).

---

10 Demographic Annual of Kazakhstan 2000. p. 10.
11 These figures are from the presentation of J. Abdiev (Chairman of the Migration Committee of Kazakhstan) at the International Conference on Migration held on 30 November 2004.
12 These figures are from the presentation of P. Finke (Germany) at the International Conference on Migration held on 30 November 2004.
3.2 Review of Post-Independence Migration Policies (including programmes on the protection of migrants) in Kazakhstan

Migration policy in Kazakhstan is rather well defined through a system of laws, state and governmental programmes and international legal agreements; and the existence of state bodies that regulate migration policy.

Kazakhstan adopted the law “On Migration” in December 1997 and made amendments to it in 2000-2002. In September 2000 the “Conception of Migration Policy” was introduced. In October 2001 the affiliated “Programme of Migration Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for the years 2001-2010” was approved.

There are also articles relating to migration on the territory of Kazakhstan in other legal documents such as the law “On Occupation of the Population” (adopted in January 2001), the law “On Citizenship”, the Decree of the President of Kazakhstan having the status of law “On the Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Kazakhstan” (June 1995), the programme “On Demographic Development for 2001-2005” (approved by the government in October 2001) and the “Conception of State Demographic Policy” (approved in September 2000).

Additionally, Kazakhstan has entered into bilateral and multilateral treaties in the field of migration. For example the treaty between Kazakhstan and Mongolia “On the Regulation of Questions of Voluntary Migration and Citizenship of Persons Arrived in Kazakhstan by Labour Agreements”; the Agreement between Kazakhstan and Russia “On the Simple Order of Acquainting the Citizenship by Citizens of Kazakhstan Arriving for Permanent Residence in Russia, and Citizens of Russia Arriving for Permanent Residence in Kazakhstan”. Kazakhstan also has signed the multilateral Eurasian Economic Community agreement “On Non-Visa Migration of People in Member Countries”.


Legal documents and agreements state that the main objective of Kazakhstan’s migration policy is to regulate migration processes, provide sustainable demographic development, and to uphold the rights of migrants. According to the Republic of Kazakhstan affiliated ‘Programme of Migration Policy for the years 2001-2010’, the primary tasks of migration policy for 2001-2005 are to lessen the negative migration balance and to promote the return of oralmans; the main tasks for 2005-2010 are the regulation of internal migration, the gradual movement of people from less developed and ecologically unsafe regions into northern and central regions of Kazakhstan, and the regulation of external migration to obtain a positive balance of migration.

The law “On Migration” is generally considered unsatisfactory because it mostly addresses the problems of oralmans but does not provide clear policy on other types of migration, including labour migration. Moreover, the law “On Migration” inadequately addresses issues of labour migrants’ rights and responsibilities.

Another important document - the Decree of the President of Kazakhstan having the status of law “On the Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Kazakhstan” elaborates the rights of foreign citizens in Kazakhstan - such as the right to work, freedom of movement within the territory of Kazakhstan and choice of residence. It does not, however, provide a clearly defined mechanism to guarantee the realization of these rights. The law is vague and stresses the responsibilities of migrants over their rights. For example, Article 28 on the extradition of foreigners allows any body to consider itself an empowered one and would in fact allow the authorities to extradite foreigners without any serious reason. Because the law provides no clear terms or deadlines for arresting labour migrants, an extreme interpretation could in fact render the labour migrant a live article of trade.

Not surprisingly, there have been several amendments to these laws. Still, issues of migration are regulated for the most part not by actual laws, but by various legal acts, orders, resolutions and instructions of the government, ministries and other state bodies. Among them are, for example, the instruction “On the Use of the Rules for Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Kazakhstan”, the “Rules of Arrival, Stay and Departure of Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Kazakhstan”, “Temporary Regulations on the Arrival and Departure from Kazakhstan”, “Regulations on the Passport System in Kazakhstan”, and many others.
An analysis of legal documents on migration in Kazakhstan reveals other problems. In many cases terms and acts that regulate migration are used incorrectly or arbitrarily. It is difficult for individuals to access procedures for the determination of refugee status. Until recently this procedure was implemented only in Almaty. The mechanism for regulating the brain drain process also has not been elaborated.

There are enormous problems with the repatriation of oralmans. Almost half of those who arrived in Kazakhstan in 2002 do not have their own homes.¹⁴ Oralmans are not provided with suitable employment and it is difficult for them to acquire citizenship. The citizenship application procedure takes nine to eighteen months; during this period oralmans may not participate in elections or be elected, become the subject of land and property relations, study abroad or own a house, even if it is given to them by the state. Moreover, as people without citizenship (or with foreign citizenship), oralmans do not have the right to be registered at the labour exchange. Finally, there is no mechanism to provide benefits to oralmans who come to Kazakhstan outside the annual presidential quota.

In 2004, the Agency on Migration and Demography that was established in 1997 became the Committee on Migration within the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection for the Population of Kazakhstan. This step effectively lowered the official status of migration affairs in Kazakhstan, as the former Agency on Migration and Demography had a more privileged and independent status than that of the Committee. At the same time, the institutional connection of the Committee with the Ministry of Labour means that migration problems in Kazakhstan are now seen mainly through the prism of labour relations, and the government considers labour migration as an urgent problem. In this respect this change is explainable - at its current stage of development, Kazakhstan faces problems associated with labour as opposed to other types of migration. However, Kazakhstan is also a zone for transit migration. That Kazakhstan experiences this problem to a lesser extent does not warrant the issue being dropped from the migration agenda entirely.

With Kazakhstan's increasing participation in the world globalization process, the problem of transit migration will gain importance. To accommodate the dynamic challenges of migration in its varied forms, it would be more reasonable and effective for Kazakhstan to maintain a specialized body on migration, which remains autonomous, but has close ties with other governmental structures that also address migration issues.

Given the present loopholes in legislation, incoherence and controversy in governmental structures and the possibilities for bribery, migration regulation in Kazakhstan promises to remain complicated both for migrants and for governmental bodies.

4. Data Analysis

Demographic Characteristics (Age, Gender, Occupation, Ethnic Group)

General Data

A field survey was conducted in five regions of Kazakhstan (Aktau, Almaty, Astana, Semey and Shymkent) and was equally distributed between rural and urban areas, 50.2% and 49.8% respectively. A total of 603 people were questioned. The number of women surveyed slightly exceeded the number of men, 53.6% versus 46.4%. Approximately one-third of all respondents were aged 30-39 years (29.5%); another 26.5% of respondents were 20-29 years of age and 19.6% were aged 40-49 years.

More than one-third of respondents (37.1%) possessed a higher education, while those with secondary and secondary special education comprised 24.4% and 21.4% respectively. The occupations of respondents were represented as follows: school or college teacher - 21.1%, student/PhD student - 13.8%, housekeeper - 8.6%, builder - 6.3%, farmer - 6%, trader - 5.8%, unemployed - 5.3%.

Of the nationalities represented in the questionnaire, Kazakhs made up the largest percentage (27%) followed by Russians (21.7%). Next were Uzbeks (11.9%) and Uighurs (9.3%). Other ethnic groups represented were Tatars (4.3%), Ukrainians (3.6%), Germans (2.7%), Chechens (2.3%) and Tajiks (1.8%).

Regional Distribution of Respondents

For a complete picture of migration in Kazakhstan it is worthwhile to break down the distribution of respondents in the areas surveyed based on nationality, occupation, gender and age. Respondents reflect the general ethnic composition of the country. The south of Kazakhstan has more Uzbeks and Tajiks who either live there permanently or migrate from/to neighboring countries. The western (Aktau) and eastern (Semey) regions of Kazakhstan are home to more ethnic Kazakhs. Northern Kazakhstan’s population (Astana) has more ethnic Russians.

Table 1: Ethnic distribution of respondents by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Shymkent</th>
<th>Astana</th>
<th>Aktau</th>
<th>Almaty</th>
<th>Semey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhs</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chechens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajiks</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uighurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbeks</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for rural-urban distribution, more than half of all respondents in Almaty and Shymkent were from rural areas, while in Astana, Aktau and Semey more than half came from urban areas.

In terms of age distribution, respondents in Shymkent were divided somewhat evenly between the three age groups surveyed (20-29, 30-39 and 40-49 years old), while in other areas respondents tended to be younger (mainly 20-29 and 30-39 years old).

Table 2: Age distribution of respondents by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Shymkent</th>
<th>Astana</th>
<th>Aktau</th>
<th>Almaty</th>
<th>Semey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of respondents by level of educational attainment shows that the majority in Shymkent possesses a secondary education; in Astana, Almaty and Semey the majority possess a higher education. In Aktau the majority of respondents have a higher education though here the numbers of respondents with secondary and secondary special education were more evenly distributed.

Table 3: Distribution of Level of Education of respondents by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Shymkent</th>
<th>Astana</th>
<th>Aktau</th>
<th>Almaty</th>
<th>Semey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary special</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender data indicate that men formed the majority of respondents in Shymkent and Semey. In the other regions women dominated.

**Table 4: Gender distribution of respondents by region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shymkent</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astana</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktau</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almaty</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semey</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data of the tables above we could compose a general average portrait of respondents living in each region:

- In Shymkent it is an Uzbek rural man 40-49 years old with a secondary education.
- In Astana - a Russian urban woman 30-39 years old with a higher education.
- In Aktau - a Kazakh urban woman 20-29 years old with a higher education.
- In Almaty - an Uighur rural woman 30-39 years old with a higher education.
- In Semey - a Kazakh urban man 30-39 years old with a higher education.

Here it is interesting to note that rural Uighur women in the Almaty region possess higher education; traditionally Uighur women, especially in rural areas were usually housekeepers or merchants with only a secondary education. This statistic attests either to the elevation of rural Uighur women in general, or to the fact that educated Uighur women have migrated to Almaty from other places to find more prosperous futures.

The data on Aktau and Astana reveal that these places have a rather young demographic with highly educated populations (urban women); as such they may be promising places for young job-seekers. This thesis is supported by official figures on migration within the country. For example in the year 2000 the only areas in Kazakhstan with positive migration balances were Almaty (+2,346 people), the Mangistau region with its regional center Aktau (+1,917 people) and Astana (+149 people). In contrast, the largest outflow of people in 2000 was seen in Eastern Kazakhstan, where Semey is located (-12,659 people). This was due to the emigration of the Slavic population, and has resulted in the present slight dominance of Kazakhs there.

**Migration Potential**

The migration potential of survey respondents was appraised by several direct and indirect questions. Answers to the question “How many years have you lived in Kazakhstan?” show that the majority of respondents (79.4%) were born in Kazakhstan. 7.9% of those asked had migrated to Kazakhstan 25 or more years ago, 3% have lived here for 10-14 years and 2.3% had been in Kazakhstan fewer than four years. This means that the percentage of migrants (out of all the respondents) that have moved to Kazakhstan since 1990 is relatively small - 5.3%.

At the same time the question: “From what age have you lived in Kazakhstan?” revealed that 27.5% of respondents arrived here between the ages of 30-50, 22.9% have lived here since birth, 17.7% arrived between the ages of 20-29 years old and another 17.9% did not answer. This means that approximately half of the respondents (27.5% + 17.7%) who came to Kazakhstan were of working age (between 20 and 50 years old).

The question: “From what age have you lived abroad?” shows the percentage of migrants who have moved to Kazakhstan. Here the term “abroad” for respondents refers to Kazakhstan. It is not surprising that the majority of respondents (92.5%) did not answer this question (indicating they consider themselves native citizens of the country). Of those who responded, 2.3% indicated that they started living abroad between the ages of 20-29, 1.5% between the ages of 10-19, and 1.3% between the ages of 30-50, giving a total of 5.1%. Comparing this to the percentage of migrants living in Kazakhstan since 1990 (5.3%), one may calculate the age distribution of immigrants living in Kazakhstan since independence.

---

Responses to the question “Do you want to leave Kazakhstan?” indicate that the majority of respondents - 80.4% are not inclined to this decision. Only 17.7% of respondents answered this question affirmatively. The majority of those wanting to leave Kazakhstan want to move to Russia (6.3%) or Germany (5.8%). Many indicated that they wish to migrate because they do not see opportunities for career growth for themselves (8.5%) and their families (7.3%), or that they are not satisfied with the economic situation in the country (6.8%). The figures show that ethnic Russians (Slavs) and Germans predominate among the 17.7% of those wanting to leave Kazakhstan. It means that emigration potential is still rather high among ethnic Slavs, while ethnic Kazakhs are not inclined to change their places of residence.

It is also worthwhile noting that among those who want to leave Kazakhstan, 65.3% would like to live in a different country but do nothing to make this happen. However, 24.5% of those wanting to leave are currently collecting information on how to emigrate, while another 10.2% have already taken a firm decision and are ready to leave the country. These data presume that more than half of those wanting to leave have migration potential but that they are uncertain. If we consider that more respondents indicated career growth over economic need as the motivation for migration, one could conclude that “potential” migrants may be afraid of being shut out of career opportunities in favor of the titular nationality, i.e. Kazakhs. Here we see that the government needs to pursue strategies to entice hesitating migrants to stay in the country, for example by elaborating special programmes, providing equal opportunities, improving the environment, etc.

If we consider this question in terms of gender, nationality and geographic location, we see the following picture. Among urban men, 29% of Russians, 22.6% of Kazakhs, 12.9% of Jews, 9.7% of Belarusians and 9.7% of Germans would like to leave Kazakhstan. At the same time, 35% of Kazakhs, 12% of Russians, 8% of Koreans, 7% of Tajiks, 6% of Uzbeks and 5% of Uighurs prefer to stay in Kazakhstan.

For urban women, 34% of Russians, 26% of Kazakhs, 12% of Germans, 6% of Ukrainians and 6% of Uighurs plan to emigrate from Kazakhstan. Conversely, 48.7% of Kazakhs (nearly half), 23% of Russians, 7.1% of Uighurs and 4.4% of Uzbeks would like to stay in the country.

The comparison between urban men and urban women shows that women are more inclined to migrate. If we take into account the distribution of the data by region (mentioned above), we conclude that urban women from Astana and Aktau have considerable migration potential. Urban men with high migration potential live predominantly in Semey.

The results for rural women reveal an interesting trend. While high numbers of rural ethnic Kazakh women who do not want to leave Kazakhstan (20.7%) were expected, the numbers of Uzbek, Russian and Uighur rural women who expressed a desire to remain in Kazakhstan were nearly as high (20%, 18.6% and 15%, respectively). The absence of big gaps in these figures means that non-titular ethnic groups - Russians, Uzbeks and Uighurs - feel relatively comfortable in their places of residence, in this case the Almaty suburbs. The existence of Uzbek and Uighur populations in this part of a country is not surprising due to its proximity to Uzbekistan. It also means that living standards in this region are satisfactory for these respondents. Almaty is the biggest city in Kazakhstan and historically has offered more opportunities for job seekers.

From these results it can be concluded that migration potential is high among urban men and urban women from the Astana, Aktau and Semey regions, and is relatively low among rural women in the Almaty region. This reflects the general official ethnic dispersion and migration data; for the most part the Slavic and European populations would like to emigrate from Kazakhstan, and they live predominantly in these parts of the country.

Perception of Migration and Migrants’ Rights

The majority of respondents (76.8%) replied negatively to the question “Is emigration to other countries a good thing?” Only 15.4% see emigration as positive, while 1.5% did not know. 6.3% did not answer this question.

These data further confirm that ethnic Kazakhs (who generally do not want to emigrate, and form the substantial percentage of respondents) have relatively poor migration potential. One reason for this is their perception that migrants who live in other countries are unsatisfied. Almost half of the respondents (41.6%) replied that emigration is not worthwhile because migrants abroad obtain low-
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Only 14.6% of respondents believe that emigrants work in professional occupations abroad, while 11.4% do not know at all.

Table 5: “Do you know in what occupations emigrants from your country work abroad?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Low-paid jobs</th>
<th>Professional sphere</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Everywhere</th>
<th>Whatever they can find</th>
<th>Business, trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although half of the respondents (53.7%) think that emigrants are treated satisfactorily abroad, almost one-third (29%) feel that they are not treated so well. This also is an indicator of their rather poor migration potential.

Respondents have various sources of information on the lives of émigrés abroad. The primary source continues to be electronic and printed mass media. 53% of respondents get their information from television and 36.3% from newspapers. Only one-quarter of all respondents believe that the best source of information is friends. This indicates the important role the media plays in forming perceptions of migrants and migration in general among Kazakhstanis.

It may be presumed that those who consider migration to be a negative thing might treat immigrants coming to Kazakhstan poorly. Answers to the question “Is it a good thing for nationalities of other countries to work in Kazakhstan?” help to explain this.

Table 6: “Is it a good thing for nationals of other countries to work in Kazakhstan?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority does not know whether immigrant labour is good or bad; 16.9% of respondents gave a positive answer, while 13.1% gave a negative one. This could mean that those who treat emigration positively would also welcome immigrants to Kazakhstan. At the same time those who see emigration as a negative process nevertheless do not demonstrate a blatant phobia towards immigrants to Kazakhstan. Their uncertainty reflects the general economic and political situation in the country. There are no extreme forms of phobia such as skinheads or other neo-fascist movements in Kazakhstan; for decades people in general have been accustomed to living in a multicultural environment (more than 100 nationalities live in Kazakhstan). Unlike neighboring Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, since independence Kazakhstan has not experienced civil war, or major interethnic conflict, which all contributes to a generally positive attitude towards migrants from other countries.

If the economy deteriorates and migrants start to replace native Kazakhstanis in the workplace, respondents who are now uncertain could form negative perceptions of immigrants. Still, it should be stressed that the experience of life in a multicultural environment within the Soviet Union has not disappeared so quickly. This legacy will continue to influence attitudes towards other nationalities in general, and immigrants in particular.

In the view of 40.6% of respondents, the “pulling” or accepting country should be responsible for migrants’ rights, while 31.3% of respondents feel that this is the domain of international organizations.
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Table 7: “Who should be responsible for defending the rights of migrants and their families?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>12.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sending country</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting country</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that although nearly half of the respondents consider the accepting country as key, it seems they do not fully trust the state and would like international organizations to have/share responsibility in this matter. This attitude may have arisen from various cases of migrants’ rights violations so picturesquely described in the mass media in Kazakhstan and Russia.

This apparent disregard for the state is clearly revealed in the responses to the following question “Why does illegal migration take place?”

Table 8: “Why does illegal migration take place?” (Percentage of those who responded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrupton</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparent borders</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect legislation</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty, unemployment</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, money</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal threat</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy, absence of documents</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact “imperfect legislation” and “bureaucracy” rank even higher than “corruption of state employees” testifies that respondents generally understand the reasons for, and consequences of illegal migration. People conclude that it is quicker and easier to organize the migration process illegally than to spend time and nerves dealing with the bureaucracy and contradictory migration laws. The relatively close ranking of “criminal threat” and “business” (money) among responses also indicates an acknowledgement that illegal migration is a potentially profitable criminal activity.

Interestingly, about half of the respondents have no knowledge of either illegal migration (53.6%) or human trafficking (55.4%). This could mean that they are simply not interested in the migration process, partially supporting the above-mentioned thesis about the poor emigration potential of respondents. Alternatively, it could mean that illegal migration and/or trafficking does not take place in their environment. If we consider that illegal migration usually occurs in the form of labour or transit migration, then it could be the case that respondents who are aware of such migration live predominantly in labour migration areas. In the case of Kazakhstan these are the Almaty and Aktau regions.

Of those who responded to the question “Who is responsible for the fight against human-trafficking?” 56.4% indicated that law-enforcement bodies such as the police, the ministry of internal affairs and security committee were responsible, while 8.1% responded that international organizations were responsible. The responses showed that people generally think migration problems should be tackled domestically and not by civil and international structures. The small number of respondents who cited international organizations could mean that respondents consider migration as a domestic event and that they are only a little concerned about the human rights of trafficking victims (the majority of the population views that the presence of international organizations in the country indicates a certain level of human rights). Responses to this question also indicate that people still believe the strong fist of the state can maintain order in the country.
It could be concluded that respondents see the rights of migrants as a sphere where the state has a certain, but not a crucial role. Answers to the question “Who is responsible for defending migrants’ rights?” were evenly divided between “the state” and “international organizations”; these answers show that people do not fully trust the state, primarily due to imperfect legislation. Respondents see international organizations as the equal guarantor, if not a partner to the state. This indicates that people feel the international involvement of Kazakhstan and multilateral cooperation can improve issues related to migrants’ rights. Conversely, with regard to the fight against human trafficking, respondents did not feel that international organizations have the primary role; this may signal the urgency of the problem on the one hand, and on the other, the perceived importance of law-enforcement bodies.

5. Conclusions

Since gaining independence in 1991 Kazakhstan, like other post-Soviet republics has experienced a negative migration balance. For the last 10 years the negative migration balance has not only absorbed the natural population surplus, but doubled it.

In general the migration situation in the country is characterized by the following tendencies:

1. **Emigration** of most of the Russian-speaking, Slavic and German populations that had come to Kazakhstan as early as the 19th century through to the 1950s. Their main destination countries have been Russia and Germany (70% and 23% respectively). There also is a tendency for highly qualified, well-educated ethnic Kazakhs to leave the country, a process known as “brain drain”. In total more than two million people have left Kazakhstan since independence.

   The sociological survey data support these tendencies. Migration potential is high among urban men and urban women from Astana, Aktau and Semey regions, and is relatively low among rural women in the Almaty region. This corroborates general official ethnic dispersion and migration data - for the most part the Slavic and European populations would like to emigrate from Kazakhstan.

   According to the survey the majority of respondents do not want to leave Kazakhstan (80.4%); those who do prefer Russia (6.3%) and Germany (5.8%) because they see no prospects for their own career growth (8.5%), or for their families (7.3%) and because they are not satisfied with the economic situation in the country (6.8%).

2. **Immigration** to Kazakhstan is due mainly to the return of oralmans (ethnic Kazakhs who left the country in the 1930s and settled in China, Mongolia and Turkey), labour migration from other Central Asian countries (mainly Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan) and to a much smaller extent, refugees. The countries “pushing” migrants to Kazakhstan are mainly Russia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Mongolia.

3. **Upholding the rights of migrants** is crucial for maintaining a civilized migration policy. Respondents in general do not consider migration a positive thing because they think migrants have low-paid, unskilled jobs. According to the survey, respondents believe migrants are not treated well and/or are not satisfied working abroad. The mass media play the biggest role in the forming this perception. At the same time respondents do not appear to exhibit phobia against labour migrants or refugees. This can be explained by the Soviet legacy of Kazakhstan as a republic of open-minded people living in a multicultural environment.

   The survey results show that nearly half of the respondents consider the receiving country as key in observing the rights of migrants; it seems they still do not fully trust the state and would like international organizations to share responsibility in this matter. This attitude could arise from having heard about various cases of the government offending the rights of migrants. Respondents see these violations as stemming from poverty, unemployment, imperfect legislation as well as bureaucracy. It can be concluded that the state is a major actor in observing and maintaining migrants’ rights; while at the same time it is the main offender.
4. The survey results are not surprising. They reflect the controversial status of migration legislation in the country. Kazakhstan was one of the first Central Asian countries to adopt a law “On Migration” in 1997; the country had a rather well presented “Concept of Migration Policy” (2000) and an affiliated “Programme on Migration Policy for the Years 2001-2010” (2001). Unfortunately, however, these documents are vague, do not regulate the migration process well and do not provide clear definitions, mechanisms and guarantees regarding the status, rights and responsibilities of oralmans, labour migrants and refugees.

The salient feature of migration legislation is the abundance of amendments that have been made to these laws and other governmental acts to improve their effectiveness. Unfortunately, however, in their attempts to improve these laws, ministries and other state bodies have made them more difficult for both migrants and government officials to follow.

5. Migration policy is regulated through the Committee on Migration within the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection for the Population of Kazakhstan (the former Agency on Migration and Demography established in 1997 was transformed in 2004 into the Committee). The status of this Committee has been lowered and migration is now seen mainly through the prism of labour relations. Migration regulation in Kazakhstan will continue to be characterized by legislative loopholes, incoherence and controversy in governmental structures.

6. Policy Recommendations

Recommendations are divided into the fields of emigration, oralmans, labour migration, refugee legislation and migration regulation.

1. In the field of emigration the main focus should be given to:
   • Creating a friendly environment for minority nationalities and raising the status of non-titular groups that have considerable migration potential.
   • Establishing better trans-border and regional cooperation between countries, including effective transport, postal, money-transfer and information services. This is especially true for the Kazakhstan-Russia border regions (in northern and eastern Kazakhstan). This process also requires the deepening of integration among countries within the frameworks of already existing bodies such as the Eurasian Economic Community.

2. In the field of oralmans:
   • Improve the social assimilation of oralmans through the organization of professional training or refresher courses, including courses on current legislation in Kazakhstan.
   • Promote the involvement of oralmans into small and medium enterprises, including traditional handicrafts and farming.
   • Elaborate state programmes to provide oralmans with low interest bank loans for building homes and buying plots of land.
   • Create special regional or state programmes to provide free education for oralmans in colleges and universities.

3. In the field of refugees and labour migration:
   • Improve the state system of checking and regulating labour migrants.
   • Provide information services for labour migrants.
   • Establish licensing and quotas for foreign labour migrants.
   • Provide and enforce international cooperation with neighboring countries on labour migration regulation issues.
   • Increase the effectiveness of border and migration controls through transparent regulation (set up unified national and regional electronic databases).
   • Decrease the number of permits required for labour migrants and their employers.
   • Provide rights to refugees on the basis of the UN 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol.
4. In the field of migration legislation and regulation:

- Update legislation with regard to the rights of oralmans, labour migrants and refugees.
- Making the law “On Migration” a direct-action law without numerous sub-law instructions and acts.
- Simplify the procedure for foreigners to obtain citizenship.
- Make the migration process transparent.
- Establish one institutional body for migration (such as a state migration agency) that is responsible before the government and is not subjugated to a ministry.
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Abstract

During the post-Soviet period hundreds of thousands of Uzbekistanis have been involved in uncontrolled migration, both short term labour migration and permanent emigration from the country. Unfortunately it is in this environment that high levels of illegal migration, criminal activity, human rights violations and human trafficking flourish.

In late 2004 the ‘Ijtimoiy Fikr Public Opinion Study Centre’ conducted an opinion survey to measure migration potential among citizens in Uzbekistan, as well as their awareness on issues of migrants’ rights and human trafficking. The study, commissioned by the UNESCO Almaty Cluster Office for Central Asia, included a survey of 600 respondents in six regions of Uzbekistan.

The survey revealed that 28.5% of respondents expressed a desire to leave Uzbekistan. Most of those who expressed a desire to leave (59.8%) hope to do so for a limited time to earn money; the largest percentage of these wish to find work in the construction industry.

As might be expected, half of those who want to leave Uzbekistan permanently want to move to Russia, though a significant number, approximately 10%, wish to go to Korea or Japan. These countries are new destinations for labour migrants from Uzbekistan. Respondents cited economic problems in Uzbekistan as the most common reason for wishing to leave the country. Respondents, especially in rural areas, had strikingly little knowledge of their rights as migrants, laws in destination countries or of instances of human trafficking.

Currently in Uzbekistan there are no official published materials on migration, nor has the country passed a law on migration. The current lack of available data, research and legal foundation present challenges to conducting an analysis of the migration situation in Uzbekistan. This sociological survey is intended to provide some much-needed data in this regard.
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1. Introduction

During the post-Soviet period, Uzbekistan has experienced complex social and economic problems that have left much of the population unemployed or earning salaries that do not allow an adequate quality of life. Hundreds of thousands of Uzbekistanis have been involved in migration, whether short term labour migration or permanent emigration from the country. This uncontrolled migration is taking place in the absence of a comprehensive, scientifically founded state migration policy and is causing Uzbekistan enormous economic, social, cultural and political damage through the loss of labour resources, intellectual power and income. Unfortunately it is in this environment that high levels of illegal migration, criminal activity, human rights violations and human trafficking flourish.

In the near term migration levels are predicted to remain high or even increase, thus serious research on migration issues is timely both for Uzbekistan and the whole Central Asia region. A national migration policy for Uzbekistan, as well as bilateral and multilateral agreements between states in the region, will be possible only with the cooperation of governmental and non-governmental organizations and economic, political and social research on these issues.

Currently in Uzbekistan there are no official published materials on migration. The country has not yet passed a law on migration. The migration of Uzbekistan’s population is controlled only by several articles of the Republic of Uzbekistan law “On Employment of the Population”. The current lack of available data, research and legal foundation present challenges to conducting an analysis of the migration situation in Uzbekistan. This sociological survey is intended to provide some much-needed data in this regard.

Aim of the survey

To get a general picture of migration tendencies throughout the republic. Also, based on the results of the survey, to make recommendations on how to improve state migration policy in Uzbekistan.

Tasks of the survey

To determine:

- The character and level of migration tendencies and intentions of state residents according to cross-sections (urban and rural, male and female).
- Major reasons for migration and purposes of migration and emigration.
- Preferred routes of migration and destination countries.
- Character and proposed intentions (kind of employment, for study, marriage, etc.) of potential migrants.
- Level of legal awareness on issues of internal and international migration.
- Awareness of service agencies for lawful defense and legal support of citizenry - migrants and emigrants.
- Problems aggravating the migration process, estimation of the level of corruption in law-enforcement agencies and governmental departments controlling the process of the migration of citizens.
- Social, political, economic and cultural factors influencing the character of migration tendencies of young people.
- Migration tendencies as an indicator of the social, economic and political situation of the country.

Demographic Information of the Respondents

The survey used combined multi-stage quota sampling. Random probability sampling was applied at the stage of the selection of concrete respondents. The number of survey respondents totaled 600. The survey was carried out place in six administrative territories of Uzbekistan. The number of the respondents was distributed proportionately according to the total population in the regions:
55.2% of respondents interviewed were from rural areas, and 44.8% were from urban areas. Equal numbers of males and females participated in survey.

The age of respondents reflects their percentage of the total population:

**Educational level of respondents**

The survey results have shown that on the whole citizens who participated in the survey have a rather high level of education. There were no illiterate, uneducated persons among the respondents. While the largest group of respondents possessed a secondary education (almost half, or 46.7%), some 16.2% of respondents had obtained a higher education at the time of the survey.

**Occupations of respondents**

Despite the rather high education level of the respondents, about half of the number of interviewed citizens of the country had no regular work during the period of the survey. Among those without regular work, almost half were temporarily unemployed and another 35% were working as housekeepers. Others were either pensioners, students, on maternity leave, or disabled. Respondents who had regular work at the time of the survey were engaged primarily as office workers (20.2%), agricultural workers (16.6%), teachers (12.2%) or other skilled labourers (12.2%). The remaining respondents were spread among various professions.

*Politics is the child of history*  
*History is the child of nature*  

Goethe
The survey results showed that almost all of the respondents have lived in Uzbekistan since birth - 95.0%. This indicator testifies to the predominance in the country's population of so-called "indigenous" residents. In addition, this data highlights one of main problems for a transitional state, the decline in the number of people arriving in the country from other states for permanent residence. The survey revealed a direct correlation between the respondents' age and the number of years they lived in Uzbekistan - the older the interviewed citizen, the greater the chance that they had moved to Uzbekistan from another country. And again, this testifies to the fact that young, active people of reproductive age are not moving to Uzbekistan. Without a doubt, this fact is far from positive and is a peculiar negative estimation of the socioeconomic situation in the country. As few as 20 or 30 years ago, Uzbekistan was the most attractive country for young people in the former Soviet Union. Tens and hundreds of thousands of young people came to Uzbekistan in the 1970s and 1980s. At present, as the survey results showed, such an inflow of young people is not observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Time living in Uzbekistan</th>
<th>(% of respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>since birth</td>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all interviewed citizens, 95.8%, were born in Uzbekistan. The remaining respondents were born in other Central Asian countries, Russia and Ukraine. Natives from Central Asia, most probably, are linked with their ethnic motherland by kinship relations, i.e. they got married and moved to their husbands, or after marriage stayed with their wives. In addition, a large number of citizens moved from Tajikistan to Uzbekistan for permanent residence during the civil war period 1992-1996. These refugees from the Tajikistan civil war moved primarily to relatives residing in Uzbekistan.

The parents of 92.5% of people who participated in the interviews also were born in Uzbekistan. As few as 7.5% of respondents had ancestors born in other countries. Tashkent, the Uzbekistan capital, showed the largest number of respondents whose parents were not born in Uzbekistan; every third interviewed resident of Tashkent said that his/her parents were not born in Uzbekistan.

91% of interviewed citizens indicated that all their ancestors - both parents and grandparents - were born in Uzbekistan.

Figure 2.1: Which of your ancestors were born in Uzbekistan?
The survey results showed that the overwhelming majority of citizens, from those interviewed - 76.8% have ancestors living in Uzbekistan at present. Only 1.7% of the interviewed citizens have ancestors who have left Uzbekistan and are living in other countries.

Figure 2.2: Do your ancestors live in Uzbekistan at present?

The largest number of respondents whose ancestors have departed Uzbekistan was among those interviewed from the capital city, Tashkent, - 5.6%. Correspondingly, Tashkent also showed the largest number of respondents whose ancestors do not live and have never lived in Uzbekistan.

The survey results showed that all the ancestors of more than half of all those interviewed are still living and reside in Uzbekistan at present.

Figure 2.3: Among your ancestors, who is alive and lives in Uzbekistan at present?

Half of the very few citizens interviewed who said that their grandparents had left Uzbekistan said they had left 8-9 years ago; the other half of these respondents said that their parents had left Uzbekistan more than 10 years ago.

The survey revealed that the major migration destination for parents was Russia. In fact, 100% of respondents whose fathers left Uzbekistan said that they now live in Russia. The absolute majority of interviewed citizens whose mothers left country, 85.7%, said that at present they also live in Russia, and 14.3% - in Kazakhstan.

As for grandparents, according to the survey results, they left for more distant countries - Greece and the USA. Almost all those who participated in the survey (98.5%) have close relatives who reside in Uzbekistan at present. Here again, Tashkent was the region with the largest number of respondents (7.4%) who reported having no relatives living in Uzbekistan at present.

The survey has revealed that of close relatives, the larger numbers of respondents have cousins, aunts and sisters living at present in Uzbekistan. It is revealing that, of close relatives residing in Uzbekistan husbands and brothers were less frequently indicated.
Table 2.2: Among your close relatives, who is living in Uzbekistan at present?
(% of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No such relatives</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin (male)</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin (female)</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Children and Migration

The family in Uzbekistan is one of the main social institutions for citizens of the country. In Uzbekistan, relationships between man and woman are identified as family relations only in the event that they have children. That is why every married couple tends to have children. For the majority of citizens children are the highest value in life.

The survey results showed that about three-quarters of interviewed citizens, or 74.2%, have children. This is a rather high indicator, taking into account that those with no children of their own at present are either not married or were never married. For example, 98% of respondents aged 18-19 reported having no children of their own.

In the capital, respondents without children made up 29.6% of interviewed citizens. Most probably this relates to the fact that in Tashkent people marry and have children later in life than in other regions of the country.

Young people of reproductive age do not tend to have as many children as in the recent past; as was confirmed by the results of the survey. The largest percentages of respondents with children have two or three children. Only 2.5% of respondents have six children and as few as 3.4% of respondents have seven and more children.

The number of children depends upon a family’s place of residence, social conditions and way of life. The survey results again confirmed this situation. Thus, the largest number of respondents having only one or two children was registered among residents of the capital. In all other regions the dominating number is three children. The largest number of respondents having four and more children was found out in Kashkadarya viloyat (province). Kashkadarya viloyat is characterized by comparatively low living standards and a larger rural population than in other areas of the country. The overwhelming majority of those interviewed (89%) have children living in Uzbekistan. One in ten responded that not all children live in the country at present. Only 0.9% of those interviewed have no children presently residing in Uzbekistan.

As expected, Tashkent showed the largest number of respondents with children currently living in other countries, while the highest numbers of respondents with all their children living in Uzbekistan were found in the Ferghana viloyat and in the Republic of Karakalpakstan (almost 97% in each region).

In ethnic terms, the largest numbers of respondents whose children left Uzbekistan was registered among interviewed ethnic Slavs, Russians, Belarussians and Ukrainians. Every third respondent from these ethnic groups has some or all of their children living in other countries at present.
Table 3.1: Do your children live in Uzbekistan? (% of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes, all of them live in Uzbekistan</th>
<th>No, not all of them live in Uzbekistan</th>
<th>No, my children don’t live in Uzbekistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekks</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajiks</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhs</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavs (Russians, Ukrainians, Belarussians)</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakalpaks</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results showed a rather high level of departure of children of respondents aged 50 to 60 years. More than one in three of the participants at this age - 34% - stated that not all children live in Uzbekistan at present. 4% of respondents have all their children currently living in other countries.

Of those interviewed aged 40 - 49 years, an impressive number - 22.2% - said that some of their children during the time of the survey lived in another country. The most common reason (44.9%) respondents gave for why their children left the country is that it is very difficult to obtain well-paid jobs in Uzbekistan.

Of the number of respondents who stated that their children had left the country, 83.7% have some, but not all children who have left the country, while 14.3% of respondents have all of their children living in other countries. On the whole, this is rather a large number of parents who have been deserted by their children. 2% of respondents have children who had never lived in Uzbekistan.

Children of almost half of the respondents (45.8%) left Uzbekistan in the year of the survey (2004). This year appears to be the peak of emigration from the country. In previous years a significantly smaller number of respondents' children left the country. Only 2.1% of respondents have children who had left Uzbekistan before 1991.

Figure 3.1: In which year did your children leave Uzbekistan?

Two-thirds of respondents indicated that their children migrated to Russia and live there at present. Other destination countries include: Kazakhstan, 12.5%; USA and Canada, 10.4%; Western European countries, 6.3% and another 6.3% have children who left for Ukraine and Belarus.
Children of survey participants left Uzbekistan for three primary goals. Children of more than half of all respondents - 58.4% - left for other countries to earn money for a limited period of time. A rather large number interviewed - 33.3% - answered that their children had left Uzbekistan permanently. Children of only 8.3% of respondents went to other countries for educational reasons.

Figure 3.2: Did your children (child) migrate from Uzbekistan to another country for permanent residence, to work for a limited time, or to obtain an education and return?

Regarding the reason for the choice of destination country, the most frequent response (29.8% of respondents) was the ease of obtaining a well-paid job. Other frequent responses included that their children migrated to where their close friends (19.2%) or relatives (12.8%) were living. It is noteworthy that only 2.1% of respondents chose to migrate because they were non-indigenous nationalities who wanted to return to their ethnic motherland.

The majority of respondents’ children who are living in other countries are engaged in manual rather than intellectual labour. 34% of respondents said that their children do construction work in the destination country. Children of 14.9% of survey participants are engaged in low-skilled labour. Only 6.4% of respondents’ children who live abroad are engaged in business and entrepreneurship, and an even smaller number of respondents - 2.1% - have children who work abroad as teachers. On the whole, these data show that citizens of Uzbekistan are employed in other countries only as cheap manual labour, which does little to enhance the prestige of the country abroad.

4. Migration Tendencies of Respondents

A realistic picture of migration potential in Uzbekistan can be revealed from studying the attitude of respondents to the issue of emigration from the country. The survey revealed a significant level of migration potential among citizens in the country on the whole. More than one-quarter of those interviewed - 28.5% - responded that they had a desire to leave Uzbekistan. 7.7% of respondents refused to discuss this subject and 3.9% of respondents found it difficult to respond to the question. More than half of those interviewed - 60% said firmly that for now they have no desire to leave Uzbekistan.

Figure 4.1: Do you have a desire to leave Uzbekistan?
Of those with a desire to leave the country, 59.8% want to go to another country for a limited time to earn money. One-third of this number - 33.2% - want to leave Uzbekistan permanently. 4.9% of respondents want to leave for another country to get an education, and 1.6% has not yet decided for what period they would like to leave.

**Emigration routes of Uzbekistan's citizens for permanent residence**

The survey results show that at present Russia is the main destination of migration from Uzbekistan. About half of the respondents who wish to leave the country permanently want to live in Russia. 20.6% want to leave for permanent residence in the USA and Canada. While the desire of citizens to depart permanently for Russia, the USA and European countries could be regarded as anticipated, the survey also revealed an unexpectedly large number of people willing to leave for South Korea and Japan. The Far East is a new vector of migration from Uzbekistan that has appeared only in the last five or ten years. The fact that now one in ten potential emigrants has a wish to leave for permanent residence in these countries can be regarded as a large and serious change in the migration intentions of the country’s population.

**Reasons for emigration**

The main motivation for the majority of survey participants is discontent with the economic situation in the country. 58.1% of respondents want to leave because they disliked the economic situation in Uzbekistan, while 40.8% of respondents wish to migrate for family circumstances. Every third respondent (or 33.7%) felt that they would be able to ensure better futures for their children in other countries.

The survey results show that the principal reasons motivating citizens to want to leave Uzbekistan are material and socio-economical rather than legal and political. Only 4.3% of potential migrants explained their intention to leave Uzbekistan as a wish to return to their ethnic motherland, and 3.3% of respondents chose countries because in their opinion, human rights were more protected and guaranteed there.

Only 6.5% of respondents cited the failure to know the state language of Uzbekistan as the reason for permanently leaving the country. An even smaller number (3.3%) of respondents explained that they wanted to leave Uzbekistan because they are worried about manifestations of religious extremism in the country (the latest actions of which took place in March 2004).

**Level of Expectations**

The survey results have shown that participants wishing to leave Uzbekistan for another country have a rather low level of expectations regarding their prospects in the destination countries. Despite the fact that 21.0% of respondents have higher, or incomplete higher education, and 27.9% of respondents have special or vocational training, the majority of respondents want and plan to work in positions that do not require the above-mentioned level of education. 22.8% of respondents want to work in construction and 16.9% of respondents plan to work as unskilled labourers. Only 1.1% of respondents plan to work as teachers, in medicine, the arts, or as computer-programmers.
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Figure 4.2: In what capacity, in which sphere of activity do you wish and plan to work in another country?

The activities citizens undertake to realize their intentions to emigrate

Despite their intentions to emigrate from Uzbekistan permanently, far from everyone who intended to emigrate has taken concrete steps to realize their intentions. Thus, more than half of respondents - 58.1% of those who firmly intend to leave the country have done nothing to realize their plans. Some 41.9% of respondents at the time of the survey have undertaken some necessary steps for leaving the country.

The majority of respondents who intend to leave Uzbekistan permanently limited their actions to correspondence with family members residing abroad. 33.8% of respondents who plan to emigrate are saving money for their intended move. And every fourth respondent is in communication with potential employers abroad. 14.5% of respondents have taken steps to learn about the country to which they plan to migrate permanently. 7.8% of respondents have already made an attempt to leave the country by participating in a green card lottery. Only 3.9% of respondents in the period of survey have attended special training courses to learn a profession, and a smaller number - 1.9% - appealed to the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection for consultation.

Interaction between potential emigrants, governmental and non-governmental immigration agencies

The majority of those who intend to leave Uzbekistan permanently do so without any help from official agencies, including governmental bodies to settle their problems with departure. This testifies to the low level of appeal these organizations have for potential migrants. 87% of potential emigrants said that they appealed to no organizations for information and only 13% of respondents visited appropriate agencies and structures.

Of those who approached organizations for information or help with leaving Uzbekistan, 34.8% appealed to the embassy of the destination country, while 21.7% had contacts with private agencies rendering assistance to emigrants. The same number appealed to the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection. 4.4% of potential emigrants appealed to the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Communities, and 17.4% of respondents refused to name the organization to which they appealed.
One reason for the low level of respondent contact with organizations, including governmental agencies is that their capabilities are limited. This was confirmed by the survey results, as more than half of the respondents who appealed to some organization (60.9%) said that they received no concrete help from any organization at all. Only 39.1% of respondents were satisfied with their contacts with the organizations.

**Level of legal awareness among potential emigrants and labour migrants**

Very likely, the most vulnerable aspect for potential emigrants is their level of legal literacy. As a rule people consult the code of Laws only in the event they face urgent necessity. Legal illiteracy is one of the main reasons for the mass infringement and violation of human rights that has been seen among migrants, particularly in the last three to four years.

The results of the survey show how urgent the problem of legal illiteracy is at present. About half (46.7%) of respondents willing to leave Uzbekistan permanently or for work said they are completely unaware of their rights to emigrate, change their country of residence, temporarily leave the country, or the rights of labour migrants. Only 8.7% of potential emigrants said that they know their rights sufficiently well.

![Figure 4.3: How well do you know your rights as a migrant?](image)

Even more telling is that an overwhelming 83.7% of respondents who are willing to leave Uzbekistan confirmed their complete unawareness of any international legal documents that regulate migration. Only 16.3% of respondents confirmed that they are aware of these legal documents.

The awareness level among respondents of Republic-level legislation regarding labour migration is somewhat higher. 38.7% said that they knew nothing of the labour migrant’s rights as outlined in the Laws and other normative legal documents of the Republic of Uzbekistan; however, more that half of potential labour migrants know something of their rights. Of these, 27.7% said that they had a general outline of the rights of labour migrants. 26% of respondents heard just something about them. Only 7.6% of those willing to migrate to other countries to earn money estimated their level of awareness of labour migrants as sufficient. Survey results show that the highest level of awareness is in the capital, Tashkent, and the lowest level of awareness of Republic Laws regarding the rights of labour migrants is in the Kashkadarya and Ferghana viloyats (provinces).

In addition, about half of potential labour migrants (45.4%) were completely unaware of the laws of the destination country, particularly those laws guaranteeing and protecting their rights. Only 7.6% of interviewed potential labour migrants answered that they knew the laws of the destination country sufficiently well. As in the previous question, the highest level of awareness of the laws in the destination country was found among potential labour migrants in Tashkent, while the lowest level was found in the Kashkadarya and Ferghana viloyats.

Unfortunately, infringements of labour migrants’ rights are the rule rather than the exception. In accordance with this peril is the level of awareness among interviewed potential migrants as to where and to whom they should appeal in other countries in case of a violation of their rights. Only a little more than half of respondents, 53.8%, answered that they knew. 46.2% confirmed that they would be completely feeble if faced with such a situation.
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The lowest level of knowledge regarding violations of rights was found among residents of the Ferghana (34.8%) and Bukhara (42.1%) viloyats and the highest was in Tashkent (85%).

Males were sufficiently more aware than females regarding where and to whom to appeal in the case of an infringement or violation of their rights.

As might be expected, the majority (67.2%) of those who knew where and to whom to appeal in another country in case of infringement of migrants’ rights would appeal to the Embassy or Consulate of Uzbekistan in the destination country. It should be noted that respondents would not appeal to a rights’ protection organization or law-enforcement agencies in the host country, but to the official representative of Uzbekistan. Just over a quarter of those interviewed, 26.6% would have talks with their employers in case of an infringement of their rights. Only 7.8% of respondents would appeal for help to the international organization on human rights in the host country, and a lesser number, 4.7% - to non-governmental organizations that protect human rights in the host country. 6.3% of respondents in this case will seek help from close friends and acquaintances.

The survey results reflect a low level of readiness to use official channels to facilitate labour migration from Uzbekistan. The larger part of respondents (26%) plan to leave Uzbekistan using the services of private individuals dealing with job placement abroad. Only 14.6% of interviewed potential labour migrants intend to emigrate using the services of a foreign labour migration agency. 13.0% of respondents said that they would use illegal methods and illegal channels to leave the country. 2.4% of respondents did not see fit to render us this information.

The highest number (72.2%) of respondents who said that a close relative had left the country was in Tashkent, while the smallest number is among those interviewed from the Republic of Karakalpakstan. This does not lead to a direct conclusion that the lowest level of migration is found in this Republic. Most likely, migration in Karakalpakstan is carried out not individually, but by entire families. Also, people from the Republic of Karakalpakstan migrate primarily towards the central and industrial regions of the country, nearer to the capital city of Tashkent.

5. Migration of Close Relatives

It is very likely that the majority of families in Uzbekistan have close relatives who have left the country for some reason and the results of the survey support this claim. 51.5% of respondents said that they had a family member or a close relative who, at the time of the survey, is in another country. 45.7% of respondents said that they had no such relatives. 2.8% refused to answer this question.

The survey results reflect a low level of readiness to use official channels to facilitate labour migration from Uzbekistan. The larger part of respondents (26%) plan to leave Uzbekistan using the services of private individuals dealing with job placement abroad. Only 14.6% of interviewed potential labour migrants intend to emigrate using the services of a foreign labour migration agency. 13.0% of respondents said that they would use illegal methods and illegal channels to leave the country. 2.4% of respondents did not see fit to render us this information.

The highest number (72.2%) of respondents who said that a close relative had left the country was in Tashkent, while the smallest number is among those interviewed from the Republic of Karakalpakstan. This does not lead to a direct conclusion that the lowest level of migration is found in this Republic. Most likely, migration in Karakalpakstan is carried out not individually, but by entire families. Also, people from the Republic of Karakalpakstan migrate primarily towards the central and industrial regions of the country, nearer to the capital city of Tashkent.
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Table 5.1: Have any of your family members or close relatives left for or live in another country at present? (% of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bukhara viloyat</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashkadarya viloyat</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarkand viloyat</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergana viloyat</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Karakalpakistan</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tashkent</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of interviewed citizens (70.6%) have family members or relatives who have left Uzbekistan for a limited time as labour migrants. In addition, the survey results show that almost one-quarter of respondents have close relatives who have left permanently for another country.

The survey results have shown that the majority of respondents either have family members or close relatives who have left Uzbekistan. One in ten families (11% of respondents), had a son who left the country. In a traditional Uzbek family the son lives with his parents; at the same time he is a husband and father. This, accordingly, increases the total number of active-aged males who have left Uzbekistan and work in other countries at present. 3.9% of respondents said their daughters had left the country; this indicator could be regarded rather high for Uzbekistan considering the strong influence of the traditional way of life in the country. It is noteworthy that 7.1% of respondents stated that some of their parents, most likely their fathers, have left the country.

As stated earlier, the Russian Federation is the most popular destination for family members. More than three-quarters (77.7%) of respondents said that their family members or close relatives had migrated to Russia. Kazakhstan was the second most common answer, though with a far smaller number (6.8%); another 6.1% had left for South Korea. Close relatives of 2.9% of respondents live and work in the USA, while relatives of 2.3% of respondents live and work in West European countries.

The principal motivation for choosing the country to migrate to, for the majority of emigrants, was the opportunity to most quickly resolve their material and financial problems. Thus, 22.7% of respondents said that their close relatives had gone to places where there was a high salary.

As with respondents who intend to migrate, survey results show that the major reasons for emigration for Uzbekistan citizens are difficulties in obtaining a high paying job. Almost half of the survey participants (49.5%) named this as the principal reason for their close relative leaving Uzbekistan, while 23.6% said that the relative had left the country because of the poor living conditions in Uzbekistan.

For an overwhelming majority of emigrants, migration is associated with settling material problems and improving living standards. Thus, relatives of 48.9% of respondents left Uzbekistan to earn money to
solve their social and life problems, to improve their living conditions, medical treatment, to marry, etc.

The survey results have shown that most family members and close relatives left the country work to work in manual labour, non-qualified and low-paid jobs. 35.6% of respondents said that close relatives, who emigrated from Uzbekistan, work in construction, though they did not specify in what capacity. Relatives of 14.6% of interviewed citizens work doing odd jobs and 12.0% in commerce, but again they do not say in what capacity. Close relatives of only 2.6% of respondents work in an intellectual sphere.

6. Respondents on Uzbekistan

One's country of birth is of great significance for every person on the planet. A people's proverb says, "One does not choose his Motherland and parents". The Motherland fills man's life with sense and content. Here the key matter is not just the individual's attitude to his birthplace but also the attitude of the country to its citizenry. Despite the fact that 95.8% of survey participants were born in Uzbekistan, only 86.3% of respondents regard it their "Motherland". For 12.7% of respondents Uzbekistan is simply their country of residence. One-half of one percent of respondents found it difficult to say something on this theme, and the same number of respondents did not answer.

![Figure 6.1: What is Uzbekistan for you?](image)

The largest number of respondents for whom Uzbekistan is merely a country of residence (32.4%) was found in the country's capital, Tashkent. The Ferghana region registered the largest number of survey participants for whom Uzbekistan is considered the Motherland (94.5%).

While the overwhelming majority of survey participants (85.5%) regard Uzbekistan as their Motherland, only a little more than half of the interviewed citizens (53.8%) confirmed that they feel proud of being citizens of Uzbekistan. Every third respondent feels satisfied with being a citizen of Uzbekistan. Finally, 7.2% of those interviewed said that they are indifferent to their Uzbekistani citizenship, while 3.5% of respondents are dissatisfied with their citizenship. 2.2% of respondents found it difficult to respond to the question.
7. Illegal Migration and Trafficking

Unfortunately Uzbekistan faces immense economic and social challenges from the problem of illegal migration. Currently most migrants leave the country illegally, either by invitation of private companies with shady reputations or by word of mouth from friends. These factors lead to illegal labour migration, human trafficking, a rise in criminal activity and slavery of our country’s citizens.

Illegal migration results in immeasurable social and economic damage to the country; it will be almost impossible for Uzbekistan to compensate for this loss of income within the next few years. Most migrants, especially labour migrants, know nothing about the laws of either Uzbekistan or their destination country; moreover, they are unaware of international legal acts that protect migrants’ rights and interests. Ignorant migrants are at the mercy of exploitative employers and corrupt law-enforcement officials in sending and receiving countries who extort money from them.

Migrants from Uzbekistan move primarily to Russia and Kazakhstan. It is in these countries that migrants fall victim to human trafficking. Uzbekistani citizens also migrate to the UAE, Israel, Thailand and South Korea.

A new kind of organized crime has accompanied the current wave of migration in Uzbekistan - the trafficking of people. Trafficking is the arranging and transport of people from one country to another, with the purpose of their further exploitation in the capacity of unpaid labour force. A separate and most profitable line of trafficking is the selling of girls and women into slavery where they are subjected, mainly, to sexual exploitation.

The complete illiteracy and rather low awareness of this new kind of violent activity in Uzbekistan makes the country fertile ground for trafficking. This is confirmed by the survey results, as 91.8% of respondents said that they were not familiar with the word and concept of “trafficking”. Only 8.2% of respondents have information about this criminal phenomenon.

The largest number of those aware of trafficking (37%) was registered in Tashkent; however, in other regions of the country, the picture is more than sad. None of survey participants in the Samarkand and Ferghana viloyats were aware of the “trafficking” phenomenon. In other viloyats where the survey was conducted, the number of those aware of this kind of criminal activity and its threat to people is a little higher than zero.

The low level of awareness of trafficking among young people of the country also provokes a certain anxiety. Only 3.9% of respondents aged 18 - 19 years old and 6.7% of respondents 20 - 29 years old said that the word and phenomenon of “trafficking” is familiar to them. This level of awareness is two to three times lower than that of the older generation.

Despite the fact that the majority of interviewed citizens are unaware of the word “trafficking,” 70% of respondents know of actual cases of selling citizens of our country into slavery or employment without pay, including sexual exploitation. The largest number of respondents with information on cases of selling Uzbekistani into slavery was registered among those interviewed in the Ferghana viloyat. 89% of respondents in this region said that they knew of concrete facts of people being sold. This statistic provides indirect information on the extent to which trafficking takes place in the Ferghana Valley region.

The majority of respondents cited social and economic problems and a low economic standard of living as the main reasons for trafficking in Uzbekistan. Thus, 39% of interviewed citizens cite financial difficulties and poverty as the major cause of slave labour, including sexual exploitation in Uzbekistan.
According to 42.8% of respondents, trafficking victims are themselves to blame for being trapped into slavery and subjected to exploitation, including that of a sexual nature. 22.7% of respondents blame government bodies for trafficking due to their pursuit of efficient economic policy in our country. 16.3% of interviewed citizens regard organized crime rings as the instigators of trafficking, and 11.2% lay the blame for trafficking with state law-enforcement agencies, whom they feel are responsible for the protection of human rights in the country. 4.7% of those interviewed felt that the corruption among officials of law-enforcement bodies is to blame for trafficking.

With large-scale trafficking of Uzbekistan’s citizens to other countries on the increase, the most urgent problem has become combating this evil. A well-organized and regulated mechanism to prevent trafficking must be developed in Uzbekistan. The majority of survey participants, 35.8%, think that the state authorities must bear the main responsibility for the prevention of trafficking and selling of Uzbekistani citizens into slavery. 30% of respondents lay all responsibility for combating this evil on the citizens of the country alone. In the view of 17.8% of respondents, the state authorities in the destination countries for trafficking should bear the major responsibility for combating this crime. Finally, 13.5% of respondents believe that law-enforcement agencies in Uzbekistan should take primary responsibility for prevention of trafficking in people.

8. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

Our research indicates that Uzbekistan will continue to face the following migration challenges:

1. Survey results indicate that we can expect migration levels to grow to 15-30% of Uzbekistan’s population.

2. The majority of migrants leaving Uzbekistan is expected to be young people up to the age of 35; this is the most socially active, able-bodied and productive segment of the population. Migrants leaving Uzbekistan have rather high educational levels and qualifications, contributing to a “brain drain”.
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3. The survey shows that rural areas are experiencing out-migration at a higher rate than urban ones. This tendency will continue to grow over the next few years.

4. The departure of rural citizens from areas with excess labour resources reduces unemployment in these regions; however, the spontaneous nature of this migration results in a number of new problems for rural areas, including a gender imbalance as fathers and single men of reproductive age leave.

We would like to make the following policy recommendations based on our research and analysis of the survey data:

1. To elaborate and accept the regulations as outlined in “Basic directions of Uzbekistan emigration and immigration policy” by the Oliy Majilis of Uzbekistan.

2. To elaborate and adopt the law “On emigration and immigration”.

3. To elaborate and adopt the law “On securing and protecting Uzbekistani citizens who work in other countries”.

4. To hold, within the next year, a meeting of high level Uzbekistani government representatives with their counterparts from countries that receive labour migrants to draw up bilateral and multilateral treaties for migration process control and the protection of migrants’ rights.

5. Uzbekistan must initiate bilateral treaties with its primary migrant destination countries. These international treaties must (i) provide protection for Uzbekistan citizens who are labour migrants, and (ii) Defend Uzbekistan’s labour and intellectual resources with regard to migration issues.

We would like to make the following recommendations as to the future role of UNESCO on migration policy in the region based on our research and analysis of the survey data:

1. Assist with the expansion of research on migration and its social, economic and cultural consequences.

2. Publish and migration research and distribute it to state and government departments, law-enforcement agencies, NGOs, etc.

3. Assist in creating permanent dialogue between academics and specialists from Central Asian states who conduct migration research (for example, a UNESCO workshop on migration issues).

4. Prepare and issue a brochure on labour migrants’ rights and laws pertaining to migration, in the relevant Central Asian languages.

5. Collaborate with law-enforcement agencies in Central Asian countries to examine current laws and international legal documents that address migrants’ rights.
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION IN KYRGYZSTAN

An Analytical Report

By Natalya Hajimuratova

Abstract

The surge in out-migration from post-independence Kyrgyzstan has been attributable mainly to economic drawbacks such as low living standards and unemployment; however, sociopolitical factors are playing an increasingly important role. Ethnic minorities, most notably Slavs, generally perceive themselves as disadvantaged in terms of social status and opportunities for career development, while concerns about the country's political situation are shared by all population groups. One of the most prominent current trends is a rise in migratory intentions among indigenous Kyrgyz. Growing labour emigration also is a major challenge for the government, which thus far has had a quite modest record in this regard.
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2. Introduction and Background

Global changes have always been accompanied by a growth in migration. The internationalization of economies and the irregular development of countries have led to enormous population flows, making migration (particularly labour migration) a world phenomenon. According to the UN and MOL, at the end of Second Millennium there were 120-200 million legal migrants around the world (in 1965, this figure was 75 million). Differences in living standards and economic potential between countries are the major impetus for such migration.

Migration policies in most destination countries are insufficient to regulate huge migratory flows, resulting in widespread illegal migration. In addition, migration problems have become major human rights issues, impacting not only theories of migration research, but also migration policies. For example, a specific group of labour migrant women (and recently, young men as well) are employed in sex services; the CIS countries currently serve as a considerable source for this kind of labour migrant.

Unfortunately, migration is, more and more, becoming a tool of international politics. For example, in some countries right-wing movements often use migration issues to play on the fears and prejudices of the electorate. No doubt, the Third Millennium will bring a new stage in the history of human movement requiring the continued cooperation of humanity.

After gaining independence, Kyrgyzstan became a supplier of unskilled migrant labour to the global market. A negative balance of migration, uncontrolled migration flows and the inability of the Kyrgyz authorities to solve these problems are not simply internal problems within Kyrgyzstan itself, but issues for international community as well.

Research on migration problems gained interest at the beginning of the 1990s when Kyrgyzstan faced its first flows of refugees, and also saw a growth in the emigration rates of the non-native population. In Kyrgyzstan, migration research programmes have been, and are currently, financed by international organizations such as OSCE, IOM, UN and UNESCO. Studies have also been carried out under various projects of the World Bank and Asian Development Bank. One of the first studies of Russian emigration from Kyrgyzstan was performed by the V. Pototsky Research Center with the support of IOM.

The Bishkek Regional Centre for Migrants and Refugees headed by Mr. T. Kadyrov is a leader in its field; its main activities include the study of migration laws and trends. The centre has participated in the development of laws and other legal documents concerning migration in Kyrgyzstan. The Research Laboratory at the Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University (headed by Professor G. Kumskov) studies demographic and economic factors influencing migration in Kyrgyzstan.

Recently research on labour migration has attracted more attention. There have been studies conducted on topics such as the mechanisms of interstate cooperation through examples of certain oblasts (provinces) of Russia with the support of OSCE, and guarantees and protection of migrant rights in Russia and Kazakhstan (Eurasia Foundation). IOM in Kyrgyzstan has made the battle against human trafficking its priority, investigating major trends in human trafficking, providing support to victims and working to eliminate this type of migration.

For the purpose of this report, we used materials from international conferences, the available publications of research findings and data from the National Statistics Committee.

The major goal of this research was:

To present recommendations for effective migration management and the resolution of migration problems in Kyrgyzstan. Recommendations will be based on a study of migration trends over the period of Kyrgyzstan’s independence, an analysis of public intentions regarding migration and the existing legal framework for migration in the country.

To this end, the basic objectives of this study were:

- A study and summary of existing migration research.
- An analysis of the Republic’s migration policy since independence.
- Exploration of motives for migration.
- A study of the ethnic features of migratory behavior.
- An analysis of migrants’ human rights and the policies designed to secure these rights.
3. Migration trends and issues

3.1 General Migration Picture

During different periods in its history, migratory flows in Kyrgyzstan have been characterized by varying and sometimes contradictory patterns.

From the late 1950s immigration had been an important source of population growth in Kyrgyzstan. During the period 1959-1970, natural resource development in Kyrgyzstan rapidly increased and skilled labour flowed to the republic from all parts of the former Soviet Union. According to the 1970 census, migration into Kyrgyzstan was second only to Kazakhstan among Soviet republics during this period. After 1970, Kyrgyzstan started to lose its population as migratory flows slowed. The migration balance acquired a stable negative value as a result of a shift in Soviet policy with regard to resource deployment and workforce distribution. In subsequent years migratory losses in Kyrgyzstan steadily increased. Post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan’s transition to a market economy, and the implementation of radical socioeconomic and political reforms have resulted in a decrease in living standards, a deterioration in interethnic relations and a marginalization of a portion of the population. All these phenomena have had a direct impact on migration in the country.

Sudden increases in migration flows show a clear correlation with significant political events in the country and are exacerbated by economic complications. The mass outflow of Kyrgyzstan’s Russian-speaking population was linked to the outbreak of ethnic violence in the Osh oblast (province) in 1990, involving mostly the Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks; this led to a state of emergency being declared in the capital, Bishkek. Pro-migration sentiment strengthened again in 1993, bringing a new surge in out-migration of the Russian-speaking population when the “Law on the Official Language in the Kyrgyz Republic” was adopted. The next wave was spurred by the invasion of armed guerilla bands and religious extremists into Kyrgyzstan near the Batken oblast. Taking advantage of this situation, a number of Kyrgyz citizens illegally entered some European countries (Belgium, Denmark and Norway) to obtain refugee status. These events all took place against the backdrop of deteriorating living standards, increasing unemployment and growing social differentiation.

The total volume of cross-border migratory movements over the period 1990-1999 reached 803,600 persons, or one in every six citizens. Of these, 590,600 people had left Kyrgyzstan, while 213,000 had entered the country. The net outflow was 377,600, or one out of every eight citizens. During the last four years, migratory outflow totaled 93,700 persons.

It should be noted, however, that official statistics cannot be viewed as complete, as they reflect only migrants officially registered with the government; over the last three to four years labour migration’s share of total emigration has increased, and many people leave the country illegally (especially those who move to Russia and Kazakhstan) without getting registered. In the absence of other reliable sources of migration data, the picture is far from clear. This issue will be discussed in more detail below.

Within the CIS, most migratory movements have been to Russia and Kazakhstan; among the “far-abroad” countries, migration has taken place mostly to Germany, the USA and Israel; on the whole, these accounted for two-thirds of all international migratory flows involving Kyrgyzstan.

Statistical data on migration into Kyrgyzstan shows that the number of immigrants is constantly decreasing. The recorded small migratory surplus was mainly due to arrivals from Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Armenia and Turkmenistan.

The recorded growth in Kyrgyzstan’s population during the period considered was largely attributed to a natural growth of the country’s rural population.

Major trends and issues in the development of migratory processes

The major migration trends in Kyrgyzstan are as follows:

1. A negative migration balance is registered in all of the country’s regions, but has strong regional differences by volumes of departures. In Kyrgyzstan about 65% of emigrants are urban and 35% are rural, despite the fact that only one-third of the country’s population is urban.
This is mostly because Russian-speaking (Slavic) people predominate among emigrants and they live mostly in cities and towns. For example about 80% of all migratory outflow takes place in Bishkek city and Chu oblast (province) (Table 2.4). The primary destinations for Kyrgyz migrants remain Russia (78%), Kazakhstan (8%) and Uzbekistan (2%).

2. Official statistics show that over the past decade, out-migration has had a strong ethnic character, primarily Russians, Germans and other non-titular nationalities. However, in terms of growth, Kyrgyz emigration completely dominated.

3. Also, in 2000 a negative migration balance was registered among Kyrgyz - 200 persons, reaching 800 in 2001, and 1,200 in 2002. These migrants went to Russia (60%) and Kazakhstan (22%). Among the ethnic Kyrgyz migrants most were natives of southern Batken, Osh and Jalal-Abad oblasts; their primary objective was employment.

4. Emigrants tend to be from the most economically active and reproductive parts of Kyrgyzstan's population. In 2003 working-age emigrants were 66.9% of the total.

5. Migratory outflow negatively affects the structure of the domestic labour force. Most emigrants are manual labourers engaged in agriculture or construction, with secondary or specialized secondary education. Highly trained specialists, employees and other non-manual workers make up 18.4% of labour migrants. The growth in out-migration of the skilled labour force may eventually result in a drastic shortage of skilled labour. At present Kyrgyzstan is actually a "donor" of labour resources to other countries (Table 2.7).

6. A major migration trend in Kyrgyzstan is the growth of labour migration, which is basically uncontrolled. The primary destinations for labour migrants are Russia and Kazakhstan. There are no complete and accurate official statistics on this topic; however, experts estimate the number of seasonal Kyrgyz migrants in Russia reaches 300,000, and in Kazakhstan – 50,000. Of this number, 90% are natives of the southern oblasts of Kyrgyzstan. These migrants are mostly employed in industries such as retail trade, tobacco farming, construction, and oil and gas extraction. In Russia, Kyrgyz migrants concentrate primarily in big cities. 15-20% run their own businesses and employ compatriots, while up to 30% are engaged in "suitcase" trade.

Many Kyrgyz migrants do not speak Russian and do not know the migration laws of the destination country (usually Russia). Therefore, they often violate laws and become subjected to the outrage of the local authorities. Infringement of foreign workers' rights and uncontrolled migration are two of the most acute problems in CIS interstate relations. All member states are interested in solving these problems. It is impossible, however, to suspend labour migration since it grows each year, bringing not just losses (in labour force) but gains as well.

According to the Kyrgyz Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) Migration Department, at present about 18% of the economically active population working abroad sends the major part of its earnings back to Kyrgyzstan. This amount varies from US$200 million to US$400 million, accounting for 10-15% of the national GDP. According to the Kyrgyz National Bank's Balance of Payments, in 2003 funds transferred to Kyrgyzstan through electronic payment systems alone reached US$74 million (compared to US$29 million in 2002). In addition, a considerable sum is brought into the country in cash and is not formally counted. This situation seems to suit the Kyrgyz authorities, since they do not try very hard to improve the internal economic situation and probably fear the return of huge masses of labour migrants to the motherland. The current tendency, however, is such that only those who fail return to Kyrgyzstan, while those who succeed abroad often take local citizenship, settle, create new families and never return.

Background and consequences of migration

In Kyrgyzstan, despite the democracy and ethnic equality declared by the Kyrgyz government, a "washing out" of non-Kyrgyz nationalities from governmental and public bodies is taking place. Many non-Kyrgyz employees (mostly in public agencies) have no chance for promotion or improvement in their financial standing. According to Vitaliy Bussel, a leader of the oppositional party Ar-Namys, discrimination towards ethnic minorities in the public/governmental sector is the major reason for a new wave of emigration of non-Kyrgyz.
Annex X  International Migration in Kyrgyzstan

The destructive influence of emigration on major social and economic indicators of Kyrgyzstan has had several negative consequences. For example, the disproportion between demand and supply of the labour force creates an irregular flow of internal migration within the country. Rural to urban migration reflects a lack of structural reform in the Kyrgyz economy and accounts for 60% of total migratory movement within Kyrgyzstan.

Migrants from rural areas arriving in cities put further stress on employment and social conditions, and cause an increase in crime. In rural areas the movement of the population skews the labour force structure and demographic balance.

The loss of qualified specialists and workers as a result of out-migration may result in a drastic shortage of skilled labour; requiring great expense to fill lost labour resources.

Over the last few years, the so-called “stable” population that settled in Kyrgyzstan long ago has also begun to emigrate. In addition to the departure of highly skilled specialists, a new category of middle class ethnic Kyrgyz, who are no longer hopeful regarding changes in the economic and social life of the country, are also emigrating. This process may result in the loss of both active business people and their capital.

For these reasons, the intense out-migration of skilled labour has become an important factor preventing the further economic development of Kyrgyzstan. It is necessary to develop and implement complex measures for ending further migratory outflow. Above all, this will require the encouragement of market reforms, stimulation of employment and development of integration processes. It will be impossible to stabilize migration until all ethnic and social groups are made equal and provided with equal rights in the country.

3.2 Review of post-independence migration policies in Kyrgyzstan

After gaining independence, Kyrgyzstan faced many immigration problems. First, as a result of the wars in Afghanistan and Tajikistan, the Republic became overcrowded with refugees. Second, labour migrants from China and Turkey also began penetrating Kyrgyzstan. Third, the growth in foreign investments and joint ventures required the preparation of laws and legal acts to regulate immigration. The growth of migratory outflow, and in particular labour migration, forced the Kyrgyz authorities to address the protection of Kyrgyz workers’ rights abroad and to develop measures to regulate and decrease out-migration. This is why the development of a legislative base became a priority in Kyrgyzstan’s migration policy.

At present, there exist many migration laws and legislative documents passed by the Kyrgyz Government. These laws divide into the following groups:


Regional. These are agreements concluded by members of the CIS. The first was the Agreement on Assistance to Refugees and Immigrants of September 24, 1993, which established a Fund for Refugee and Immigrant Support, as well as the Advisory Council for Labour, Migration and Social Protection for citizens of CIS countries (November 13, 1992). Also important in this regard is the Agreement on Cooperation in Labour Migration and the Social Protection of Migrants (May 15, 1997), and the Agreement on Cooperation in Prevention of Illegal Migration (March 6, 1998).

Other important documents ratified by Kyrgyzstan include the Convention “On Major Freedoms and Human Rights” and the Convention “On the Guarantee of the Rights of Ethnic Minorities”. In addition, there are several agreements within the CIS Customs Union, for example the Agreement on the Legal Status of Foreign Citizens (May 28, 1998) and the Agreement on Simplified Procedures for the Granting of Citizenship (February 16, 1999).
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Bilateral. The Kyrgyz government passed the Decree “On Approval of the Resolution on Simplified Procedure of Granting of Kyrgyz Citizenship to Citizens of the Russian Federation and Simplified Removal of Kyrgyz Citizenship to Citizens Arrived in the Russian Federation” (April 4, 1999). However, this Decree faces several juridical problems that prevent its effective implementation. The Law “On Kyrgyz Citizenship” is not consistent with the same Russian Law in several areas. Kyrgyzstan does not have a law on forced migration and, thus, the meaning of “forced migrant” is absent; at the same time, in neighboring countries that were major destinations for Kyrgyz migrants, these kinds of laws were ratified long ago; for example Russia passed such a law in 1993 and adopted an amended version in 1997. Russia and Kyrgyzstan concluded the Agreement “On the Legal Status of Kyrgyz/Russian Citizens Permanently Living in Russia and Kyrgyzstan” (November 13, 1995) and an inter-governmental Agreement “On the Regulation of Migration and the Protection of Migrants’ Rights” (November 16, 1995). Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan concluded an Agreement “On Labour Status and the Social Protection of Immigrant Workers Engaged in Agriculture in Border Areas” (July 8, 2002). However, Kyrgyzstan has not concluded similar agreements with Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, though there remain conflicts between these countries that prevent the control of labour migration.

National. In December of 1993 the Law “On Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the Kyrgyz Republic” was ratified. This law describes the basic rights and obligations of foreigners living in Kyrgyzstan.

In 2000, on the basis of the President’s Decree, the “Conception of Demographic and Migratory Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic” was passed and, in 2004, an amended version was introduced, the “Conception of Migratory Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2010”.

It must be said that recently Kyrgyz legislation has been notably intensified – the government has adopted new laws and amended those that are obsolete. For example, the Criminal Code was amended to add a punishment provision for the trafficking of humans; this amendment has already served as the basis for 25 criminal cases. At the same time, there is no sound legislative basis for labour migration, no clear legal definition of a labour migrant, no system to manage labour migration or to prevent illegal migration. In addition, there is no law clarifying the rights of repatriated ethnic Kyrgyz who have answered the Kyrgyz government’s call to return to the motherland.

As mentioned above, from 2000-2004 two Conceptions of Migratory Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic were approved. The first did not reflect the up-to-date migration situation and none of its programmes were implemented. The amended (2004) version of The Conception reflects the anxiety of the Kyrgyz Government over the size and lack of control over emigration. It also addresses the management of labour migration as a priority of migration policy and determines goals, targets and principles of the policy. Other tasks stated by The Conception are the following:

- Removal of barriers for Kyrgyzstan to penetrate the international labour market through regulated interstate migration (search for potential employers).
- Development of interstate mechanisms for assisting Kyrgyz citizens living abroad.
- Development of multilateral and bilateral interstate relationships in order to create favorable conditions for Kyrgyz citizens living abroad.
- Participation in the development of international agreements on the prevention of illegal migration.
- Cooperation with the Kyrgyz Representative of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and international institutions and NGOs regarding migration issues.
- Informing the Kyrgyz population about migration conditions, job prospects on the international labour market and legislative changes in destination countries.
- Monitoring the current migration situation, and forming a migration database.
- Development of tourism, employment and making the use of local labour resources a priority for foreign companies that operate in the territory of the Kyrgyz Republic.

Interestingly, the Conception does not contain any proposals from the Kyrgyz authorities for job creation within the country, nor effective economic measures to lower migratory outflow. The government seems to be afraid of suspending emigration for fear of the problems that may arise. According to IOM Coordinator Mrs. Bermet Moldobaeva, the Conception authors adopted a realistic approach to migration and tried not to include items that would not be implemented in any case.

A very important step for Kyrgyz migration policy was the opening of two Kyrgyzstan consulates in the Russian Federation (in Ekaterinburg and Novosibirsk) to support Kyrgyz immigrants in Russia. It should be noted that none of the neighboring Central Asian states (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan) have agreed to do the same. The presence of Kyrgyz consulates has really changed the attitude of the
Russian authorities towards Kyrgyz immigrants. Ironically, however, this has caused a surge in demand for illegal Kyrgyz passports, particularly among Uzbeks and Tajiks who want to work in Russia.

From January of 2005, with the support of international institutions, including IOM, the Kyrgyz authorities will use plastic identification cards for internal use and foreign passports for traveling abroad. This step should eventually eliminate the forgery of Kyrgyz passports (the new passports will be relatively expensive and their issue will be computerized).

Another important issue in migration policy is data collection and the analysis of migration trends. Unfortunately the Kyrgyz government does not finance this kind of work; it is done almost exclusively by local NGOs such as the Bishkek Regional Centre for Migrants and Refugees, and with the financial support of international organizations (IOM, OSCE, Eurasia Foundation and others).

IOM, in cooperation with the Department for External Labour Migration of the Kyrgyz Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has implemented several projects, the major goals of which were: (a) the study and elimination of the consequences of human trafficking, (b) the creation of an automated system of migration control, (c) information and legal support for labour migrants and (d) human rights training for the population and law-enforcement authorities.

To this end, since March of 2004, the Bishkek Centre for Social Initiatives, with the support of IOM and the External Labour Migration Department has been implementing the Labour Migrants’ Legal Support Project. The project initiated use of a Migrant Security Passport, which is given to each migrant departing to Russia, together with a migration card. At the central railway station in Bishkek NGO staff members conduct an account of migrants, instruct them on how to arrange temporary registration in Russia and assist them with completing the migration card. In Osh city the same activities are carried out by the NGO “Golden Goal”, an organization that provides information and legal support to migrants in the south of Kyrgyzstan.

Kyrgyzstan has developed and ratified a number of laws and regulations on migration. However there are still many unresolved problems, mostly related to uncontrolled mass labour migration. At present this work is mostly carried out by NGOs that have limited capacity and their activities are local in nature. The stabilization and removal of negative migration tendencies will be possible only through the implementation of nationwide measures supported by all stakeholders including government authorities, international institutions and the civil society.

4. Analysis of the survey results

4.1 Survey Objectives

The analysis of migration statistics for the last decade shows that the rate of international migration is increasing, while its composition, purpose and causes are changing. The survey was carried out to achieve the following:

- Analyze current migratory intentions of the population.
- Identify motivations for and causes of out-migration.
- Analyze trends in the development of labour migration.
- Study migrants’ rights and means for their protection.
- Identify more effective methods for the regulation of migratory flows.

A sample survey covering all oblasts of Kyrgyzstan was conducted and supplemented by unstandardized expert interviews.

The survey focused on the following issues:

1. Socio-demographic characteristics of people with migratory intentions.
2. Awareness of existing migration, migrant rights, and the activities of organizations dealing with migration.
3. Identification of people leaving, or planning to leave, for other countries in search of job opportunities.
4. Popular attitudes towards growing migration.
5. The current level of enforcement of regulations on migrant rights, the role of the Government and international organizations in safeguarding migrants’ rights.
4.2 Methodology

The survey was conducted during October-November 2004. In the course of the survey, both qualitative and quantitative methods of information collection were employed, together with statistical analysis, and a study of relevant legislation. The accuracy of the data gathered was evaluated using statistical criteria.

In accordance with the survey objectives, a set of guidelines was developed for conducting non-standardized expert interviews with representatives of international institutions, public authorities and NGOs. A total of eight experts were interviewed (see Attachment).

Quantitative research was based on the questionnaire proposed by the Project Manager, with some amendments introduced after the pilot survey. Key questions remained unchanged, but three questions were added, which, in the researchers’ opinion, would help understand better the general attitude towards migration among the people of Kyrgyzstan.

The survey was carried out in all oblasts of Kyrgyzstan by means of formal (face-to-face) interviews conducted in the respondents’ places of residence. The population sample was developed on the basis of the results of the National Census of 1999. Respondent selection was made through proportionate quota and targeted sampling that requires establishing quotas according to age, gender and ethnic characteristics. Given the nature of the problem, identification of age groups that are most active in terms of migration is important to develop a better understanding of the situation. That is why the range of the target age groups was determined to be from 19 to 50 years, with an emphasis put on the most mobile age groups, from 23 to 40 years old.

In Kyrgyzstan, the urban population is less than one-third of the total population. However, urban dwellers account for more than 68% of total migrants. For this reason, despite the overall socio-demographic structure of the population, the sample has been structured to include 30%, on average, of rural dwellers and 70% of urban dwellers; in Bishkek 20% of respondents resided in suburban areas. In large cities, the survey was conducted using route sampling.

The size of the sample was 700 respondents. For the purpose of quality control, 50 telephone interviews were made in various locations to verify the duration of interviews, dates conducted and the content of the questions asked. Interviews were performed in both the Russian and the Kyrgyz languages.

4.3 Socio-demographic composition of respondents

Males totaled 49.4% of the respondents (346 persons), while females numbered 50.6% (354 persons) of respondents. Of these, 55.5% were married and 37.8% were single, 5.7% divorced and 1% widowed. The distribution of respondents by age and education is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Distribution of respondents by age and education (N=700)
The distribution of respondents by ethnicity was as follows: Kyrgyz: 410 (58.5%), Russians: 96 (13.7%), Uzbeks: 92 (13.1%), Tatars: 16 (2.3%), Kazakhs: 15 (2.2%), Tajiks: 13 (1.9%), Uighurs: 13 (1.9%), Ukrainians: 10 (1.5%), Koreans: 9 (1.3%), Jews: 6 (0.8%), Chechens: 1 (0.1%), and other: 19 (2.7%).

The distribution of respondents by oblast and place of residence, and by place of birth and ethnicity is shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. At the oblast level, the sample covered not only administrative centres, but also towns such as Kara-Balta, Kemin, Balykchi, Cholpon-Ata, Uzgen and Kyzyl-Kia.

In analyzing migration trends, significant factors that influence migration decisions should be verified. These include past cases of emigration in the family, migrant country of origin, duration of residence in Kyrgyzstan and children or other relatives living abroad.

The results of the survey showed that most respondents (90.4%) were born in Kyrgyzstan and have lived in the country since birth.

Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by oblast and place of residence (N=700)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>In rural areas</th>
<th>In urban areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryn</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talas</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osh</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal-Abad</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batken</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batken</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishkek city</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages were calculated from the number of respondents in a given oblast.

Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by place of birth and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As follows from Table 4.3, most of the respondents in all ethnic groups were born in Kyrgyzstan, which probably means that intentions to migrate should not be linked to place of birth. 83% of the respondents’ parents and on average, and 72% of their grandmothers and grandfathers were also born in Kyrgyzstan.
About 58% of respondents have children and 10.7% have children living abroad. Nearly 57% of respondents have some relative(s) abroad, primarily in the CIS (mostly Russia), and 6% have relatives in countries outside the CIS.

The distribution of respondents by occupation is shown in the chart on the right. Students enrolled in institutes of higher education, public servants and bazaar vendors made up the three largest groups among respondents, while unskilled workers made up the smallest group. Note: the item “Skilled workers, etc” in the chart denotes skilled industrial workers, technical-industrial personnel and engineers.

In conclusion, a portion of respondents with roots in Kyrgyzstan is indirectly involved in the migration process because they intend to join children or relatives who already live abroad; the survey results on the causes of out-migration confirm this. More than 10% of those who wish to leave Kyrgyzstan explained it as a desire to join their relatives. A portion said that they expected their relatives already abroad to help them find employment and housing.

4.4 Migratory intentions

The answers to one of the key survey questions, “Do you want to leave Kyrgyzstan?” have been analyzed in relation to various socio-demographic indicators in the country to develop a social profile of people seeking to leave the country.

The chart on the right shows that 19% of all respondents want to leave Kyrgyzstan permanently, while about 31% would like to do so for a limited period of time. More than 4% are already involved in labour migration, and 46% do not want to leave.

Thus, more than 50% of respondents display some migratory intentions.

As shown in table 4.4 below, migratory intentions predominate among the 16 to 29 age group, and among middle aged people - those from 30 to 39.

Interestingly, 20% of respondents aged 50-59 also want to leave the country, of whom about half want to do so permanently (to reunite with relatives) and half to work for a time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration intentions</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrate forever</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrate for a time</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour migrant already</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing to leave</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 4.4: Age-specific structure of migratory intentions](N=700)
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Overall, women are a bit more inclined to migrate permanently, while men are more willing to leave the country temporarily (mostly to work); however, the general structure of answers in both groups is very similar:

Table 4.5: Structure of migratory intentions by gender
(N=700)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Leave Permanently</th>
<th>Leave for a time</th>
<th>To work</th>
<th>Not willing to leave</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to educational level, the survey results showed that respondents with higher and incomplete higher education are more likely to want to leave the country permanently. Those with a secondary education hope to migrate temporarily for work. Looking at educational level by nationality, one sees that ethnic Kyrgyz with at least some higher education are most likely to want to emigrate permanently. A significant number of respondents with higher education also want to migrate temporarily for work, although these tend to be middle-aged and older respondents from the southern areas of the country.

Regarding possible country of destination, respondents gave a wide variety of answers. Russia is a leading destination country for potential emigrants. 26 respondents answered that they already migrate to Russia for work. Two young men from Issyk-Kul oblast separately expressed the intention to leave for Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates for religious reasons. Potential migrant destination countries are listed in Table 4.6 below:

Table 4.6: Major countries of destination
(N=348)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Permanent residency</th>
<th>Temporary residence, work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European countries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>383*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: some respondents indicated two or more countries

Although 49.7% of respondents are willing to leave Kyrgyzstan (either temporarily or permanently), few make any real attempts in this regard. Half of those willing to leave permanently do nothing at all to achieve this goal. Approximately the same number of those who want to leave for work — 49%, also do nothing towards this goal. This is partly because of the common human tendency to dream (particularly among the young), but in most cases it is explained by a shortage of money needed to achieve the move.

Only 8% of the total wishing to leave said they had completed their emigration arrangements.
Despite a high level of migration intentions, respondents actually demonstrated a poor awareness of migration laws and the activities of migration authorities and institutions. This is particularly true of rural people who intend to migrate to Russia to find a better job.

Their major source of information was neighbors, friends and relatives. For example, in answer to a question on illegal migration, many rural and small town people said they did not know how to formally prepare legal emigration documents and thus, they would have to take any offer of employment abroad. Unfortunately, sometimes this ultimately leads to their sale into slavery; more often it results in illegal residency in a foreign country necessitating forged papers and continuous bribes to local police to avoid deportation.

The question “Have you ever turned to any organization for assistance and information for support in emigrating from Kyrgyzstan?” was answered affirmatively by only 23% of those willing to emigrate; 77% have not approached any organization for emigration assistance. Those who answered this question affirmatively in most cases turned to the embassies of potential destination countries, to travel agencies engaged in migration, to law firms, or to the Department for Migration at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Public attitude towards emigrants was basically positive. 67% of respondents approved of emigration, stating that people have a right to improve their lives. 19% held negative attitudes towards migration, feeling it was necessary to make life better in Kyrgyzstan; another 10% considered emigration an act of treachery. The last answer was given mostly by older respondents who grew up during the Soviet era.

4.5 Reasons for migration intentions and expectations from departure

Respondents were asked to name three prime reasons for emigration from Kyrgyzstan (this was an open-ended question), and the answers divided into four major groups:

1. Economic — unemployment, low income and a generally low standard of living.

2. Social — difficult to improve social status, no possibilities for career promotion and employment by specialty, no future for children, bad healthcare, desire to live in historical motherland, reunite with relatives, marry abroad.

3. Political and legal — limitation of ethnic rights (especially language discrimination), political instability, tribalism and corruption.

4. Cultural — desire for quality education, spiritual and material needs and travel. Often respondents (mostly young ones) mistook migration for tourism; however, this item was counted as a reason for migration on questionnaires where respondents also answered “for earnings”.

Representative of the OSCE Bureau for Human Rights, Marcus Müller told an interviewer that Kyrgyz youths do not really have any other choice but to leave the country. There are no jobs by specialty, the employment situation is not expected to improve because the economy is quite bad; in addition, corruption is so rampant that it has become impossible to get a job except by means of certain connections. Therefore, emigration of the young will continue to increase.

Respondents’ answers regarding reasons for emigration are shown in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Reasons for Emigration
(N=348)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Major Reasons</th>
<th>Number of choices</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>1. To earn for a better life, and low incomes in Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Total unemployment</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Low standard of living</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>4. No future for selves, children, country in general</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. No job by specialty</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Family reuniting</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. No career promotion</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Return to motherland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Marriage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>10. Nationalism, problems with official (Kyrgyz) language</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Undemocratic society, corruption</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>12. Traveling</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Low level of culture in Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Search for quality education and work experience</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.3*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some respondents gave several answers, thus, the sum does not equal 100%.

An analysis of reasons for emigration by region gives additional insight into migration processes in the Republic. Natives of south Kyrgyzstan often named only one reason for emigration – job seeking (those respondents who intended to, or already travel abroad for work) and added that everything else is all right in Kyrgyzstan. Some responded, “Kyrgyz emigrate just to get a better job for a time, but they will surely return because they don’t want to stay abroad.” Respondents in the capital, Bishkek, more frequently cited the lack of future in the country or the lack of jobs by specialty as their motivations for emigrating. Twelve respondents of the total answered, “I just don’t want to live here at all.”

Comparing these data with the findings of earlier surveys indicates a change in the reasons for emigration. In the 1990s people emigrated to their historical motherland because they were afraid of possible political and economic difficulties of staying in a young country. By the end of the decade, this type of out-migration had decreased, though it remained a major reason for emigration. At the same time, unemployment and the inability to obtain a job in one’s specialty predominated. At the beginning of the 21st century the search for a better job and the low standard of living in Kyrgyzstan became major factors for emigration, resulting in a considerable growth in labour migration.

Table 4.8: Respondent Opinion of Type of Work Undertaken by Migrants from KR Abroad
(N=700)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unskilled Labour</th>
<th>Working in Area of Specialty</th>
<th>Small Business</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hard to Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to Leave</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Want to Leave</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Percentages are calculated among those wanting to leave. ** Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents. Some respondents chose multiple answers, and so the total does not equal 100%.

The category “Other” mainly includes answers of the type “depends on their luck” and “in various jobs”.
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When asked what kinds of work migrants may expect to find abroad, 14% of respondents who wish to leave Kyrgyzstan said that they would welcome any kind of paid work; 31.5% said that they expected to find well-paid jobs, even if not prestigious; 30% hope to be offered jobs according to their specialties; 18% would like to start their own businesses; 3.5% already knew where to find work (because they had migrated for work previously), and 3% had no idea what they would find abroad.

The group expecting to find jobs in their specialties mostly included students enrolled in higher educational institutions, and professionals with a higher education. The group wishing to start their own businesses abroad was comprised of people with some work experience in foreign countries, businessmen, and young people with secondary occupational or incomplete higher education. Many answers however, suggested wishful thinking and displayed a rather superficial knowledge of the opportunities open to migrants in foreign countries.

It is informative to compare answers to this question with those to the question about what kinds of work respondents think that migrants from Kyrgyzstan do abroad. The results are shown in Table 4.8 above.

Respondents who want to migrate expect to find jobs abroad according to their specialties; at the same time nearly half of them think that most migrants are employed in unskilled jobs; only 12% feel it is possible to find a job in one’s specialty (by comparison, 30% of these respondents themselves hope to find jobs in their specialties).

Studies conducted in Russia show that a migrant can find a job in his/her specialty if a formal agreement with an employer is reached; in other cases migrants are offered only unskilled jobs for which they are paid at lower rates than local workers. It should be noted however, that some who migrate for construction work are in fact skilled construction workers for whom the demand is high. One also should consider that many individuals migrate to work as bazaar vendors; it is possible that in Kyrgyzstan they had been doing the same kind of work and therefore would be working abroad according to their specialties.

Respondents’ understanding of migrant life is based primarily on information received from relatives and friends (71%) who have visited foreign countries or reside there; from radio and television programmes (32%), from newspapers (23%), from the Internet (21%) and from specialized publications on migration (12%). Note: some respondents chose two or three answers.

It is quite common for Kyrgyzstanis to use relatives and friends as their primary source of information and to trust them more than official sources. Often stories told by fellow villagers become incentives for the rest to follow. Mr. A. Tuialiev, head of the Jalal-Abad Department for Migration said that in the town of Mali-Suu, when a local man returned from seasonal work in Russia with stories of his success there, one hundred men packed their things and left with him for that very place (Irkutsk oblast, Russia).

It is worth noting that in addition to traditional sources of information, a significant number, some 21% of surveyed potential migrants, get information from resources on the Internet.

4.6 Problems of labour migration and human rights

As mentioned above, in Kyrgyzstan, labour migration has reached an unprecedented size (300,000 according to various estimates) and is presently known for its uncontrolled nature. This kind of migration is often called illegal migration. Illegal migration implies evasion or infringement of visa laws; however, labour migration from Kyrgyzstan is basically oriented towards Russia and Kazakhstan, where, at the time of this report, Kyrgyz citizens may arrive without a visa. Most Kyrgyz migrants cross the border with passports, i.e., legally, but once they enter, they begin to break local rules of registration, to work without legal permission and become illegal aliens. That is why many experts refer to this kind of migration as uncontrollable.

The term includes the following characteristics: irregularity of movements, infringement of the rules stated on departure documents, working and residing illegally in the destination countries, and the inability of public/governmental authorities to control migratory flows.

These unsolved issues produce certain tensions in interstate relations between Kyrgyzstan and the two largest migrant destination countries, Russia and Kazakhstan. Labour market instability, crime,
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narcotics trafficking and some infectious diseases can be the unintentional consequences of satiating this demand for cheap, unskilled labour. For example, in Russia's larger cities most of the unskilled construction workers are immigrants because they are willing to accept lower pay, and work longer hours without additional social guarantees, etc.

Most labour migrants from Kyrgyzstan perform unskilled labour in construction, municipal utilities, services and the bazaar trade. Some do run their own businesses in joint ventures with locals and eventually obtain citizenship in the destination countries. In most cases, however, immigrants in these countries have a very low social standing and only those who work under formal contracts with employers have the ability to defend their human and civil rights.

In answer to the question "How are migrants from Kyrgyzstan treated abroad?" 14.4% feel migrants are treated well, while 39.8% feel they are treated satisfactorily. 26% of respondents said migrants abroad were treated poorly and 19.8% found it difficult to say. For the most part these answers came via word of mouth rather than from factual sources. More than half of respondents who already migrate abroad for work answered that migrants are treated satisfactorily and 20% feel they are treated poorly.

When asked, "Do migrants from other countries live well in Kyrgyzstan?" the largest percentage answered that they did not know (44.6%). 37.4% felt that migrants live well in Kyrgyzstan because it is a democratic country, free of discrimination, with a low cost of living, etc. Ethnic Kyrgyz most frequently responded positively to this question over other nationalities. 18% of respondents felt that migrants in Kyrgyzstan live poorly due to the generally low living standards and lack of employment opportunities in the country.

Indeed, migrants in Kyrgyzstan face the same problems that migrants from Kyrgyzstan face while abroad - problems with law enforcement officials, discrimination, difficult living conditions, etc.

It is important to consider that some respondents who answered that foreigners in Kyrgyzstan live well, may have in mind foreign workers who are hired (mostly by foreign companies), work for a much higher wage and receive better benefits than do their local counterparts. Conversely, most Kyrgyz migrants work in unskilled, low-paid positions abroad.

Answers to the question “Who should defend the rights of Kyrgyz migrant workers abroad?” were divided; 39.5% felt that the government of the sending country was responsible, while 34% felt that the receiving country should defend migrants’ rights.

Another 28% of respondents felt that international organizations should defend migrants’ rights, 9.7% found it difficult to say, and 1.7% felt that all parties were responsible (respondents were allowed to select multiple answers and therefore the total is greater than 100%). That fewer than half of respondents felt that the sending country should be responsible for defending migrants’ rights shows the low level of trust respondents have in the Kyrgyz government in this regard. Alternatively, perhaps they simply do not know whom, if anyone should defend migrants’ rights.

4.7 Attitudes Towards Illegal Migration

With the increase in legal migration in Kyrgyzstan, there has been a corresponding increase in various forms of illegal migration. Businesses that facilitate employment abroad have flourished since the fall of the Soviet Union. These businesses are profitable and many offer legitimate services; others offer work, particularly to women and girls, with the intent to deceive them, confiscate their documents and force them into prostitution or slave labour abroad.

Undocumented migrant workers, often seasonal agricultural workers, flow from Kyrgyzstan to Russia and Kazakhstan, while workers from Uzbekistan and Tajikistan flow into southern Kyrgyzstan.

The survey asked respondents whether they know something about illegal migration and similarly, whether they have heard about illegal trafficking in humans. More than half of respondents claim to have heard about both of these phenomena; interestingly, more respondents had heard about trafficking than illegal migration, though the latter is more common. Responses indicate that people cannot imagine what exactly constitutes illegal migration; around 40% of those who knew about the existence of illegal migration could not name a reason why it happens. Those who could answer the question tended to be in the middle age range among survey respondents. Respondents were able to choose up to three reasons for illegal migration. 79% of respondents attributed the phenomenon to the
complicated, slow and expensive process of getting migration documents, and 37% cited migrants' ignorance of the laws.

The migration experts interviewed as part of this study stated that illegal migration from Kyrgyzstan takes place for a variety of reasons; these include the incompatibility of laws between the sending and receiving societies, the low level of legal culture among Kyrgyz citizens, the profitability of illegal migration for a small number of corrupt bureaucrats, and the lack of a comprehensive migration policy in the country.

In answer to the question “Who is responsible for combating the human trafficking of Kyrgyzstani?” 56% cited the state security structures in the country where the trafficking happens, 34% felt international organizations were responsible for this work, while 22.4% felt this work should be done by social organizations. 17% of respondents thought that all parties should work together to combat trafficking.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The survey data reveal the following migration tendencies in Kyrgyzstan:

- The low standard of living in Kyrgyzstan compels citizens to seek a better life for themselves and their families. In answer to the question “How many Kyrgyzstani citizens do you think would like to leave the country?” 60% replied there were very many, and that even more would leave if they had the financial means to do so.
- The tendency for non-titular nationalities to emigrate from the country remains stable. In addition to the Slavic and German nationalities, we now see the emigration of other “Asian” nationalities, such as Tatars, Kazakhs, Uzbeks and Koreans.
- Recently we have seen a rise in emigration of ethnic Kyrgyz; while most of this is temporary labour migration, there also is a rise in the number of Kyrgyz who want to emigrate permanently, and these, by and large, tend to have at least some higher education.
- In general women and men have an equal tendency to migrate, though given that the population of women in the workforce is lower than men at present, their emigration could have a damaging effect on the overall demographic in the country. Also Kyrgyz women are now marrying foreign men at a higher rate than previously.
- Increased emigration from the country means that more Kyrgyz citizens have relatives working and/or living abroad; this in turn can influence future motivation to migrate.
- The Kyrgyz government increasingly relies on labour migration abroad to solve a host of economic problems in the country. This is why, rather than addressing ways to halt the flow of labour from the country, the 2004 version of The Conception of Migration Policy supports labour migration as an important export product. The defense of migrants’ rights remains a major problem for labour migrants in Kyrgyzstan, as well as for those Kyrgyz citizens who migrate abroad for employment.

We would like to make the following recommendations regarding migration policy on the basis of our research:

- It is necessary to take a comprehensive approach to migration regulation, including all stages of the migration process, from pre-migration consulting and job placement to the monitoring of living conditions and defending migrants’ rights.
- It is vital to monitor migrants’ progress as they leave the country, collecting data on where they work and in what capacity.
- Keep the population informed on migration policies in Kyrgyzstan and Russia (as the primary destination country), so that migrants will know how changes to migration laws will affect them.
- Create a joint programme that brings together the Department of Migration Services, international organizations and NGOs to study the problem of migration, to manage areas with large migration flows and to provide legal assistance and information to migrants. It is important that this be a coordinated effort.
- Stimulate the activity of organizations that place labour migrants by offering tax cuts to those who reduce their placement fees. Constantly track the activity of these firms.
- Set up actual migrant labour markets in Bishkek and Osh where groups of migrants can be hired, receive information and language training in preparation for their departure to specific regions abroad.
It is essential to solve the issue of social insurance for migrants to guarantee that their rights abroad are upheld.

- Develop initiatives for returning labour migrants to invest their earnings in the local economy, to assist them in forming networks by areas of specialty, to form credit groups, etc.
- Provide the population with regular accessible information on migration laws, migration organizations, and job placement agencies for labour migrants and ask these organizations to inform the media on their activities and details of life and work abroad.
- Legalize the status of migrants working abroad illegally without punishing migrants or their employers through the conclusion of bilateral agreements.
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INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION IN POST-SOVIET TAJIKISTAN

The Problems of Protecting the Rights of Migrants and their Families

By S. Olimova and M. Olimov

Abstract

One of the most significant social processes currently taking place in post-Soviet Tajikistan is international migration among its citizens. UNESCO has initiated a project entitled “International migration in post-Soviet Tajikistan: the problems of protecting the rights of migrants and their families” to study international migration in Tajikistan.

The following issues were studied within the project framework: basic trends in international migration in Tajikistan; migration intentions of the population (socio-economic, cultural and psychological, political, and legal components of intentions); labour migration trends; problems connected to the protection of migrants and their family members’ rights; recommendations for all structures related to international migration and migrants and their family members’ rights protection.

Collected materials show that migration trends during Tajikistan’s first 12 years of independence have been tied to its turbulent recent history. During almost the entire Soviet period Tajikistan was an immigration country. Since the end of the 1970s a gradual transition from a positive to negative migration balance began in the country. The civil war that began in 1992 precipitated a population outflow from Tajikistan. Since 1994 a gradual decline in Tajikistan’s migration activity has been observed.

Results of the public opinion study indicate that despite a huge volume of migration, the population of Tajikistan does not have significant migration intentions. Potential emigrants divide into three flows: temporary labour migrants (83%), permanent migrants (8.5%) and migration for educational purposes (8.5%).

According to the data collected, violations of migrants’ rights by state bodies, employers and xenophobes as well as legal violations committed by migrants themselves have become mass phenomena. Many of the migrants’ problems stem from a low level of legal literacy and a lack of information. Insufficient development of migration legislation in the CIS countries and a general violation of human rights also play a negative role in this regard.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Project Goals and Tasks

One of the most significant social processes currently taking place in post-Soviet Tajikistan is international migration among its citizens. The scale and dynamics of migration in Tajikistan are so great that migration has become one of the central issues in social and political discourse. During its twelve years of independence, migration trends have changed in connection with this turbulent time in Tajikistan's history. These changes, and the main migration trends and problems have been partially documented in statistics and research; however, despite a number of scientific works on this subject, migration in Tajikistan is still not studied well.¹

In order to study the main trends, factors and problems of migration in Tajikistan, UNESCO has initiated a project entitled International Migration in Post-Soviet Tajikistan: the problems of protecting the rights of migrants and their families.

The main goals of the project were:

- To define the main trends and characteristics of international migration in Tajikistan;
- To identify the migration intentions of the population (socio-economic, cultural and psychological, political, and legal components of intentions);
- To identify labour migration trends;
- To define problems connected to protecting the rights of migrants and their family members;
- To develop policy recommendations related to international migration, protecting the rights of migrants and their family members.

1.2. Research Methodology

Research was conducted using the following:

- Data from the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Tajikistan (SSC RT);
- Data from the records of state institutions: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Ministry of Interior Affairs (MOI), Ministry of Security (MOS), etc.;
- Data from interviews with state officials responsible for migration regulation and control, NGO personnel, academic researchers, journalists, migration organizers, held from September to November 2004;
- Data from a public opinion survey held from 18 September to 3 October 2004. The survey was conducted using stratified random sampling representing the Tajikistan population as a whole, and taking into account the ethnic composition of the country. The survey was completed by 603 persons in 32 populated areas in all regions and districts of Tajikistan. The survey was conducted through personal interviews in respondents' homes by “Sharq" Centre interviewers. The survey information was processed and entered into a database by “Sharq" Centre operators, who also prepared the tables used in this report.
- Analysis of secondary information (sociological research conducted prior to this report);

This report is a source for public servants to define further directions for research and programme development and directed towards raising social awareness on migration issues.

1.4. Statistical data on international migration in the Republic of Tajikistan. Data collection problems

Before the USSR collapsed, interior law enforcement bodies had controlled both migration and the statistical bodies that processed the data. After gaining independence a Tajikistan State Statistic Committee was established; however migration control procedures remained as they were during Soviet times.

Before 1994 data on migration was confidential in Tajikistan and only for official use. In 1995-1996 information on migration statistics became transparent. Unfortunately however, since 1997 access to official data on migration statistics has again been limited to confidential and official use. This has led to the need to use alternate information sources that have varying degrees of reliability. These alternate sources include census materials, sociological surveys, information from refugee centres and migrant societies, national communities and from international organizations such as IOM and UNHCR.

Control of migration flows

The initial control of foreign migration (arriving and departing persons) is made within passport agencies (MOI, Republic of Tajikistan) based on two documents - an arrival voucher and a departure voucher. Intra-republican migration is controlled using a single voucher. In rural areas local authorities - Jamoats - control intra-republican migration.

The main migration control problems in Tajikistan include multiple changes in identification documentation (including passports) after independence, cases of multiple citizenship that hinder migration control, especially dual citizenship for Tajikistan and the Russian Federation; and a lack of administrative control, including passport control at the borders.

Refugee control

Previously, refugee control was separately conducted by the State Migration Service (SMS) under the Ministry of Labour and Employment of the population of the Republic of Tajikistan (RT) (currently the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population). Since the end of 1997, control has been carried out by personnel of SMS under the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of Tajikistan who work in each district. Nearly all refugees and IDPs who were in Tajikistan under international programmes were controlled.

General data collection problems

Often statistics on migration in Tajikistan are incomplete and contradictory due to changes in the structure of the government bodies overseeing migration, a lack of funds and qualified specialists and other problems characteristic of a transitional country.

Labour migration control has been hindered due to a visa-free regime with the main destination country - the Russian Federation, as well as with Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Despite the Tajikistan government’s attempts to institute better border control procedures, there remains an information shortage at checkpoints due to a lack of entry/exit slips, inattention of state border personnel, etc. In January 2004 a system of external migration control cards came into operation. In October 2004 a computer system of migration slip processing was introduced, but it is still not running. For these reasons the primary data sources on labour migration in Tajikistan remain household surveys and sociological polling.

There have been a number of surveys on labour migration held in Tajikistan during recent years. The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of the Republic of Tajikistan held labour migration surveys three times (June - October 2001, January - February 2002, and in August 2003); IOM, together with "Sharq" Centre held a study on labour migration from Tajikistan, which covered all of Tajikistan in 2002-2003. In 2003-2004 the Aga Khan Foundation conducted a labour migration study in the mountainous Badakhshan Autonomous Region.
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2. Main trends of international migration in Tajikistan

2.1. Migration processes in post-soviet Tajikistan. A General Overview

For almost all of the Soviet period Tajikistan was an immigration country. Since the end of 1970s a gradual shift from a positive to negative migration balance began due to a system crisis in Central Asia that affected all aspects of society. Survey materials confirm this emigration trend. Thus, 96.8% of respondents interviewed were born in Tajikistan and 95.7% have lived in Tajikistan their entire lives. 2.3% of those interviewed were born in Russia, and 0.5% in Uzbekistan. Those who were born outside Tajikistan (2.7%) immigrated to Tajikistan more than 30 years ago. Most of these are Russians and a smaller number of Ukrainians, Uzbeks and Tartars. The low mobility of the Tajikistan population is confirmed by the fact that the parents of 93.7% of those interviewed were also born in Tajikistan.

A small migration surge reflected in the survey materials was noticed during Perestroika - at that time 0.8% of the interviewed respondents immigrated into Tajikistan, mostly ethnic Tajiks.

The first wave of out-migration during the last years of the Soviet era in Tajikistan was noticed in 1989, when the Law on State language was adopted. During the period 1981-1985 the annual outflow of migrants averaged 8,200 persons, while in 1989 migration out-flow was 19,100 persons.

The February 1990 massacres in Tajikistan, and the interethnic strife during that period, stimulated a second wave of out-migration. In 1990 59,000 people left Tajikistan. Migration in that period gained a pronounced ethnic character. The overwhelming majority of people who emigrated from Tajikistan during this period were non-Tajiks.

In 1991 migration out-flow decreased, but the civil war that started in 1992 again increased population flow from Tajikistan and caused the third and largest wave of out-migration from the country. During 1992-1993 every seventh inhabitant of Tajikistan became either a refugee or an internally displaced person. After large-scale battles finished in 1993, emigration fell but still remained very high due to the general instability in the country. From 1991-1995 some 284,600 people emigrated from Tajikistan.

Since 1994 a gradual decline in migration activity of the Tajikistan population has been observed. A decline in migration intentions was noticed during a national public opinion survey conducted by the International Foundation for Election Systems (Survey IFES-96) in Tajikistan in December 1996. The survey indicated that only 9% of those interviewed planned to leave Tajikistan permanently. However, since 2001 migration activity has started to accelerate again.

The September 2004 survey results confirm this pattern of post-soviet migration in Tajikistan. The parents of 2.6% of those interviewed have left Tajikistan. The primary destination countries were Russia (75%) and Uzbekistan (25%). 89.5% of all parents, grandfathers and grandmothers who emigrated from Tajikistan moved to Russia and Uzbekistan for permanent residence.

2.2. Forced migration, refugees, refugees' repatriation and internally displaced persons (IDP)

The collapse of the USSR was accompanied by large-scale migration. This process was very active in Tajikistan, where independence was accompanied by civil conflict. The war in Tajikistan was the result of ethno-regional elites struggling for the power and resources in the country, which was suddenly left without central governance. By the middle of 1993, when the large-scale fighting ceased, there were 698,000 internally displaced people in Tajikistan; 196,000 people who sought refuge in other CIS countries and 60,000 who found asylum in Afghanistan, according to the Republic of Tajikistan Department of Refugees and Forced Migrants of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population. However, by 2000 all but some 44,900 Tajik refugees had returned to Tajikistan.

Returning refugees could not find jobs that would guarantee their basic family needs, which prompted a huge increase in labour emigration from Tajikistan.

3 Steven Wagner, 1996.
2.3. Ethnic migration from Tajikistan

During the first years of independence, every ethnic group living in Tajikistan experienced some degree of out-migration. Over time however, specific ethnic migration flows began to take shape in the country; these were caused by statehood transformation of the territory of Tajikistan.

By the beginning of the civil war, Russians composed 398,000 or 7.6% of Tajikistan's population. Ethnic Russians also formed the largest number of emigrants leaving Tajikistan (50.1%) during its first five years of independence. Tartars made up 10.3%, Germans - 7.6%, Ukrainians - 5.0%, and Jews composed 3.2%. Russians in Tajikistan's population now number 1.1%, Tartars 0.3%, and almost all Germans and Jews have emigrated from the country, according to SSC RT.5

In 1989, 32.4% of the population of Dushanbe was Russian. By December of 2000 the number of ethnic Russians in the Tajikistan capital was 5.1%.6 The main destination countries for emigrants were Russia, Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Kazakhstan.7

After 1997, emigration to ECEA countries declined. The majority of migrants were Russians and Tajiks, but the share of Russians continued to decline because the majority of them already had left.

2.4. Migration in modern Tajikistan

Migration in contemporary Tajikistan is characterized by the following trends:

• High levels of external labour migration, the largest trend in recent years.
• A slow increase of population's migration activity.
• A decline in migration outflow.8
• An increase in rural-urban migration.
• An increase in human trafficking volumes.
• A decline in the transit migration of Afghans and subsequent decrease of the Afghani community in Tajikistan. Among the 603 survey respondents, one indicated having migrated to Tajikistan from Afghanistan five years ago.

3. International migration intentions of the population (socio-economic, cultural and psychological, political and legal issues).

3.1. Reasons for migration. Modern social and economic trends

Demographic situation. Tajikistan has a young, rapidly growing population. During the period between the two censuses (1989 to 2000) the working-aged population grew 124.1%, or 2.1% annually.9 The average age is 22.8 years and 46% of the population is under 16 years of age. Only 7% of the population is over 60 years of age.10 This rapid population growth strengthens pressure on the labour market, indirectly encouraging people to leave the country in search of brighter prospects.

Employment levels and the labour market. One of the most important factors promoting emigration is unemployment. During the last five years, the official level of unemployment increased from 1.7% to 3.2%. If we consider that the majority of unemployed do not register with the authorities, then the real scale of unemployment, according to World Bank specialists is 30%.11 Youths compose the majority of unemployed (68.9%); most of whom are dependants or receive limited income from occasional earnings.

The problem of unemployment is most urgent for young people and women. Tajikistan has a socially excluded group of youth that has never worked and has no prospects for employment at home in the future. 14.5% of interviewed labour migrants had never worked before leaving Tajikistan.12
Low Income, Wages and Poverty. Tajikistan is the poorest among Central Asian countries. GDP per capita in 2003 was US$241 and the average accrued salary in Tajikistan was US$15 per month (October 2004). In 2003 some 54.4% of labour migrants from Tajikistan had left the country to work citing low wages earned at home.

Survey Results: Reasons for Planned Departure from Tajikistan

The above summary of motivational factors for migration is confirmed by survey data gathered in September of 2004. Potential migrants indicate unemployment (32.7%) as the primary reason for planned departure. The unsatisfactory economic situation in Tajikistan is cited as the second most important motivation for migration (30.7%). 17.6% believe that there are no prospects in Tajikistan either for themselves or for family members. Those in this last category are mostly ethnic Russians, educated women and persons with higher education and qualifications.

Table 1: Reasons for planned departure from Tajikistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with economic situation in Tajikistan</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is no future for me</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is no future for my family/children</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low wages</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am concerned by religious extremism in country</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Migration intentions of the Tajikistan population

Mobility of the Tajikistan population

The survey results indicate that the population of Tajikistan does not have significant migration intentions despite the huge volume of migration across its borders. Only 15.6% of those interviewed would like to leave Tajikistan. Of these 83% want to emigrate for employment abroad, 8.5% for permanent residence and 8.5% for educational purposes.

If we analyse the profiles of those with migration intentions we can see that men aged 16 to 29 with complete secondary, secondary special and incomplete higher education dominate. Students (30% of all interviewed students), unemployed people (31% of unemployed), construction workers (18.8%), traders (25%), service personnel (21.4%), university teachers, doctors and medical workers (16.7%) indicated the highest level of migration intentions. Inhabitants of GBAO (23.3%) and Sughd Region (19%) are the most mobile. Citizens of Dushanbe (17.8%) and Khatlon Region (17.1%) indicated a lower propensity to migrate. The populations of districts of republican subordination are less mobile - only 5% indicated an intention to migrate.

International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects

Migration goals

According to the survey data, potential migrants divide into three groups: 1) labour migrants, who are by far the largest, constituting 83% of all those who indicated migration intentions, 2) those who intend to emigrate permanently - 8.5%, and 3) those who intend to study abroad - primarily in Russia, Turkey, the USA and Germany - 8.5%.

Profiles of potential migrants

Gender. Migration intentions of Tajikistan citizens differ significantly by gender. For men, temporary labour emigration is most attractive. 91.7% of potential male migrants plan to leave Tajikistan for earnings, 2.8% for permanent residence, and 5.6% for educational purposes.

Half as many women as men intend to leave Tajikistan for earnings (54.5%), but almost ten times as many women as men expressed a desire to emigrate from Tajikistan permanently (27.3%). The number of Tajikistani women who would like to study abroad is more than three times higher than that of men - 18.2%.

Age. The survey explored significant age-specific differences in the migration intentions of Tajikistanis. Analysing the profiles of potential migrants by age, one sees a correlation between migration intentions and ages of potential migrants: the younger the potential migrants, the more often they chose temporary labour migration over moving to another country permanently. Among 16-19 year-old potential migrants, 91.7% would like to go for earnings, 8.3% would like to study abroad, while no respondents in this age group indicated that they would like to emigrate from Tajikistan permanently.

This stands in direct contrast to the age cohort of 50-59 year-olds, where the most popular response is permanent resettlement: two-thirds of potential migrants in this age group would like to go abroad for earnings, and one-third would like to resettle abroad permanently.

The largest percentage of respondents who would like to study abroad (14.3%) was found in the 20-29 age group. People in this age group plan to continue their education to raise their qualifications to a level not obtainable at home.

Education. There is a correlation between migration intentions and level of education. Respondents with secondary special, higher or incomplete higher education favour permanent emigration, testifying to a continuing "brain drain". Potential migrants with low levels of education prefer labour emigration and dream about a foreign education.

Employment. Employees of trade and service sectors expressed the greatest desire for permanent emigration. Members of other professions prefer temporary labour emigration.

Ethnic origin. Most differences in migration intentions clearly are related to ethnic origin. Tajiks prefer labour emigration (89% of potential Tajik migrants) and study abroad (9.6%); no Uzbek respondents wish to study abroad, but 8.3% of potential Uzbek migrants would like to move to other countries permanently.

Ethnic Russians significantly differ from other nationalities in their migration intentions. 85.7% of interviewed potential Russian migrants wish to move to Russia permanently and 14.5% plan to go to Russia temporarily for earnings.

Regional dimension. The survey revealed significant differences in migration intentions among populations of different regions of Tajikistan. Residents of Dushanbe are most motivated to move permanently and study abroad (25% of potential migrants from Dushanbe would like to emigrate, and 25% of potential migrants would like to get an education abroad). Residents of the capital city showed the lowest level of intention to migrate temporarily for work (50%).

The percentage of those who dream about foreign education is high in GBAO and DRS (16% in each). However, the overwhelming majority of potential migrants in these regions (85-86%) want to migrate for earnings, and there is no one who plans to move abroad permanently.
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The highest percentage of respondents who intend to migrate for work is observed in the Sughd and Khatlon Regions. A small number from these regions plan to move to other countries. No respondent in the Khatlon Region indicated a desire to study abroad. In the Sughd Region the number of people giving this response is also low (6.7% of potential migrants).

The wish to move abroad for permanent residence was expressed only by 1.1% of those interviewed, most of whom were ethnic Russians, educated women, people with high levels of education and qualifications. The preferred countries for resettlement are Russia, the US and Germany.

12.8% of survey respondents indicated a desire to work abroad. The desire for temporary labour migration absolutely dominates among men - primarily young Tajiks and Uzbeks in all regions of the country.

The desire to migrate abroad to obtain a foreign education was highest among young women living in capital city of Dushanbe, and to a lesser extent among young men - Tajiks in Dushanbe and GBAO. Ethnic Uzbeks and residents of Khatlon Region showed the least interest in migrating for educational purposes.

**Destination points.** The primary destination country for migrants is the Russian Federation; 89% of potential migrants would like to migrate to Russia. An insignificant number of migrants plan to depart for Kazakhstan, Germany, Ukraine and other countries.

---

### 3.3. Potential migrants’ preparation for departure

A high share of potential migrants (25.6%) indicates a desire to migrate but have not done anything to achieve this end. The largest percentage of potential migrants gathers information about the destination country, terms of moving, finding employment, housing, etc.

21.3% of potential migrants report they have completed preparations for departure. 5.3% are experienced labour migrants - seasonal workers who come home to their families for the winter months. 3.2% of respondents are saving money for their trip, and 1.1% is in the process of getting an external passport (from 1 January 2005 entrance to other CIS countries will be granted only to those holding external passports).

**Table 2: Extent of potential migrants’ preparation for departure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am collecting information in order to leave Tajikistan.</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I would like to live in another country but I do nothing in order to leave.</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am already going to leave Tajikistan.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have gone for earning for many years and I do not need information.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am collecting money for the trip.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I want to get an external passport.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses):</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 3.4. Informational awareness among potential migrants and Tajikistanis about migration

Potential migrants seldom approach state agencies or NGOs, preferring to gather information from friends, relatives, newspapers, radio and TV broadcasts. Only 13.8% of potential migrants have approached agencies for information concerning departure from Tajikistan, of which 39.8% approached the Tajikistan Ministry of Labour and Social protection. These are potential labour migrants who learned about the MLSP RT’s activities organizing labour migration from Tajikistan to Russia.

A small number of potential migrants approached the Russian Embassy in Dushanbe and Consulate in Khujand to find out how to receive Russian citizenship and move to Russia. One person approached the embassy of the USA. Only one person approached an NGO.
Informational awareness on migration

The most important source of information on migration for respondents is migrants who share information about their own experiences. The second most significant source of information is relatives who have been abroad or collect information about opportunities and terms of departure. Friends were a significantly smaller source of information. 3.1% of those interviewed had personal experiences with migration. Of the mass media, the most important information source is television (8.8%), then newspapers (3.1%) and radio broadcasts (2.6%).

Table 3: Information sources on life and work of migrants abroad, on opportunities and migration routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information sources on life and work of migrants abroad, on opportunities and migration routes.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TV broadcasts</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have lived there myself for several years.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Radio broadcasts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Information from private employment agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teahouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses):</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Preferred job abroad

Those wanting to work in do construction or repair (26.7%) formed the largest group of responses, although only 18.8% of potential migrants are construction workers by profession; demonstrating that many potential migrants are aware of the labour demand in destination countries. 24.3% of potential migrants are ready to accept any paying job, followed by those planning to engage in trade (13.1%). These numbers testify not only to the severe situation in the Tajikistan labour market, but also to a significant decline in the level of expectations that have occurred in post-Soviet Tajikistan.

Table 4: Preferred job abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Preferred job abroad</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Any paying job</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cleaning lady, street-cleaner, night guard, docker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medical facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Babysitter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intellectual labour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Waitress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Artist-designer, structural engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>According to profession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Agricultural worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses):</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a whole, Tajikistanis are well-informed about employment opportunities abroad and they assess the situation realistically. 86.2% of respondents indicated that labour migrants from Tajikistan are engaged in low qualified labour, an accurate assessment. Only 4% of those interviewed do not know what kind of work labour migrants from Tajikistan perform.

Table 5: Do you know where/in what field migrants from your country are working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low qualified labour</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Qualified labour</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Depends who gets what job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. Attitude of potential migrants and Tajikistan society as a whole to migration

The majority of respondents interviewed assess migration positively and see it as an instrument to address their problems. More than half of potential migrants (59.6%) assess their planned departure with optimism. However, 40% of potential migrants are unsure regarding the success of their upcoming trip.

Table 6: What do you think; will departure to another country positively affect you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a whole, the population of Tajikistan has a positive attitude towards international labour migration. 71.8% of those interviewed believe that is good to have a foreign labour force in Tajikistan. However, a significant group (28%) are against labour immigration to Tajikistan.

Table 7: What do you think; is it good that citizens of other countries work in our country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7. Money transfers

The results of the survey show that the population of Tajikistan has a low level of migration potential despite having a very high level of labour migration. Departure for earnings is seen as a necessary step for survival, not only for the individual, but for the family and all of society. Public opinion on money transfers testifies to this fact. 97.2% of respondents believe that those who have left Tajikistan for labour migration or permanent residence should support those left behind with remittances. Only 2.3% of respondents believe that migrants do not have to take care of relatives who remain in Tajikistan. Incomes from labour migration are main source of income for 81.7% of migrant households in Tajikistan.

Table 8: Do you think that migrants should send money/remittances to Tajikistan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the lack of legal mechanisms for currency transfer, migrants from Tajikistan were forced to carry their earnings with themselves or send the money via relatives and friends. This created a basis for criminal activity on railway transport and motorways, resulting in an unprecedented increase in corruption at customs, border protection bodies and law enforcement agencies. The lack of legal money transfer opportunities promoted dissemination of informal money transfers. By 2003, the Tajikistan government enacted new legislation to ease the financial and bureaucratic burden on migrants. The new money transfer system allows migrants to wire money to relatives in Tajikistan without holding current bank accounts; this contributed to the fact that in 2003-2004 more than half of labour migrants from Tajikistan were using banking services and refusing illegal financial institutes like “crossover” ("havola"). The improved money transfer system resulted in an increase of migrant money transfers from US$300,000 in 2001 up to US$ 256 million in 2003.

4. Labour migration. Main trends, directions, problems


Labour migration has always existed in the mountainous regions of modern Tajikistan and has been an integral part of the mountain community economy. Seasonal migration was eliminated during the Soviet period but restored again after the collapse of the Soviet Union, as people started to leave Tajikistan for earnings in 1992. Refugees played a major role in the formation of modern labour migration; during the civil war in 1992 Tajiks departed to other CIS countries seeking asylum, found employment and established a migrant network.

Labour migration peaked in 1999 and has since stabilized. Labour migration volumes started to decline in 2000 when the socio-economic situation improved and economic growth was seen in the country. A significant decline in labour migration was observed in 2003 when new Russian legislation on migration came into force, because Russia was the primary destination country for Tajik labour migrants.

4.2. Immigration of foreign labour into country

In 2003-2004 a total of 9,000 foreign workers were present in Tajikistan. During the first nine months of 2004, 6,000 foreigners left Tajikistan. These were mainly citizens of Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Turkey, and to a much lesser extent, India. There is a progressive increase of Chinese migration into Tajikistan. Many citizens of Afghanistan entered Tajikistan territory as refugees or asylum seekers and now live and work in Tajikistan.

Tajikistan has a problem with labour migration control. Despite current legislation, which requires MOI RT to issue residence, permits to foreigners, the latter do not approach MOI. As a rule, employers do not pay attention to the absence of such a document. These are usually illegal migrants from Uzbekistan who do not have entry visas and do not register with authorities. If MOI bodies subsequently detain these unregistered migrants, they discard their passports and hide out.

4.3. Emigration of labour force from country

In order to determine the total number of Tajikistan citizens who emigrated for temporary employment, the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population, together with local executive bodies (Hukumats), conducted a countrywide household survey in 2003. According to the results of the survey, 190,001 people went abroad for temporary employment at the time of the survey (August, 2003); a total of 347,556 people departed between the early 1990s through 2003. In contrast, an IOM interview with lawyer-consultant of the Tajik Railway Company.

14 Source: National Bank of Tajikistan.
17 Source: COBP.
18 Interview with Chief of labour market of Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of the Republic of Tajikistan.
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and “Sharq” Centre survey held in 2002-2003 showed the total volume of labour migration from Tajikistan to be 632,000 people.\(^{21}\)

The difference in these figures is the result of the weakness of external labour migration control and the different methodologies and approaches used.

According to many officials and experts, one problem that needs addressing urgently is what migrant groups are included in the term “migrant-worker”. The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population data (Survey 2003), IOM Report 2003 materials, and the results of the National Survey of Labour Migrants held by the “Sharq” Centre in February-March 2004 will be used in this chapter.

4.4. Time of planned stay abroad

Results of the September 2004 survey indicate that potential migrants from Tajikistan are tuned to temporary migration. 46.8% would like to live abroad for five years, 17% for one year, 12.8% do not define a specific time period, but are sure that their stay abroad, if it happens, will be temporary. Only 8.5% would like to emigrate from Tajikistan permanently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Time of planned stay abroad</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forever</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For 10 years</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For 5 years</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For three years</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For two years</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>For one year</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Annually for 7-9 months</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For several years</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. Profile of labour migration from Tajikistan

Prior to 2004, labour migration from Tajikistan was not officially controlled, which is why there is no statistically reliable data on the profiles of labour migrants. This gap, to a certain extent, is filled by sociological surveys, though statistics vary depending on the methodology used.

Men by far outnumber women among labour migrants, numbering as high as 94%. Labour migrants tend to be younger and work in manual labour and construction work, though middle-aged migrants tend to dominate in the more skilled, contract labour positions and among “shuttle traders”. Construction workers make up 51% of all labour migrants from Tajikistan. The rest work mostly in trade and in the service sphere (34%), petroleum and natural gas extraction, industrial enterprises (6%) and in agriculture (6%). The largest percentage of agricultural workers is aged 30-39, mostly peasants, who rent land and work for landlords in southern Russia and Kyrgyzstan.\(^{22}\)

The ethnic composition of migration flows corresponds to the ethnic composition of the Tajikistan population with the exception of the Uzbek and Turkish ethnic groups who travel abroad less frequently than do Tajiks. Tajiks predominate, with 88% of labour migrants. The education levels of labour migrants are rather higher than the level of Tajikistanis as a whole. Here respondents clearly divide into two groups: the first is larger and consists of youths with secondary, incomplete secondary education or less frequently - professional education. More than half of labour migrants (57%) fall into this category, and the overwhelming majority are youths who are on the labour market for the first time. The second group consists of respondents who are middle-aged and older, qualified workers and specialists with secondary and higher special education.

---

\(^{21}\) IOM, 2003, p. 20.

Surveys indicate the vast majority of migrants from Tajikistan (about 97%) travel to the Russian Federation for work, mostly to Moscow and Siberia. A very small number travel to Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, other CIS countries and the “far abroad”. Since 2001, seasonal migration from bordering regions of Tajikistan has started to expand to southern regions of Kazakhstan, where access to land is easier and taxes are lower. A smaller percentage of migrants from Tajikistan in Kyrgyzstan are “shuttle-traders”. During the last two years labour migration to Afghanistan has also increased as drivers, doctors, technicians, engineering personnel, translators/interpreters and other specialists from Tajikistan take part in the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

Labour migration to non-CIS countries is of limited character due to visa regimes, severe limitations on immigration and the lack of competitiveness of the Tajikistan labour force.

5. State migration policy, structures and legislation

5.1. State structures on migration management

Several governmental agencies in Tajikistan address issues related to migration, particularly labour migration. The Division of Employment and Social Protection is part of the Executive Apparatus of the President of the RT and manages internal and external issues of labour migration. This department coordinates the activity of different ministries and agencies in the field of migration. The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population of the Republic of Tajikistan works closely on all aspects of labour migration issues including the formation of state policy, legislative acts, issuing economic licenses to entities that assist migrants find jobs abroad and provide migrants with information.

The state migration service functions as a part of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population of the Republic of Tajikistan; it provides employment assistance, as well as professional education for potential labour migrants through a system of professional and technical colleges and training centres. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is charged with regulating labour migration through its consular service.

5.2. State migration policy in the Republic of Tajikistan

Article 24 of the Republic’s Constitution gives the citizen the right to free migration and choice of residence as well as the right to exit and re-enter the country. “The Conception of Labour Migration of the Residents of the Republic of Tajikistan Abroad” (adopted by the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, No. 242, June 9, 2001) affirmed that stimulation of labour migration is a main direction of Tajikistan state policy. This document acknowledges migration abroad to secure employment as a constitutional right given that the country is unable to provide employment for the population. The Conception is noteworthy in that the government acknowledges an unemployment level of 16.8%, and estimates that up to one-third of the employable population of Tajikistan may be subject to labour migration. The Conception also spells out measures and incentives to stimulate migration and states that Tajikistan labour migration policy should aim to prevent a growth of illegal and uncontrolled migration. In 2002 “The Programme of External Labour Migration of Tajikistan Citizens for 2003-2005” was adopted by the RT Government (No. 480, December 3, 2002), effectively putting The Conception into law.

In 2003 two very important policy documents were adopted regarding the labour market and employment: a) the programme on assistance to employment of the population, 2003-2005 dated March 4 2003, and b) The Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On Assistance to the Population’s Employment” dated July 16 2003. This programme has not been integrated with policies to stimulate external labour migration and considers only internal employment issues.

5.3. Legislation in the field of migration

A substantial amount of legislation regarding migration exists in Tajikistan. Much of this legislation relates to regulating labour migration for citizens of Tajikistan who travel abroad for employment. Tajikistan has also signed a number of regional and international documents regulating migration and defending the rights of migrants and their families, including the 1951 United Nations Convention on the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol.
A list of the most important laws, resolutions, amendments and agreements entered into by Tajikistan can be found in Attachment 1.

The principle of protection of a home labour market is taken into account in Tajikistan. According to the “Law on Migration”, quotas on immigration and employment are established annually by Presidential decree.

Employment, entrance and stay

The control over entrance of foreigners in Tajikistan is assigned to the Committee for border protection (COBP RT). Using the experience of some other countries, Tajikistan has adopted the use of migratory cards. Upon entrance to the country, each foreigner should complete a migratory card. Foreign citizens who take up residence in Tajikistan should register with law-enforcement bodies in their places of residence. Registration is a paid procedure. The migratory card is returned to border guards upon departure from the country. Foreign labour quotas in Tajikistan are established annually by the Decree of the President.

Legislation regulating labour emigration

According to the Law of the Republic of Tajikistan, “About Migration”, the state promotes labour migration only to countries where migrants’ rights are protected, where labour contracts are made with employers, and where all passports and visas are properly issued. The law calls for labour recruitment in the RT to be carried out only by physical and legal persons with special licenses issued by the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of the Population.

5.4. International cooperation

In May 1998, the Agreement “On Cooperation Between Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan in the Field of Labour Migration and Social Protection of Working Migrants” was signed. Similar agreements have been signed between Tajikistan and the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan and Belarus. The inter-governmental “Agreement on Labour Activity and Protection of the Rights of Citizens of Russia in Tajikistan and citizens of Tajikistan in Russia Between the Russian Federation and Republic Tajikistan” (October 18, 2004) was the result of long negotiations on the problem of illegal migration between the two countries. The federation of trade unions of Tajikistan entered into an agreement with the federation of trade unions of builders of Russia regarding the protection of Tajikistani builders in Russia. Now a similar Agreement with the builders’ trade union of Republic Kazakhstan has been developed.

Beyond the CIS, in October 2002, a bilateral cooperation agreement on employment, labour migration and professional training was signed with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Turkey.

5.5. State institutes and private agencies for employment assistance abroad

Potential migrants approach intermediary organizations and pay a fee for assistance with job placement, labour contracts, a physical examination (including testing for HIV and other infectious diseases) and insurance. Migrants’ data are entered into a special databank. Employees acquaint clients with legal and legal aspects of the work and on departure they give clients the phone numbers of the State migratory service of the Russian Federation and the representative of the Ministry of Labour of the RT in the Russian Federation. When a labour migrant “group” is formed, a firm representative accompanies the migrants to their destination in Russia (interview with the head of organization “Tojikkhorijakor”).

In 2002, 12,180 citizens of Tajikistan received employment through such intermediaries. In 2003 the activity of the recruiting agencies began to decrease; the heads of these agencies stated that new legislation in the Russian Federation had increased the cost and complexity of procedures for foreign workers. In 2004 three governmental and nine private organizations received licenses to facilitate job placement for labour migrants. The state recruiting structure is outdated. Two state agencies “Shughli Beruna” and “Tojikkhorijakor” work quite ineffectively. Private businesses are much more effective at job placement. (Interview with the national coordinator of the ILO programme on countering human trafficking in Tajikistan). Research has shown that only 0.8% of interviewed migrants were employed through the state structures.
6. Protection of the Rights of Migrants and Members of Their Families

6.1. Rights of migrants

Migration from Tajikistan to the CIS countries recently gained the status of international migration. The rise of sovereign states of the former USSR has been faster than the change in the mindsets of their citizens. As a result, migrants' rights have been violated by state bodies, employers and by xenophobic individuals; in addition, migrants themselves have committed many legal violations. Many problems are connected to the low legal literacy of migrants and a lack of information. Insufficient development of migration legislation in CIS countries and violations of human rights also plays a negative role. Xenophobic tendencies are expanding in migrant receiving countries, especially Russia.

6.2. Tajikistani attitudes on treatment of migrants in destination countries

More than half of the respondents believe that migrants are badly treated abroad. Very few believe that migrants are well-treated.

Table 10: Do you know how migrants are treated when they are abroad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Vulnerability of migrants from Tajikistan in destination countries

Migrants from Tajikistan are vulnerable to human rights violations whether they are moving abroad permanently, or working or studying abroad on a temporary basis. Migrants face abuse and racketeering at all stages of the migration process. The activities of illegal labour traffickers increase illicit migration. The complexity and high cost resulting from new migration legislation in the Russian Federation deters migrants from registering with the authorities. Thus, 26% of labour migrants in 2003 did not register in their destination countries. Knowing that the latter do not register, employers isolate workers to avoid undesirable contact with police. 23 69.9% of migrants reported that they did not go anywhere other than their place of work or where they resided. Labour migrants in construction and agriculture more often work in near-slavery conditions.

The high level of illegal employment among Tajik labour migrants is connected, firstly, with limited opportunity for legal employment that leaves most Tajik migrants to work in the shadow part of economy. Secondly, employment via legal labour contracts significantly reduces migrants' wages. Thirdly, migrants consciously wish to act beyond the control of official bodies. It is also important to note that labour migrants from Tajikistan do not trust state bodies. In 2003-2004 some 58.4% of labour migrants from Tajikistan worked based on oral agreements with employers. 24 Labour migrants view relations with law enforcement bodies as one of the main difficulties of working abroad. Most of the migrants who had routine problems with police (97%) worked in construction brigades or were individual construction workers. Construction workers tend to have the lowest level of education and qualifications, do not speak Russian and do not know the laws or customs of the host country. They seldom sign contracts with employers or register with authorities. This automatically makes them illegal migrants and gives grounds for local law enforcement agencies to detain and extort money from them, insult them with impunity, beat and murder them. A few "shuttle-traders" and traders occasionally complain that the police confiscate their money or some of their goods. Contracted workers experience police oppression less frequently than construction workers but more often than traders.

23 An interview with representative of MOI of the Republic of Tajikistan at MOI RF.
In 2002, some 91% of interviewed labour migrants stated that they constantly face problems with the police. Complaints about racketeering during document checks are most widespread and typically occur when workers use public transportation to and from their workplaces. The war in Chechnya has stimulated a rise of xenophobia and Islam phobia in Russia. For this reason Russian law enforcement officers hold Tajik migrants with suspicion. Representatives of law enforcement agencies often identify Tajiks with Chechens, prompting additional checks and arrests. The murder of Tajik migrants by fascist and nationalist groups in host countries also has been a tragic result.

6.4. Protection of migrants and their family members

In 2002-2003, in an effort to protect migrants, representatives of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of the Republic of Tajikistan began to operate in three cities of Russia - Moscow, Volgograd and Novosibirsk. Their functions included protecting the rights of labour migrants, providing consultative services to labour migrants regarding employment and offering assistance in employment contract negotiations. In 2004 representations of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of the Republic of Tajikistan also were established in St. Petersburg, Irkutsk and Ekaterinburg. Despite the existence of these representations, there exist no mechanisms to protect the rights of labour migrants in the host country. This is due to foot-dragging on the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements, as well as a lack of harmonization of legislation in these countries.

In 2004 a system of obligatory insurance was introduced for citizens departing abroad and for foreign citizens arriving to Tajikistan, provided by “Tojiksarmoyaguzor” insurance company.

Table 11: Who, in your opinion, should be responsible for the protection of migrants’ rights and those of their families?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sending country</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Receiving country</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International organizations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Migration agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses)</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 72 respondents refused to answer this question

Survey materials indicated that the population of Tajikistan believes that the primary responsibility for the protection of the rights of migrants and members of their family should be carried by their home country, i.e. Tajikistan. That is why migrants approach the Embassy of the Republic of Tajikistan and Tajik communities in host countries for protection.

Significantly fewer respondents believe that migrants can approach institutions and agencies in the host country in order to protect their rights. This is why Tajik migrants seldom approach the courts, complain to state and local administration bodies or join trade unions in the host countries where they work.

6.5. Illegal migration

The definition of “illegal migration” causes much confusion. Survey data indicate that many officials in Tajikistan do not have a clear understanding of what “illegal migration” is, or what qualifies as illicit migration in destination countries such as the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan. Public opinion reflects a similar lack of understanding. 56.4% of those interviewed responded that they do not know the definition of illicit migration while 43.2% can define this phenomenon.

Tajikistanis believe that the main causes of illicit migration are unemployment (20.7%) and the lack of opportunities to receive a decent salary for labour (27.8%). Another 17.8% of those interviewed believe

---
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that the cause of illicit migration in Tajikistan is low legal literacy among migrants; it is their lack of knowledge of their rights and responsibilities that promotes numerous violations and fraud. Other, less frequently cited reasons can be seen in Table 12 below.

**Table 12: Reasons for illicit migration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>People cannot find decent jobs to feed them and their families</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unemployment forces people to seek earnings illegally</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Migrants basically have a low level of knowledge and do not know their rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is cheaper to get employment illegally</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No permanent residence, no registration</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People are guilty themselves, they depart without documents and lose them</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Due to disorganization of our government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Corruption in all branches of power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not much choice of legal jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses):</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.6. Human trafficking**

**General trafficking trends**

Human trafficking as a phenomenon appeared in Tajikistan during the military actions of 1992-1997. However, since 1997 the incidence of women and children trafficking through fraudulent employment offers has started to increase. In these cases victims voluntarily agree to go abroad for work and then face exploitation upon their arrival in the destination country. This type of trafficking has become the most prevalent in Tajikistan, with victims being sent to the UAE, Gulf States, Turkey, Spain and Israel for sexual exploitation. The practice of using people for debt payment as hostages to Afghanistan has also emerged. Since 2001 human trafficking for forced labour has escalated and a rapid increase in this practice has been observed since 2002. The primary country for forced labour export is Russia, and to a lesser extent, Kazakhstan.

**6.7. Public opinion about trafficking and its organizers**

A large share of those surveyed in Tajikistan - 43.4% of those interviewed - have not formed a personal opinion about trafficking. The rest have varied information on the volumes and types of trafficking.

**Table 13: Public opinion about traffickers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>These are unprincipled people who can be of any age, gender or nationality, who fraudulently seduce girls, young women and men and take them abroad and trade them there.</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Basically these are Tajik women who fraud girls and young women, export them abroad and trade them.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men who trade children</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criminal groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drug dealers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Islamic extremists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Law enforcement structures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I do not know anything about them</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An increase in trafficking in recent years has raised concern both in society and in the Government of Tajikistan. The Republic of Tajikistan President, E. Rahmonov, has admitted the existence of human trafficking in Tajikistan, which has enabled legislative measures to be initiated: a draft Article 130 of the Criminal Code of Tajikistan on the introduction of criminal responsibility for human trafficking was included into the Criminal Code of Tajikistan and came into force on 1 August 2003. The law against human trafficking was adopted. A department on human trafficking within the MOI has been established. However, there are still many obstacles and difficulties that aggravate the struggle against human trafficking. The largest group of respondents (40.2%) believe that law enforcement agencies such as the police, the prosecutor's office and the department for combating organized crime are mainly responsible for the struggle against human trafficking. 28.1% believe that the primary responsibility in the struggle against human trafficking lies with government and state power bodies.

Protection of the rights of trafficking victims is the most sensitive issue in the struggle against human trafficking in Tajikistan. Tajikistan offers no asylum, no protection for witnesses and victims. Mass media and journalists perpetuate traditional gender stereotypes and endanger victims by revealing their actual names and occupations; moreover, they publish photos of victims and usually condemn them in publications.

Table 14: Who is responsible for the struggle against human trafficking?
(Up to three responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ministry of internal affairs, law enforcement bodies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ministry of internal affairs, law enforcement bodies</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The State</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The people, each individual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The President</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Educational institutions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>International Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>People must think for themselves and avoid falling prey to traffickers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Joint operations of States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Women traffickers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parents, who raised their children in bad way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (number of responses):</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IOM Programme on “Counteraction to Human Trafficking” was implemented in Tajikistan in 2001. Both government structures and NGOs take part in this IOM programme. A network of 17 NGOs is working to combat trafficking, to protect the rights of migrants, etc. The government of Sweden through SIDA funds the IOM Counteraction to Human Trafficking Programme.

IOM’s programme activity covers almost every aspect of the struggle against human trafficking, including the promotion of legislation and protection for victims of trafficking. The larger part of IOM’s activity is related to providing assistance to victims of trafficking. IOM established a resource centre for labour migrants in Dushanbe in December 2003. The centre provides free consultations for potential labour migrants on all aspects of labour migration, including information on the country of destination, its labour and civil legislation, order of entry and exit, obtaining visas, conclusion of labour contracts, medical, legal services for migrants, customs documents, protection of the rights of migrants, and rules for money transfers. Brochures and booklets prepared by IOM on issues of protection of the rights of migrants are distributed to visitors to the resource centre. The ILO started a two-year project on the struggle against trafficking and the protection of migrants’ rights in 2004.
7. Recommendations on policies to protect migrants’ rights

The above review of migration issues in contemporary Tajikistan and survey results reveal that while strides have been made to address migration problems in the country, there is much that can be done to improve existing migration structures and to protect migrants. The following recommendations are directed at generating discussion on improving the futures for migrants and their families in the Central Asian region.

- Develop mechanisms for practical implementation of laws regulating migration; improve enforcement of laws.
- Develop international cooperation within the CIS, EAEC; conclude multilateral and bilateral agreements on migration, agreements on social security and the protection of the rights of labour migrants.
- Cooperate with international organizations and scientific centres: IOM, ILO, OSCE, UNESCO, other international organizations, communities of experts and the mass media in the sphere of international migration studies.
- Establish employment vacancy databases, as well as data on workers and specialists both in departure and destination countries.
- Improve the legal literacy of migrants through training, information campaigns, and the production of brochures explaining the rights and responsibilities of migrants.
- Scientific research and publications on the problems of labour migration in Kazakhstan, Central Asia, Russia, the CIS; lessons from foreign experience.
- Study and create econometric models for estimating the economic efficiency of labour migrants’ activity in different spheres of the economy; an evaluation of social and political risks.
- Attract trade union organisations, organisations of Tajik communities in host countries, institutions of civil society (creation of NGOs and/or programmes on legal assistance to migrants, including by labour migrants themselves) for protection of their rights in host countries.
- Conduct personnel training in migration management.
- Regulate and control the activities of foreign employment agencies, establish labour exchanges.
- Create professional improvement centres for potential migrants, taking into account the needs of host countries, including foreign language training.
- Create centres for professional improvement of local personnel so that locals may replace foreign specialists; make this issue a condition of agreement with foreign companies.
- Promote awareness on migrant-workers and their problems; foster tolerance of migrants; prevent “xenophobia” and “phobia of migrants”.
- Improve migrant control systems for those who emigrate from Tajikistan as well as for those who immigrate to Tajikistan from other countries.

Recommendations to state agencies implementing control and management in the field of employment and migration:

- Develop a migrant services infrastructure.
- Liberalize the economy to encourage the creation of jobs, change tax policies and stimulate employment. Change customs legislation, benefits for encouraging technology import; industries that stimulate employment are needed.
• Exempt from VAT enterprises that create employment in the field of production.

• Develop labour skills to increase the qualification of potential labour migrants.

• The Government of the Republic of Tajikistan should be careful to avoid the introduction of controlling mechanisms on labour migration, which may eventually negatively affect the interests of migrants and money transfers.

• Assist in planning the economic activity of returned labour migrants. For example, stimulate professional or other associations.

• Establish a system of direct contacts with countries where migrants from Tajikistan work, to link labour force export with other forms of foreign economic or other relations. Create conditions for investing the foreign currency income of migrants into the Tajikistan economy, to provide settlement of returned migrants, including decent employment, allocation of land plots and sale of housing.

• The Fiscal and taxation policy of the Republic of Tajikistan should include functions to support the labour force export.

• Legal and financial education of migrants is needed.

• Legalize and stimulate properly operated intermediary agencies for foreign employment, in particular through taxation benefits.

• Strengthen state control on defending the interests (accumulation, transfers, deposits, property) of Tajik labour migrants, including via intermediary agencies.

• Precisely study the supply-demand system of the international labour force.

• Address the problems of illicit migration taking into consideration the interests of both sending and receiving countries on a fair and equal basis.

Recommendations to authorized banks:

• Improve the terms of money transfers and decrease bank commissions where needed.

• Develop transparency in all banking procedures for money transfers. Increase migrants' awareness on money transfers and legal knowledge of fiscal matters.

• “Agroinvestbonk” should provide migrants with information on its rules and rates for money transfers and the commissions of “Avtobank”, so that migrants can evaluate the “pros” and “cons” of money transfer.
### Main normative and legal acts of the Republic of Tajikistan on migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date of Adoption/ (Amendment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constitution of the Republic of Tajikistan</td>
<td>6 November 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conception of Labour migration of residents of the Republic of Tajikistan abroad, adopted by the Government of RT No. 242</td>
<td>9 June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State conception of migration Policy</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “On migration”</td>
<td>11 December 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decree of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan “On order of issuing licenses for activity on employment of citizens of the Republic of Tajikistan abroad and attracting foreign labour force into the Republic of Tajikistan” No. 608</td>
<td>25 July 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Decree of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan “On strengthening control over illicit migration in the Republic of Tajikistan” No. 554</td>
<td>2 April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan “On measures on putting labour migration processes into order” No. 595</td>
<td>30 December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan “On regulating issues of Labour Migration” No. 134</td>
<td>31 March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Law “On counteraction to human trafficking”</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Decree of the President of the Republic of Tajikistan “On order of issuing licenses for activity on employment of citizens of the Republic of Tajikistan abroad and attracting foreign labour force into the Republic of Tajikistan” No. 608</td>
<td>25 July 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EECA</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAEC</td>
<td>Euro-Asian Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLF</td>
<td>Foreign Labour Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Check Point (At the border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>United Nations Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>Republic of Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Republic of Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUz</td>
<td>Republic of Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMAR</td>
<td>Regional Centre for Migration and Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States, (former Soviet Republics, excluding Baltic states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (before 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMA</td>
<td>Federal Migration Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRG</td>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects

Attachment 3

Terms and Definitions

The following Terms and Definitions were used in this report:

According to the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its Resolution 45/158 of 18 April 1990, "The term "migrant worker" refers to a person who is to be engaged, is engaged or has been engaged in a remunerated activity in a State of which he or she is not a national." On this basis, the International Labour Organization (ILO) gives its own definition of labour migrant:

Labour migrants are the persons admitted by a country, which is not the country of their origin, with a definite goal for performing economic activity.

Within this general definition of labour migrant there are several different types of labour migrants:

(a) Seasonal migrant-workers are persons working in a country other than their country of origin during part of the year, because the character of work performed is dependent on seasonal conditions.

(b) Working migrants, working on contract or for a wage are persons working in a country that is not their country of origin on a contract agreement that imposes limits for the time and type of employment performed by the migrant.

(c) Temporary working migrants are persons admitted to a country that is not their country of origin, for performing, during a limited period of time, a certain occupation or specific work. Temporary working migrants may change employers and renew their working permit without leaving the country of employment. This ILO category, to a certain extent, has something in common with the category underlined in the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families as "a migrant worker who is engaged in a remunerated activity other than under a contract of employment and who earns his or her living through this activity normally working alone or together with members of his or her family, and to any other migrant worker recognized as self-employed by applicable legislation of the State of employment or bilateral or multilateral agreements."

This is the most popular migrant category in labour migration from Tajikistan. Shuttle-traders are also included in the category of working migrants other than those under contract of employment.

There are very many different opinions as to whether commercial or trade migration or "shuttle" trade are types of labour migration. Let us consider the question of "What is a 'shuttle-trader'?" at large:

(d) A shuttle-trading migrant, a migrant taking part in "shop-tours", a "shop-tourist", or a "shuttle-trader" is a person whose commercial activity is connected to routine departures from, and arrivals to his state of habitual residence. The frequency and duration of trips are subject to variation. The main goal is to earn profit. "Shuttle-traders" use interregional and interstate price differentiations, and the availability or deficit or overstock of goods in certain regions. On the basis of the above-mentioned, one can see that "shuttle-traders" or "shop-tourists" are subject to the Convention in terms of a "worker who is engaged in a remunerated activity other than under a contract of employment". As a rule modern research on labour migration considers "shuttle-traders" in this capacity.

(e) Settled working migrants are working migrants who, after few years of stay in the country of employment, are granted a permit for residence and work without any limitations. Settled working migrants are not required to leave the country of employment when they do not have job, and usually they have right to reunite with family members after meeting some requirements related to employment and living standards.

---

28 Convention, p. 35.
29 See Migration of population. 2001, p. 5.
**Illegal migration.** In CIS countries the definition of illegal or illicit migration causes much discussion. Deviations in the interpretation of this term are based on differences in both legislation and practices. Legal migrants, who are foreigners, must have the following permits: for entry into a state, for staying within it for definite time, and for employment activity. If one of these is missing, the migrant is considered as illegal. Tajikistan has a visa-free regime with a number of states that attract Tajik labour migrants (e.g. the Russian Federation). Citizens of Tajikistan enter into Russia legally. However, there are many illegal migrants among labour migrants from Tajikistan. Sometimes they violate registration rules. More often they do not have labour contracts and insurance policies. The latter violations are related to labour market peculiarities within the CIS. Despite the efforts of states on regulating labour relations, the labour market in CIS countries still remains mostly a "shadow" market. Illegal employment is as popular among its “own” citizens as it is among labour migrants. Though, certainly, there are more illegal workers among labour migrants, because they are forced by employers to accept such employment more than the country's own citizens. Many officials in Tajikistan, contrary to Russian officials, believe that definition of “illegal worker” is not identical to “illegal migrant”. That is why in this case we suggest using either “illicit migration” or the ILO definition: “Migrants with unregulated status are persons in a state of which they are not nationals, who do not meet the requirements and terms set by this State on entrance, stay or economic activity on the territory of this State.”

---
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International Migration in Kyrgyzstan; Levels and Trends Revealed by Existing Data

Ms. Ludmila Torgasheva
Head, Demographic Statistics Department
State Committee of Statistics, Kyrgyz Republic

Ms. Torgasheva presented the demographic and migration scenarios in Kyrgyzstan, explained data sources, processing, methodologies and analysis. The following is the text from her power-point presentation:

Demographic Situation in Kyrgyzstan

As of January 1, 2005: Current population: 5,120,00 people

- Urban population 35%
- Rural population 65%

Target group and methodology

Ministry of Internal Affairs - National Statistics Committee is given raw data in the form of statistical focus by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIA) in compliance with Kyrgyz law;
NSC - data collection and processing, data analysis and dissemination;
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) - policy elaboration in the field of migration.

Data Analysis

Demographic situation;
International migration (immigrants/migrants);
Labour migrants.
Rate of population growth, %

Age and gender pyramid - population of Kyrgyzstan

Beginning of 2005
Annex XII  International Migration in Kyrgyzstan; Levels and Trends Revealed by Existing Data

**Birth Rate**

Number of births per 1000 people

**Fertility rates**

Number of live births per woman, ages 15-49
Urban and rural international migration rates

Number of departures per 1000 people

International Migration - arrivals by nationality, 2004

- Russians 47.2%
- Kyrgyz 22.0%
- Tajik 1.7%
- German 1.9%
- Kazakh 2.2%
- Ukrainians 4.9%
- Tatars 3.9%
- Others 10.3%

Uzbek 5.9%
According to calculated data, international labour migrants number up to 350,000 people.
Labour migrants by age group

Labour migrants by educational level

Percent of total labour migrants, by gender
Demands/Challenges

Lack of migrant registration: migrants leave country for indefinite periods without registration or appropriate documents;
Need for the introduction of migration cards.

Results

Increased population growth rate, and an increase in urbanization;
Changing ethnic and age population structure;
Development of external labour migration processes.

Recommendations

Regulation of migration flows;
Improve economic situation to reduce labour emigration;
Solve problem of teenage unemployment.

Future prospects and UNESCO's role

Conduct conferences/workshops on international migration, international consent and stability in the region;
Facilitate information exchange between conference/workshop participants;
Create a permanent working group on migration issues.
1. Introduction

Migration processes in the Republic of Tajikistan over the past few years have gone through several important changes and they continue to change under the pressure of political and social and economic reforms. These changes have different influences on migration processes on different levels of development. There also is a reverse connection - migration influences the social and economic situation in the country: living standards and the welfare of the population, the labour market and employment levels. Also it influences demographic dynamics in terms of the qualitative and quantitative features and structure of the population.

Post-independence economic trends resulted in an increase in migration. In addition to internal migration, international migration has also increased.

International migration is a new phenomenon for the republic. There are many reasons for it.

Economic problems in the transitional period have influenced the increase of population's outflow across Tajikistan's borders. From 1991-1997 political instability and economic decline caused out-migration from the country. In subsequent years (1997-2004) migration was connected to employment, low income and education. These days Tajikistan is experiencing emigration mostly for the purpose of returning to one's native land, reuniting with family members and temporary labour migration. This is confirmed by statistical data and research.

2. Methods of Data Collection, Registration and Legislation

The Tajikistan State Statistics Committee systematically collects and summarizes data on migration, both internal and external, taking into account current laws:

Legislation and Data Collection:

- Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “About migration” (11 December 1999, No. 882), where definitions of migration, immigration and emigration are given. Subjects of migration are persons, moving legally for residence, for a period of more than six months.

The law does not differentiate between short-term and long-term migration.

In Tajikistan the following methods are used to derive information on International Migration:

- Current registration.
- Research, surveys, data comparison from different sources.
- Population census data.

Current registration is based on specially elaborated statistical registration forms for data collection.

Information about permanent emigration of the population is collected via registration cards distributed upon arrival (or departure) and organized during the registration permit process by internal affairs services. Statistical cards allow data collection on arrivals and departures, calculated by region, and a number of social and demographic features (gender, age, nationality, country of departure/arrival, etc.). Statistics on international migrants also are derived from statistical reports on visa issuance and departure/arrival permits.
Statistical reports on refugees and forced migrants have been produced since 1993; they show data on the number of citizens registered in the state migration survey books and corresponding region of residence - country (region), where they used to live. Statistical control is carried out using forms:


Since 2000 Tajikistan has registered international tourism and business trips that are conducted (foreign citizens arriving in Tajikistan, and Tajikistan citizens departing abroad). Statistic control is conducted using forms:

- No.4-int. (Incomes and expenditures) “Incomes (currency income) of foreign citizens, connected with departure of citizens abroad.”

Statistical control of labour migration abroad has been conducted since the year 2000. Every six months the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population of the Republic Tajikistan carries out a statistical control of labour migration. The following forms are used:

- Report No. 1T (migration) “Report on the quantity and structure of Tajikistan citizens migrating for work abroad.”
- Since 1994 labour migration form No. 9C “Report on gender and age structure of the rural population.” The report is presented by the Jamoaty Dehot (rural administration) once every two years.

The following categories are included on labour migration statistical control forms: gender and age structure, educational level, profession, receiving country (for Republic citizens) and sending country (for foreign citizens to Republic of Tajikistan), type of employment, and other issues.

For registration of the foreign labour force, the following forms of reports were confirmed in Tajikistan by recommendation of the CIS Statistical committee:

- No. 2T (migration) “Report of the quantity and structure of the foreign labour force”;
- No. 3T (migration) “Report of enterprises, organizations and establishments, about the quantity and structure of the foreign labour force.”

According to Article 14 of the Law of the Republic of Tajikistan “About migration” (10 May 2002) quotas for immigration and foreign labour in the Republic of Tajikistan each calendar year are set by the President of Tajikistan and presented to the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan.

Research on the living standards of the population and labour force are conducted to obtain more detailed information on labour migration.

According to the Decree of Republic of Tajikistan Government “About labour migration allotments for citizens of the Republic of Tajikistan.” (6 June 2003 No. 264) a migration card system was implemented from January 1, 2004, and migration statistics are collected based on the presentation of this card.

The Tajikistan population census of 2000 polled persons temporarily living in the republic in addition to residents. The questionnaire included questions about citizenship, foreign citizens, refugees, temporary residency in the territory of Tajikistan and from what year they have lived in Tajikistan. Foreign citizens (persons without citizenship), permanently living abroad, but located in Tajikistan on the date of the census with purpose of finding a job, on a business trip, studying or international tourists.
3. Analysis of International Migration Data

In 2003 5% of the population participated in migration turnover, as described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Analysis of Reasons for migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists (including shuttle business) private visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (reunion with family, return to motherland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour migrants, registered in employment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour migrants without necessary departure documents (inspections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour migrants from rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees having this status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Census - 2000
- Number of foreigners living in Tajikistan: 11591
- Number of refugees: 3672

Tourism, business trips. International tourism is not sufficiently developed in Tajikistan. The number of foreign tourists arriving in Tajikistan every year is less than 1,000. Tourist trips for Tajikistan citizens are mostly shuttle trade business and trips to the United Arab Emirates; the number of tourists fluctuates from 20 to 3,000 people per year. The number of Tajikistan citizens going abroad for business is about 2,000 people per year.

The government has started to pay attention to tourism development. A national program for tourist industry development for 2004-2009 has been elaborated.

Permanent migration of the population (for changing residence, study, reunion with family, moving to motherland). It is difficult to isolate these reasons separately in reports, as motivations are often linked. The main reasons for leaving are: change of residence, reunion with family, moving to motherland. The number of people who depart for study is about 5% of the number of emigrants (about 500-600 people).

During the past few years the trend towards permanent migration was characterized first by an intensive increase, then by a decrease in migration. In general, outflow was observed from large industrial cities, where the percentage of non-titular nationalities was high. Migration turnover in the beginning of 1990s was 1-2% of the population (more than 100,000 people per year). Migration movements have led to stable negative growth.

Stabilization of the political situation helped reduce permanent migration in subsequent years. Outflow from the republic weakened, and now about 0.2% of the population (10,000 people) participates in out-migration. Migration outflow in 2003 was 8,800 people.

During these years, migration has changed the quantity and structure of the country's population.

The largest share (about 99.7%) of migration is to CIS countries. Immigration and emigration to foreign countries (outside the CIS) has almost stopped. In the beginning of the 1990s migration outflow to these countries was 6-10,000 per year; in 2003 the number was fewer than 50 people. The main flow of emigrants from Tajikistan (over 60-80%) was to Germany, Israel and the USA.
Labour migration. The reduction of permanent emigration volumes for change of residence in recent years, together with the decrease of living standards in the republic has given rise to temporary labour migration of Tajikistan citizens abroad for periods of three months up to one year. According to IOM criteria this kind of migration is categorized as long-term migration. International labour migration is the most important in terms of volume, and results in employment growth in the receiving republics, a decrease of unemployment in the country and a rise in living standards.

It is necessary to constantly statistically control this phenomenon, as it influences social and economic development in sending and receiving countries. Special attention is paid to this issue. Registration methodology for this kind of migration, however, has not been fully elaborated. Much attention is paid to this problem in the Republic of Tajikistan. During the last few years a “Conception of external labour migration of the Republic of Tajikistan” was elaborated by resolution of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan (from 3 December 2002, No. 480). In addition, the “Program of external labour migration of Republic of Tajikistan citizens for 2003-2005” was confirmed. A number of resolutions of the Government of Republic of the Tajikistan were adopted, including “About the administration of the registration order for external labour migration of Tajikistan citizens” (6 June 2003, No. 264), and “About the regulation of labour migration issues for Republic of Tajikistan citizens” (30 December 2001, No. 595).

Only 2,000-2,500 people migrate legally for temporary employment. In fact, the number of labour migrants is much higher than those registered. Inspections show that about 200,000-350,000 people take part in external labour migration, most of whom (95%) are working-aged men. According to research data on living standards conducted by the World Bank in August-September 2003, the number of citizens moving for work abroad for three months or longer was 208,000 (3.1%). The main flow of external labour migration is to the Russian Federation. Data of the labour force inspectorate conducted in July - August place the number of labour migrants going to Russia at 318,000. According to migration card registration data, this number is greater than 400,000 people. Also it is necessary to note that labour migration has a seasonal character - in the winter it numbers about 200,000 people, while in the summer - 350,000 to 400,000 people. On January 1, 2004 about 140,000 people from rural areas were living abroad as labour migrants.

Refugees. Migration survey data shows that the number of refugees in the Republic at the beginning of 2004 was 2,000; all of them citizens of Afghanistan. This figure is 2.5 times lower than that of 1998.

According to the Tajikistan population census, 9,400 foreign citizens and 2,300 persons without any citizenship live in the republic.

4. Challenges and Problems

Research on international migration is new for the Republic of Tajikistan and at present statistical registration using UN recommendations has not yet been elaborated; this is why:

1. Migration legislation in some areas deviates from UN definitions. For example, the definitions for short-term versus long-term migrant are absent.

2. No registration exists for certain categories of international migrants as recommended by the UN (study and internship, residence by contract, free residence, work in international organizations).

3. Current registration data does not always show the true international migration situation. Inspections are needed.
5. Conclusions and Proposals:

International migration in the Republic of Tajikistan is now developing intensively and will continue to grow. Tajikistan is a country of emigrants. For this reason it is necessary to:

1. Improve the legal base.
2. Improve the methodology of registration.
3. Use the experience of other countries.

6. Recommendations:

1. It is necessary to conduct meetings and workshops for supervisors to exchange experiences on improving methodology for statistical registration for Central Asian republics.
2. Issue special statistical collections or bulletins on international migration.

7. Future Prospects and UNESCO's Role:

1. Organize regional workshops on international migration issues for different levels of specialists.
2. Promote new methodology for registration and analysis of international migration, (including research conducted by IOM).
3. Organize short-term courses on international migration issues.
Uzbekistan’s indigenous population is characterized by low population mobility, especially with regard to international migration. During the Soviet period this feature was reinforced by the “Iron Curtain” and a “closed door” state policy for indigenous nations in the former Soviet republics.

During the Soviet period, migration processes were best defined as a “one way street”. As part of the Soviet colonization process, Uzbekistan and the other Central Asia republics were subjected to large immigration flows compared to the other Soviet republics. Large numbers of Russians, Tatars, Ukrainians and Jews were relocated to the Central Asian republics; in addition, whole nations were forcibly resettled here including Koreans, Germans, Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks, Chechens and others.

Uzbekistan began to experience out-migration in the second half of the 1970s. This process gradually increased, peaking in 1990, when the state’s officially registered negative migration balance reached almost 140,000 people. After 1990 it began to decline, except in 1994 when the country again showed a negative migration balance.

Until the end of the 1980s migration from Uzbekistan was confined to the Soviet Republics. Migration abroad was extremely low. During these years on average, 100,000-150,000 people left the country and an almost equal number arrived.

The years 1989-1990 saw a peak of population movement in Uzbekistan. During these two years alone about 400,000 people migrated to/from the country, according to official data. The negative balance of migration was 233,700 people, including 34,100 to foreign countries.

After the collapse of the USSR the migration situation in Uzbekistan changed radically. An outflow of Russian-speaking and other ethnic groups began to leave, while Uzbeks from neighboring Central Asian republics arrived.

The current negative external migration balance in Uzbekistan is mostly the result of the departure of European nationalities. Between the years 1991-1999 the outflow of Russians from urban areas totaled 356,800; Ukrainians - 32,300; Jews - 55,500; Germans - 22,600; and Tatars - 108,000. Between 1990-2004 more than 1.7 million people left Uzbekistan and about 540,000 arrived, creating a negative migration balance of approximately 1.2 million people.

At present, Uzbeks mostly migrate within the CIS: Russia, Ukraine, and neighboring Central Asia countries. Russia receives 50.9% of all migrants, Ukraine - 12.9%, Kazakhstan - 10.9%, and other Central Asia countries - 13.2%. Other CIS countries received 8.4% of the total number of migrants. Correspondingly, 62.0% of Uzbekistan’s total negative migration balance consisted of citizens who left for Russia, 20.4% to Ukraine and 15.8% to other countries. The majority of migrants are ethnic Russians, Tatars, Jews and Crimean Tatars. Meskhetian Turks, Greeks and Germans also have moved. Jews migrated to Israel, Germans, to Germany, Greeks to Greece and Russians to Russia.

Over the last several years out-migration of Russian-speaking population groups from Uzbekistan has declined. In fact, a process of “return migration” of the population has been observed. The “Ijtimoiy Fikr” Centre for Public Opinion Research researched the issue of remigration and revealed the reasons for this phenomenon.

It was noted that return migrants listed the following reasons for their return to the republic: unsolved social, economic and other problems (60.0%); economic instability in Russia and in regions where migrants tried to settle (17.0%); family divisions over whether to leave Uzbekistan (8.0%); problems finding employment in the new place of residence (6.0%); health (2.0%) and negative attitudes of those in the receiving country (2.0%).

Since independence internal migration and temporary migration for work or study have declined. The outflow of Russian speaking people from cities has led to a fall in the country’s urban population.
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Improving Migration Statistics through Methods, Standards and Analysis

Mr. Yerbolat Mussabek
Deputy Head of Department of Statistics, Kazakhstan Statistics Agency

Prior to independence, due to the policies of development of migrants and the years of industrialization (1954-1967) there was a net of Immigration to Kazakhstan of 1.6 million people. From 1968-2004 the Republic faced a negative migration balance. During this period net emigration was 4.8 million people.

After independence in 1991, Kazakhstan started facing social transformation processes, creating more opportunities for various ethnic groups to return to their ethnic countries. As in other CIS countries, the size, trends and nature of migration have changed sharply in Kazakhstan. The tendency for a negative balance in migration was growing.

However, since 1995 (except for 1997) the number of people leaving Kazakhstan decreased. As a result, the negative balance fell to 8,300 in 2003 and the migration rate was minus 0.6 per every 1,000 people.

In 2004, for the first time in 36 years, the country had a positive migration balance of 2,789 people. Also in 2004, the number of emigrants decreased 2.5 times, and the number of immigrants increased to 26,999 people or 1.6 times compared to 1999. Of this number 22,370 people came from other CIS countries. Immigrants from the CIS make up 90.5-95.5% of Kazakhstan’s total number of immigrants.

During this period the number of emigrants declined to 99,417 people, or by 2.5 times. Of the total number of people who left the country, 66-74.9% emigrated to other CIS countries.

In general, from 2003 the Republic has experienced a positive migration balance with other CIS countries. With individual countries such as Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, the balance remains negative.

The highest migration inflow is from Uzbekistan, with 58% of the total number of immigrants from the CIS; another 30% are from Russia. In 1999 the trend was reversed, with 67.7% from Russia and 18.3% from Uzbekistan. Emigration is mainly to Russia, it is the destination of 94.2% of the total number of emigrants to CIS countries (in 1999 this figure was 90%).

Of countries outside the CIS, Kazakhstan has a positive migration balance with China, Mongolia, Turkey, Iran, and a negative balance with Germany, the US, Canada and Israel. Of those coming into the country, 53.4% immigrated from China, 24.8% from Mongolia and 11.8% from Germany (in 1999 these figures were 7.8%, 23.5% and 27.3%, respectively). Of those who left Kazakhstan for countries outside the CIS, 92.6% went to Germany (in 1999 this figure 91.4%).

By level of education, most migrants possess a general secondary education, their share among immigrants and emigrants (older than 15 years) is 47.8% and 36.4% respectively (in 1999, 34.6% and 33%), migrants with secondary special education numbered 25.3% and 29.5% (27.7% and 30.6%), migrants with higher education - 12.7% and 16% (13.9% and 12.3%) and people with incomplete higher education, 3% and 4.4% (8.7% and 4.8%).

The share of married people among immigrants and emigrants is 57.9% and 52.4% respectively (older than 15 years), never married: 33.9% and 33%, widowed: 4.4% and 8%, and divorced: 3.7% and 6.6%.

In 2004, of the number of immigrants from outside of Kazakhstan, the highest share was Kazakhks, numbering 69% (in 1999, 26.4%), Russians 18.2% (48.6% in 1999), and Germans 1.3% (3.4% in 1999). The number of Kazakh immigrants has increased by 4.3 times compared to 1999.

Of the number of people leaving Kazakhstan, the share of Russians was 59.7% (in 1999, 55.4%), Germans 18% (20%), Kazakhs 5.2% (5%). The number of German emigrants has decreased by 2.8 times and the number of Russians by 2.3 times compared to 1999.

In 2004 the share of working-aged immigrants and emigrants was 73.4% and 71.8% (in 1999, 71.5% and 67.5% respectively). All in all in 2004 there were 100 immigrants of working age per 94 emigrants of the same age category, whereas in 1999 there were 377 emigrants for 100 immigrants.
Dear participants, I also would like to repeat that we move on from the perception of migration as a problem, to seeing migration as part of the solution to the problems of this region.

It is obvious that policy should be based on facts; on the other hand, we have objective difficulties when designing policies for thematic areas where the facts are not generally known. Countries have to design policies against human trafficking or drug trafficking but often cannot base these policies on many hard facts, because the reality is hidden and criminals do not publish statistics of their activities.

Similarly, when we discuss labour migration, we often depend upon estimates. IOM has commissioned research on labour migration issues and has recently published a study “Labour Migration in Central Asia, the Russian Federation, Afghanistan and Pakistan”, currently available in Russian, as part of its regional project “Dialogue and Technical Capacity Building in Migration Management in Central Asia and Pakistan” funded by the European Commission. IOM has also submitted, two months ago, a new project proposal under the European AENEAS budget line that proposes the publication of a semi-annual report on labour migration in Central Asia, based on statistics but also on sociological research, and the discussion of these reports in meetings with representatives from the Statistics Agencies and the Ministries of Labour in the region, and with scientists and experts. The intention would be to develop together a monitoring tool for legal and irregular labour migration in the region that could assist governments in their tasks to design labour migration policies.

While IOM has been implementing projects to build capacity in migration management in the CIS countries for about eight years, I have to observe that many problems remain unsolved. I will be glad for feedback and advice on how we could improve our work to improve the situation.

I would like to raise six points where I see problems and a need for improvement:

1. **Freedom of movement is a basic human right, but it is not respected fully in Central Asia.**

   Freedom of movement is defined, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, as the right to take residence within your own country, to leave any country including your own, and to return to your country. Unfortunately, this freedom is still not fully respected in certain countries of Central Asia: in some capitals “propiska” (registration) is denied to citizens arriving from the countryside, and exit visas are needed to leave certain countries. The media speak about “internal illegal migrants”. Under such circumstances, where the labour market in the capital is closed to the majority of the national population, people tend to look for work in order to improve their income, and because they don’t believe that freedom of movement exists, they ask for the services of intermediaries who can be smugglers, or even worse - traffickers that can sell them into slavery.

2. **Governments have not understood the full importance of labour migration:**

   Worldwide, including in Central Asia, the remittances of labour migrants are higher than official development aid. A country that has understood the economic importance of labour migration is the Philippines, a country that sends over 900,000 labour migrants abroad every year, legally, with work contracts and insurance. Last autumn IOM organized a visit to the Philippines, with a governmental delegation from all over Central Asia. An important piece of advice from the Filipino government was to put labour migration high on the agenda of sending countries, as is done by the President of the Philippines when she travels abroad.

   Sending and receiving countries in the migration space of Central Asia, Kazakhstan and Russia, have not taken labour migration seriously enough. When Presidents meet, they do not talk enough about labour migration. Labour migration remains weakly managed in sending countries - sometimes by private recruitment agencies that do not guarantee the rights of workers abroad, and are not, or insufficiently supervised by governments, or in another country of the region by a governmental agency that has a monopoly for legal labour migration but finds legal work for less than 1% of labour migrants. The lack of
lawful working opportunities does not stop labour migration, but creates opportunities for situations of
exploitation, or even slavery and strengthens the shadow economy. Employers and workers pay no
taxes; workers have no insurance, and in a situation where they have no protection, may also feel less
responsible for the quality of their work.

My request to the governments of the region is therefore to legalize labour migration in the common
migration space constituted by Central Asia and the Russian Federation.

3. Over-regulation.

When discussing solutions to problems, Governments and Parliaments usually believe that there is a
need for new laws and regulations. A few years ago, IOM Almaty made an attempt to analyze the
migration-related legislation of Kazakhstan, and found that there are 232 laws, by-laws and regulations
that at least partly refer to migration, and there are contradicting rules. Therefore, it would probably
make sense to collect and analyze the existing legislation, and to start reducing contradictions that
exist between laws, between the laws and the Constitution, between laws and international
obligations, and between laws and by-laws. In the field of labour migration, the government could
consider opening up certain sectors of the economy - for instance agriculture, not attractive for the
local population - but for foreign workers. But in order for foreign workers and national employers to
choose the legal options, it is important not to introduce procedural obstacles to prevent legal labour
migration from becoming a difficult bureaucratic process; otherwise the objective of reducing illegal
labour migration will never be reached.

4. Central Asian borders are becoming iron curtains, but this doesn’t stop the influence of criminal
groups on border management.

In spite of the intentions of governments to establish or re-establish a space for the free movement of
goods, capital, services and persons in Central Asia or Eurasia, Central Asian borders have become
increasingly similar to the Iron Curtain that divided East and West during the Cold War: houses are
demolished along the border, double fences and watchtowers erected. Why is this happening? Because
people are used to being able to cross borders anywhere, because these borders previously did not
exist. Certainly it is correct to expect that persons cross borders at checkpoints. But sometimes, it is
the reduction of the numbers of checkpoints and the harassment from law-enforcement agencies that
motivate people to use the services of smugglers, and because these smugglers pay the law-
enforcement agencies more than they receive as salary from their government, they de facto manage
certain borders in Central Asia. IOM has been implementing projects on improving border management
and never fails to repeat that governments must try to find the right balance between control and
facilitation, and that rational border management includes both elements.

5. Human trafficking and slavery have become a common practice.

IOM has been assisting hundreds of trafficking victims by helping them to return home and by providing
medical, psychological, financial and legal assistance to them upon their return. IOM has also been
promoting changes in the legislation to make it possible to punish all those involved in the crime of
trafficking, and to protect victims from being considered illegal migrants. Through contact with this
reality, IOM has been able to see that in over 90% of cases involving victims from Central Asia, the
traffickers are not punished for their crimes.

6. Access to Proper Documents.

It also seems to be a general rule that persons without valid identity or travel documents can be
detained and exploited without major risk, as they are systematically denied access to the protection
guaranteed by the legislation, both because they are unable to immediately prove their identity, and
because their witness reports will not be recognized as proof. It is possible to force persons into
slavery-like situations by taking away their identity papers or by declaring that they are not in order.
Growing social stratification also contributes to a new reality, where the equality of persons before the
law is not guaranteed. Government work-plans against human trafficking have not, until now, brought
any fundamental changes.

IOM proposes to address the mentioned challenges in a project proposal called “Steps to Improve
Migration Management in Central Asia” recently submitted to the European Commission.
Labour Migration from the Central Asian States to
The Sverdlovsk Oblast of Russia

Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova,
Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population, Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow

The objective of this presentation is to provide some data and analysis from Russian statistics and recent research on labour migration from the Central Asian countries to Russia. According to official statistics, labour migration to Russia has increased from 129,000 people in 1994 to 366,000 persons in 2003. However, the share of migrants from the CA countries is small; and hardly exceeds 10% of total migrant workers.

Table 1: Foreign workers in Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand people</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of the Foreign Worker Force (FWF) in Russia</td>
<td>399.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign workers from the CIS countries in Russia</td>
<td>204.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Committee of the CIS.

The official statistics report only about 10% of the real number of labour migrants, which, according to estimates is between 3 and 5 million people, of which not less than 1 million people are from the Central Asian countries.

More results, from a selective survey of labour migrants from the CA countries, are provided for the Sverdlovsk oblast of Russia. The survey was conducted by the Regional Centre for issues of migration and refugees (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan) under the support of OSCE (Warsaw). Respondent selection was based on random sampling, taking into account the approximate characteristics of the general aggregate of labour migrants from CA in the region.

According to the survey data, more than 80% of migrants from CA arrived in Russia for the first time after 2000. On average, during the period 2000-2003 migrants spent 7-8 months a year in Russia. Thus, labour migration for many families in CA turned into a long-term strategy for survival. On the whole, this strategy becomes efficient for migrants themselves.

Migrants are mainly inclined to stay in Russia temporarily to provide for their families, while 17% are oriented towards future permanent residency in Russia and 6% will not leave. Among the labour migrants from CA, today obviously the titular nationalities of the departure countries prevail: Tajiks predominate (more than 40%), while the Kyrgyz and Uzbeks make up 26% and 29% of migrants respectively.

The majority of migrants have higher and incomplete higher education (42% and 43% respectively). Only 24% of the migrants are professionally educated (16% - higher specialized, 8% - finished and unfinished higher education). The migration influx from Kyrgyzstan is one of the most educated - 36% of migrants are professionally educated and 11% have higher education.

Among the survey respondents 33% were women and 67% men. The most gender balanced group of migrants was from Kyrgyzstan (45% women, 55% men), while Tajik migrant women number only 18%. Migration processes in Russia and the CIS reflect the worldwide feminization of migration. This is caused by the structural changes in the economy, a relative growth in the service sector and the decrease in production. The majority of migration opportunities for women is linked to informal services...
(private/home services, etc.) or is connected with marginal and risky spheres of employment (sex industry, entertainment). Female and child trade (including sexual exploitation) is becoming a more and more dangerous phenomenon in Russia.

70% of migrants come to Russia from small towns and rural areas (78% among Kyrgyz migrants). Many migrants possess an insufficient command of the Russian language (only 17% migrants from Kyrgyzstan know Russian very well, and 14% migrants from Tajikistan have no knowledge of it at all). In these conditions the social and cultural aspects of migration become more and more important.

Russia, as a migrant receiving country, should conduct a clear-cut policy for the adaptation and integration of migrants. Today the majority of labour migrants live practically outside the host society, outside its law. Many try to avoid social contact; even trying not to go out. Children of these migrants, who arrived together with their families, often do not attend school. Such a situation is dangerous, as the “social alienation” of migrants is considered by the local population as a threat and direct danger, giving birth to a variety of myths (for example, the high criminal potential of labour migrants).

More than 60% of the migrants studied cited insufficient or lack of information about the advantages of labour migration. The quality of such information leaves much to be desired. Only 24% of respondents trust it. More than a quarter of migrants (28%) did not have offers of employment when they were leaving for Russia; they went ‘blindly’, or ‘as luck would have it’. As for those who had offers of employment in advance, very often they got this information through acquaintances, private go-betweens, or through other informal channels. 24% of migrants reported that the actual working conditions did not live up to their expectations, i.e. they were somehow cheated. Only 3% of migrants used official channels of employment. A channel of private mediators in migration organization is being developed (10% of migrants paid private mediator agents to contact an employer). Such “deals” result in severe exploitation for migrants and in the violation of their rights, for example human trade or servile labour. Unofficial and shadow services organizing migration are of a very criminal nature and are often controlled by criminal groups.

Use of ethnic or fellow-countrymen resources, migrant contacts with diasporas and transformation of the traditional institution of the Diaspora itself are very interesting and inadequately studied issues in modern labour migration. Currently migrants from many countries, and in particular from CA, have typically weak contacts with their traditional Diasporas, i.e. with those who live for relatively long periods outside the ethnic homeland. Migrants tend to ask for help not from such Diasporas but from migrants’ networks that have formed in recent years as a result of migration patterns and are very often unstable. The traditional diasporas as a rule are institutionalized (there are certain organizations, heads and staff, etc.) and try to follow standards accepted in society, keep far from the criminal world, ethnic gangs, the mafia and so on. The migrants’ networks represent a more flexible and informal way of self-organization. They are at less of a distance from the criminal world and are very often exploited by shadow structures and criminals, for example with the aim to organize private channels of illegal migration, manipulation of documents, bribery of the authorities, racketeering, and “protection” of migrants’ businesses, drugs, human trade and other types of purely criminal activities. If a migrant addresses such a network for example, to get a job, this could be a considerable risk and could bring him directly to the criminals and human traders; which, instead of helping, could harm the migrant.

The majority of migrants (68%) send part of their money to their families. Migrants from CA send, on average, US$50-70 monthly. A number of migrants reported that this money is the primary or even only income their families receive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money transfer of migrants from CA in Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Send</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not send</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of migrants operate in the shadow economy: 89% (of those who answered this question) get their salaries in so-called “black cash”, i.e. unofficially. In 40% of cases employers do not stick to the payment schedule that was previously specified. Less than 24% of migrants have a contract with their employers.

### Table 2: Availability of a written contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kyrgyzstan</th>
<th>Tajikistan</th>
<th>Uzbekistan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason for this is the employer’s unwillingness to be bound by such a contract. An employee’s consent to work, without having duties and responsibilities specified on paper, is very often forced and used as an advantage in competition with local workers and other migrants.

Meeting the supply of cheap labour on the one hand, and using the advantages of the shadow economy on the other, a group of entrepreneur-employers is being created who develop their businesses based on dishonest competition and excess profit from the exploitation of cheap and unprotected labour. They seek and find workers of this very kind, bringing forward the demand for such labour and thus speeding up its supply. So, here we move out of the framework of purely economic relations to the sphere of interaction between the definite social groups: employees with forced (or zero) requirements regarding the social protection of labour and employers with reduced (or zero) qualifications of social responsibility towards the employee. The number of these social groups in the Russian economy has increased to such an extent that they have already stepped over the boundaries of the marginal communities and influence the situation as a whole, lowering the social norms threshold.

The problem described is a defect in the economic system rather than a risk or threat caused by migration as such. To improve the situation it is necessary to fight the illegitimate economic practices and to organize the migration process on a reasonable basis. It is often asserted that the Russia does not need “normal” labour migration, that there is only a demand for informal and cheap labour. This is basically incorrect. The Russian economy, even if it is out from the shadow, will be more and more dependent on the attraction of migrant labour, just as in the majority of receiving countries.

The social role of migration in the transition period should not be forgotten either, nor its contribution to the social structuring of developed society, particularly in the formation of a middle class. In the transition period, when the poor are numerous, migrant labour meets the needs of such groups of the population who are not rich, providing their services for low prices, thus promoting the elevation of part of the population from poor to middle class. In later stages of society development, when the number of the middle class increases, they start to raise the demand for migrant labour, particularly, for the services of female migrants in private households (looking after children, the aged, the ill, work about the house, etc.). Thus, in Moscow, where the middle class layer is more numerous than in other regions of Russia, these processes have already started: the household services sector, which increases the demand for migrant labour has been shaped already.

So, the authorities, business and civil society in Russia should learn to see and understand the present and future role of migration in the development of our economy and society; what work is being done for us, the citizens of Russia, by migrants, and what is our responsibility in maintaining an integrated society based on the principles of tolerance and multiculturalism.
External Labour Migration in Central Asia

Dr. Elena Sadovskaya
President of the Centre for Conflict Management (Almaty), Expert of the Research Council for the CIS and Baltic States Migration Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow)

Dr. Elena Sadovskaya presented the background and findings of an IOM study undertaken in five Central Asian countries. The following is her Power Point presentation:

Purpose and Goals of Research

- **Research:**
  - Analysis of external labour migration.
  - Develop recommendations for labour migration policy in Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

- **Research Goals:**
  1. Identify numbers of labour migrants.
  2. Study social and demographic structure, education level and professional composition.
  3. Study countries/regions of origin and destination, occupation areas.
  4. Analyze rights of labour migrants (working conditions, social protection, knowledge of legislation).
  5. Study remittances (assess size, methods of remitting money, role in business development).

Methodology

- Expert survey by informal interview (250 experts).
- Informal interviews with labour migrants.
- Analysis of secondary data.
- Analysis of publications in the national press.
- Analysis of national statistics and registration data in specialized agencies: MoFA, MIA, state security bodies, etc.

Reasons for Labour Migration

- Economic
- Social
- Demographic
- Legal and Political
- ‘Pushing’ and ‘pulling’ factors in the countries of origin and destination.

Analysis

1. **CIS - common migration system.**
2. **Russia - receives immigrants from all CIS countries, mainly the Caucasus, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.**
3. **Central Asian Republics - migration subsystem in the CIS and transit global movements.**
4. **Central Asian Republics are subdivided into countries of emigration and immigration.**
   - Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan: emigration, or sending nations
Challenges of Labour Migration in Central Asian Countries

1. Labour migration in CA is unregulated.
2. Illegal employment - one of the major traits of labour migration.
3. Illegal migration is increasing, particularly the export of migrants.
4. Legislation on labour migration is weakly developed.

Migration Results

1. Commercial migration ('shuttle' and other trade) - largest type of labour migration in the 1990s. In 2000s - growth in the number of contracted personnel.
2. Labour migration is mainly temporary; seasonal labour migration is widespread.
3. Labour migrants from the region = 20-35% of the economically active population.
4. Remittances from workers abroad form a significant part of national budgets.
5. Remittances play a significant role in increasing the living standards of migrant households, and have an impact on social and political stability.

Recommendations

Main principle of work in the area of labour migration -

'Respect for human rights'

- Develop national legislation on labour migration in accordance with international legal standards.
- Ratify UN Convention on Protection of the Rights of Migrants and their Family Members and/or ILO Convention on Protection of the Rights of Labour Migrants, etc.
- Develop mechanisms for practical implementation of laws, improve law application practice.
- Institutional development in migration management.
- Develop international cooperation to regulate migration movements; use labour migration as a development tool in sending and receiving countries.

Future Trends and UNESCO’s Role

- Globalization will increase migration flows, demanding further legislation development and international cooperation.
- Enhance national/international cooperation to address labour migrant problems.
- Expert network on migration/labour migration.
- Research migration in Central Asia/Russia, study and apply international experience.
- Resume work in the Department of Culture, Peace and Tolerance at Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University and in the national universities of Central Asia. Promote human rights, tolerance, peace, conflict prevention and resolution.
- Increase public awareness on labour migrants, promote tolerance, and prevent xenophobia and ‘migrantophobia’.
Ms. Damira Sartbaeva  
Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM Almaty Regional Office for CIS  

I would like to thank UNESCO for inviting all the agencies from Central Asia to participate in this workshop to discuss the scenarios of migration in Central Asia. Since Russia is one of the major recipient countries for the region, I would like to note that the work of the workshop would be more beneficial if Russia would also take part in this event. It would be good to explore what is the Russian potential in terms of political will, service provision for migrants and cultural tolerance.

Being a UNIFEM representative in the CIS region, I would like to draw your attention to the gender dimensions of migration. I am pleased to note that UNESCO has incorporated a gender approach into the work under the survey in terms of methodology, but this approach has been demonstrated only in the Tajikistan presentation, which revealed gender differences in the migration intentions of the respondents. In addition, gender aspects should also be taken into consideration at the analysis and prognosis levels to ensure women's rights in both countries of origin and receiving countries.

Among the evident gender issues in migration I would name the following: (i) a prevalence of women employed in the informal sector (the examples can include so-called “suitcase traders”, women from Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan who are neither socially protected, nor have access to health care systems in either their countries of origin or receiving countries, and as a result are marginalized), (ii) Seasonal workers in labour migration (Ferghana Valley is a good illustration of this case, when women and children involved in cotton-picking become the targets of various forms of violence, discrimination and violations of human rights), (iii) Trafficking in humans, and in particular, in women, who with their further exploitation make this one of the most vital problems; one which is addressed by many organizations, but, unfortunately, not many programs and projects have a connection back to the economic root causes, and in most cases this is not considered as a migration issue.

Even though this issue is addressed at a policy level, the measures often lack a comprehensive approach, etc. This is why the gender dimensions of these migration processes must be taken into consideration at all levels, while: a) conducting analysis and research based on reliable data, b) making a prognosis on labour force demand, c) concluding agreements between migrant origin and receiving countries on policy and service provision, d) establishing legal protection of migrant human rights, etc.

Another point, which I think deserves your attention, is the necessity for coordination of efforts:

1. **Within a country, between ministries**, since the issue of migration is not solely an issue for the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Labour, but also other stakeholders, which should be involved, such as the Ministry of Economics, etc.

2. **Between migrant origin and receiving countries**, since the problems of uncontrolled migration, illegal employment (slavery, servitude, exploitation) and violence against migrants are the result of a lack of effective coordination and cooperation.

3. **Between UN agencies and other international organizations**, dealing with migration issues. Such specialized agencies as IOM, ILO, working directly with migration issues, UNESCO, dealing with cultural integration of migrants, UNDP, working for economic development, etc., UNIFEM, ensuring the inclusion of gender dimensions, in close cooperation with each other can bring a real change at the policy level, around the ratification of important international covenants, development, sharing information, and much more.
International Migration in Central Asia: Challenges and Prospects
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Current Situation and Actual Problems of Labour Migration in the Kyrgyz Republic and Alternative Perspectives for its Control

Professor B. A. Sarygulov
Deputy Director of the Migration Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kyrgyz Republic

After independence Kyrgyzstan actively started a systematic and fundamental social, economic and political reform in all transition-related spheres. The country had disparity and instability in key social and economic areas; at the same time mechanisms of migration processes in the Kyrgyz Republic also started to change.

A considerable part of the economically active population and members of their families that had suffered losses based on economic activities migrated from the country.

Internal migration of the population also increased to 60% of all territorial movements. People moved mostly from mountainous and rural and border areas to economically developed districts.

Internal migration seems to have increased tension in the urbanized centres, along with deterioration of the environment. The negative impact has already become apparent in the hyper-urbanization of Bishkek. The residence of over 300,000 migrants in the capital without permanent employment or appropriate living places has resulted in looting and seizure of city properties.

One of the main concerns is the emigration of qualified people, which led to a significant loss of professional and intellectual potential. Also, the outflow of the Slavic population has accentuated the monoethnicity of the population. From the mid-1990s the Russian speaking population has declined.

Labour migration has not been accurately measured. Different experts give estimates of 500,000 to 1 million labour migrants at peak seasons. Most go to Russia and Kazakhstan. There are also many sporadic and cyclical migrants. The absolute majority of them lives and works there illegally, which makes them socially and legally unprotected and vulnerable, creating a lot of problems for the destination country. So, on the one hand, the rights, interests and freedoms of our compatriots are violated en masse, and on the other, the political authority and image of Kyrgyzstan are undermined in the international community. However, the major role of these migrants is as ‘shock absorbers’, in avoiding the spread of poverty. They are the main source of ensuring minimum living standards and the family budget, for an estimated more than half of the country. Their many millions in hard currency remittances are a huge investment potential for the country.

According to the records of the Migration Service Department there are significant numbers of foreigners working in the country: more than 300 businesses with foreign or joint capital, employing almost 15,000 expatriates. But this list does not include foreigners working under inter-governmental agreements and those coming in illegally.

Illegal migration is spreading as a result of globalization processes, the country’s entry into the global economic market and migration space, liberalization of visa regimes and the absence of proper migration control. Kyrgyzstan, having lost its migratory attractiveness, has been experiencing the undesirable trends of criminal migration. Human trafficking, ‘creeping immigration expansion’ from overpopulated neighboring countries and risk states, and transit migration to developed Western countries are on the rise.

The geopolitical location of Kyrgyzstan, steady adherence to accepted international commitments, the successfully implemented liberal policy of refugee acceptance are favorable factors contributing to the large numbers that currently arrive and stay, and will increase in the future. Since the time of independence 22,000 refugee-seekers arrived in Kyrgyzstan from neighboring states, mainly from Tajikistan. At present they also arrive from Iraq, Sri-Lanka, and other overpopulated and at-risk countries, and this tendency is growing.

Among the registered refugees there are 7,000 ethnic Kyrgyz who mainly wish to stay in the country. During the last three years 15,000 more compatriots came from adjacent countries. In this inflow the
number of people coming from Uzbekistan is growing and will continue to do so, as living conditions in Uzbekistan keep deteriorating. According to different estimates there are over one million ethnic Kyrgyz living outside their metropolis: around 160,000 live in China, over 65,000 in Tajikistan and the rest in other countries.

However, due to a lack of funding, the state support programme for compatriot-returnees and those staying abroad is not fully exercised. Their disorganized return, complex registration procedures and acquisition of citizenship create several problems for local and national authorities and for the returnees themselves.

The dynamics and scale of migration processes mainly reflect the hypertrophied social and economic situation. Therefore, population mobility is connected as much with destructive processes in the development of the real sector of economy as with sporadic mass migration, which negatively affects the country’s progressive development.

Thus, management and regulation of migratory processes in Kyrgyzstan are crying for an urgent, large-scale coordinated solution. There is an urgent need for the development and implementation of new strategies, introduction of effective market mechanisms and regulators.

In 2004 the country developed and adopted the Concept Paper on State Migratory Policy in order to ensure efficient and effective coordination of the activities of different ministries and agencies in migration, the establishment of working mechanisms and measures to stabilize migration to address the legal protection of Kyrgyz migrants, to ensure the country’s civilized entry into the international labour market, to optimize interregional distribution of the population and solve refugee problems.

Analysis of the external labour migration in the Kyrgyz Republic

To regulate migration processes the Kyrgyz Law “On External Labour Migration” is currently under development and will soon be finalized. At present the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic “On External Migration” serves as a base. In accordance with these, the Migration Department under the Kyrgyz Ministry of Foreign Affairs developed and approved government “Regulations On Labour Activities of foreign citizens in Kyrgyzstan” and “On the Order of Activities carried out by Legal Entities and Individuals dealing with the employment of Kyrgyz citizens outside the country”, and also rules, conditions and the size of warrant contributions.

In compliance with the Regulation of employment of Kyrgyz citizens outside the country, eight permits were given to legal entities and individuals in 2004 who employed 2,500 people, mainly in ex-Soviet countries: in Kazakhstan - 2,217 people (87%) and Russia - 289 people (12%). However, many labour migrants still ignore the internal legislation in destination countries.

The workforce export to developed countries is not widespread due to complexities of entry into the global labour market. Moreover, these countries only select the intellectual and professional elite. As for the non-prestigious vacancies, they are normally filled by the countries having long-standing labour export relationships with the countries of destination. The language barrier also is an obstacle; the major labour flows are therefore to Russia and Kazakhstan.

According to official data of the Russian Interior Ministry as of 1 January 2005, 1,197 Kyrgyz citizens had residence permits and nearly 3,140 people had temporary permits. Whereas, according to the expert estimates, there are between 300,000 and 700,000 Kyrgyz workers and businessmen working in Russia, varying by season. Of these, only 7,674 people have official work permits. Kyrgyz citizens are mainly concentrated in big centres: Sverdlovsk, Kemerovo, Novosibirsk oblasts, Krasnoyarsk, as well as in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Samara. In the Russian city markets there are quantitatively sustainable associations of ethnic Kyrgyz.

Russian official data is incomplete and inaccurate, as most of our citizens are registered at their place of stay for only a short term, or not at all, making most Kyrgyz immigrants in Russia illegal.

There are three major categories of external labour migrants: (i) Permanent residence or temporary stay, (ii) Contracted, and (iii) Businessmen mainly ‘shuttle traders’, which make up the majority, who stay in Russia from a few weeks to months at a time.
People with Russian residence permits or temporary residence permits are freed from obtaining supportive documents for employment. The period of temporary stay cannot exceed 90 days. When this period ends foreigners must either leave Russia or extend as labour migrants and obtain a document permitting them to get legal employment or do business. However, our citizens keep going and working without any work permit.

The main challenge for Kyrgyz migrant workers in Russia is the registration and the multi-step procedure of obtaining an employment permit (residence owners do not usually want to rent their property out officially, due to increased costs).

Thus, Kyrgyz immigrants usually receive illegal short-term guest registration for one to three months, which does not permit employment. Often they are then hired without a written contract by an employer having no right to employ foreign personnel, who bears neither economic, nor social, nor labour obligations. As a result, these migrants become hostages of their employers and their rights are often violated. In 2004 alone 65,763 Kyrgyz citizens were administratively punished.

Multiple problems with employment and short-term stays often arise due to legal ignorance or disrespect for legislation in the destination country. Migrants thus become victims of violations, especially blackmailing of tax, customs and the police authorities. This situation is aggravated due to newly adopted migration legislation in Russia, with more documents required and higher fees and duties imposed for employment of the foreign labour force.

Bureaucratic procedures in arranging short-term stay and employment for labour migrants, and a lack of funds to register all documents properly promote shadow employment in Russia.

To ensure efficient regulation of external labour migration and overcome its sporadic nature, active measures are undertaken to enhance cooperation with the Russian authorities in the following areas:

1. Consulate Services were opened in Ekaterinburg and Novosibirsk. In the Almaty Consulate there is a new position of Attaché who will work with labour migrants as a priority. Consulate personnel have visited several Russian oblasts to meet with migrants and the oblast authorities. The Almaty Attaché will stay in the tobacco planting regions with Kyrgyz workers for the whole season. To ensure efficient protection and legalize the status of migrants and monitor their activity throughout their stay, the Department for Migration Services has opened a mission at the Kyrgyz Embassy in Russia.

2. In September 2003 a Protocol to the Agreement on work and the social protection of labour migrants from the Kyrgyz Republic (28 March 1996) was signed to regulate properly and adjust the legal status of labour migrants in Russia. It includes employer exemption of a preliminary warrant for hired Kyrgyz (4000 rubles), extension of permits up to three years, state registration as entrepreneurs without establishing a legal entity, not dependent upon the period of stay in Russia. However, this Protocol is yet to be ratified by Russia.

3. To establish closer links with the Russian Migration Service, a Cooperation Agreement on Migration was signed between the Kyrgyz Migration Department and Migration Departments under the Directorates of Interiors of Kurgan and Novosibirsk oblasts and the Altai region. Similar agreements will be signed with Moscow city, Tiumen, Moscow, Samara, Penza, Cheliabinsk, Omsk, Orenburg, Kemerovo oblasts and Krasnoyarsk region. In compliance with this Agreement Kyrgyz citizens get migration cards. Almost 30,000 cards were distributed between March and December 2004.

4. Together with the Ministries of Interior and Social Labour, the staff of the Ministry of Finance regularly visits Russia to monitor the situation with labour migrants, enhance cooperation with stakeholders and develop mechanisms for implementing existing agreements regarding our labour migrants. During these trips working meetings were held with representatives of migration, borders, customs, tax, employment services, and with the Diaspora leaders. Russia agreed to regularly provide Kyrgyzstan with information about vacancies, working and payment conditions, etc. As a result of these trips, national culture centres were opened and registered in Krasnoyarsk, Samara, Orenburg, Cheliabinsk, Tomsk, Novosibirsk and Omsk (all in all, in 18 Russian regions), which actually became first protectors of the rights of Kyrgyz labour migrants, established close ties with the heads of regions and law and order controlling bodies.
5. As Russia and Kyrgyzstan will have a visa regime starting from 1 July 2005, the staff of the Department was sent to give Kyrgyz citizens assistance in acquiring international pages in their passports, and to deliver a public-awareness campaign about the changes in migration legislation in Russia.

6. A Programme of Support for Kyrgyz citizens working in Russia and Kazakhstan was developed to specify and strengthen the effectiveness of strategies and priorities. Kyrgyz MoFA is carrying out public awareness work on labour migration through thematic press conferences and media publications. There is a 'helpline' in the Department.

With IOM funding, 300,000 copies of 'Security Passports for Kyrgyz citizens leaving for Russia for short term' were developed, published and distributed in Kyrgyz and Russian. They describe in detail Russian legislation for entry, stay, business activities, addresses of diplomatic missions, etc.

The second major direction for labour migration is Kazakhstan. According to official data of the Kazakhstan Interior Ministry 4,600 people were permanently registered in Kazakhstan and 47,100 had temporary registration during 10 months of 2004. Whereas, according to the Kyrgyz Embassy data there are 80,000 people working in Kazakhstan, of whom only 7,507 have work permits.

There are 3 major categories: (i) Seasonal workers (in agricultural work), (ii) contracted personnel, and (iii) individual entrepreneurs. This last group is the main part of Kyrgyz labour migrants, working in markets in large cities. They usually stay in Kazakhstan from several weeks to several months. According to the data of the General Consulate there are around 10,000 Kyrgyz labour migrants in Almaty today. Their stay and work is regulated by inter-governmental agreement.

Starting from 2003 the Kazakhstani side introduced quotas for Kyrgyz labour migrants (in 2003 - 7435, 2004 - 7750, 2005 - 7230, and 2006 - 6700 people). The success of tobacco-growers is explained by the fact that the Labour Migration Attaché is actively involved in their problems throughout the whole process.

There are 15-50,000 Kyrgyz shuttle traders in markets. Other categories of Kyrgyz migrants are mainly employed in low-income manual work. Most labour migrants go to Kazakhstan knowing nothing about its internal legislation and therefore often violate it.

At present Kazakhstan has a licensing system for foreign labour, i.e. annual quotas. Employers are faced with numerous bureaucratic barriers, which are even more difficult than those in Russia. At the same time the authorities do not always use Kazakhstani citizens to fill vacancies. These measures lead to a situation whereby the illegal import of the workforce significantly increases the size of the shadow economy, which in turn has a negative effect on migrants’ rights.

The following measures were carried out to solve these problems:

To regulate the problems of labour migrants in a civilized manner, an Agreement on Allied Relationships was signed by the Kyrgyz President on 25-26 December 2003, stipulating, “every contracting party guarantees equal rights to the citizens of the other contracting party in education, employment, payment, and other social guarantees…”

In accordance with it, the Kyrgyz Ministry of Foreign Affairs developed and sent a draft inter-governmental Agreement in December 2003; however, the Kazakhstan side came to the conclusion that such an Agreement was not expedient, referring to the existing legislation that is sufficient to regulate labour migration, and to the clauses of the proposed Agreement that contradict the internal legislation of Kazakhstan.

In July 2004, during the 4th meeting of Kyrgyz-Kazakh joint committee on bilateral cooperation, the question of migrants was very urgent. However the Kazakhstan side again did not find it important to fix the legal status of neighboring labour migrants based on international standards. Therefore, the parties agreed to introduce a draft Agreement for Governments’ consideration within three months to regulate the problems of all categories of labour migrants. However, according to the information received from Kazakhstan, it does not see the meeting and Agreement expedient.

At present labour migration between our countries is regulated by two Agreements:
1. CIS Framework Agreement on cooperation in labour migration and social protection of labour migrants has a general nature and is unable to regulate current labour migration effectively.

2. Agreement between the Kyrgyz and Kazakh governments 'On labour and social protection of labour migrants working in agriculture in border areas', the share of such seasonal workers is not large.

During the 2003-04 tobacco season several working groups were sent to study the situation and render assistance to our citizens. The process was surveyed. In February this year the Ministry of Foreign Affairs developed and approved an Action Plan to support Kyrgyz workers in Russia and Kazakhstan. A public awareness campaign about labour migration to Kazakhstan, similar to the one for Russia, is being conducted.

Other CIS countries are visited by Kyrgyz labour migrants only seasonally and infrequently, except for the border areas with Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

Of special concern is the growing illegal import of workers, mostly from the Third World. Uncontrolled employment of foreigners, often with disdain towards Kyrgyz personnel on the part of foreign employers causes a negative reaction. The absence of a clear distinction between visa issuing and authorized visa extending bodies made the illegal import of foreign labour possible from at-risk countries, which aggravates the situation in the internal labour market.

To ensure strict control over incoming foreign workers, optimize their inflow and limit their replacement with unqualified workforce, the system of permits and quotations was introduced. Priority must be given to Kyrgyz citizens to give maximum protection to the national labour market.

However suitably qualified foreigners are favored, as the country needs a qualified foreign workforce to develop production capacity, based on modern technologies and non-production sector. Foreign employers create new work places for Kyrgyz people by investing in our economy.

According to the 2004 Regulation of Labour Activities by Foreign Workers and People without Citizenship, the Migration Department has issued 490 permits for foreigners, 3,114 work permits, including 1,231 for entrepreneurs. The major exporters of labour force, and respectively investors, are Turkey and China.
Diasporas, a Central Asian Perspective

Dr. Sabiha H. Syed
Director, Migration Research Centre, Islamabad

Different types of Diasporas

- Victim or refugee:
  Africans, Armenians, Palestinians, Irish, Jews
- Imperial or colonial:
  Ancient Greek, British, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, French
- Labour or service:
  Indentured Indians, Chinese, Japanese
- Trade or Commerce:
  Venetians, Lebanese, Chinese

Source: Cohen (1997)

Some notable Diasporas

- Afghan people who fled their country throughout the 20th century and the long civil wars.
- The African Diaspora comprises the movements and culture of Africans taken into slavery and their descendants throughout the world.
- Arabs who have migrated from the Arab World and now reside in Western Europe, the Americas, Australia and elsewhere.
- Armenians living in the region controlled by the Ottoman Empire fled during genocides from the 1880s to the 1910s.
- Almost 5% of the present day Australian population lives outside of Australia for a variety of reasons. This phenomenon is known as the Australian Diaspora.
- Chechens who fled Chechnya during the late 20th century insurrection against the Russian Federation.
- Chinese Diaspora, all around the world.
- Crimean Tatar Diaspora, formed after the annexation of the Crimea Khanate by Russia in 1783.
- The Filipino peoples throughout Australia, the USA, Canada and South East Asia; overseas workers who have their own political party in parliament.
- The French Canadian Diaspora includes hundreds of thousands of people who left Quebec for greener pastures in the United States, Ontario and the prairies between 1840 and the 1930s.
- The Hispanic Diaspora in the United States numbered 37.4 million in 2002 according to US Census Bureau figures.
- The Indian Diaspora includes millions of people in Suriname, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Jamaica, Mauritius, Fiji and Malaysia and other countries, who left British India in the 19th and early 20th centuries, and millions more who have moved to the United States, the United Kingdom and the United Arab Emirates in recent decades.
- The Irish Diaspora includes the millions of Irish refugees from Ireland due to the Irish Potato Famine and political oppression. (The term first came widely into use in Ireland in the 1990s when the then President of Ireland, Mary Robinson began using it to describe all those of Irish descent).
- The Jewish Diaspora in modern use consists of Jews living outside of the Jewish state of Israel. There is a Ministry of Diaspora Affairs in the Israeli government.
- Palestinians who fled Palestine during the 1948 Arab-Israeli war.
- Polonia, the Diaspora of the Poles, started with the emigration after the partition of Poland.
- The South East Asian Diaspora includes the refugees from the numerous wars that took place in South East Asia, such as World War II and the Vietnam War.
- Various ethnic minorities from areas under Russian/Soviet control following the Russian Revolution, continuing through the mass forced migration and resettlements, especially under Stalin. Central Asian peoples faced forced migration to other lands.
Various groups fled in large numbers from areas under Axis control during World War II, or after the border changes following the war, and formed their own Diasporas (in addition to the aforementioned Jewish Diaspora).

The Somali Diaspora that includes Ethnic Somalis who live in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Djibouti. It also includes the million people who live Europe, North America, and the Middle East as refugees from the civil war. It altogether numbers between 5 and 7 million. This is near the population of Somalia itself.

Key Questions

• Are Diasporas engaged in development activities in countries of origin and destination?
• What are some of the challenges that Diasporas face and how can governments and Diasporas work together to address these issues?
• Can Diasporas be included in social and economic development in countries of origin?

Diasporas’ approaches to development
(Examples from African Diasporas)

• Prefer self-help and self-reliance.
• Usually engage in small-scale, local, community-based activities.
• Identity with locals is important.
• Emphasize a new development paradigm.
• Stress on the human factor, processes, and relationships and less on technical aspects of inputs and outputs.
• Focus on two-way processes between services and beneficiaries.

Problems of governments regarding migration and Diasporas

• Lack of capacity
  • Limited structures for civil society engagement.
  • Tend to focus on relations with “northern donors” rather than with citizens at home or abroad

• Lack of will/desire
  • Discomfort with diasporas
    – Identity-based
    – Specific focus
  • Versus “national” focus
  • May raise difficult issues of accountability

Issues that unite governments of sending and receiving countries
(some views from outside)

• United by common hypocrisy or unholy alliance:
  • Sending country governments:
    – Blame migrants for leaving and working hard in other countries.
    – Are glad to be relieved of the social and economic pressures of employment and services.
    – Are happy for receipt of income from remittances.
  • Receiving governments:
    – Blame migrants for coming for work.
    – Are happy to use their skills without investing in them.
    – Are pleased to have cheap labour for long work.
• Solution - It's time for "common truths" on both sides!

• The making of the Central Asian Diaspora.
• The Ever-Growing Central Asian Diaspora.
• Dispersions of Overseas Central Asians.
• The Labour Markets for Central Asians.
• The Central Asian Diaspora is alive, expanding, and still in the making.
• The Central Asian Diaspora is concentrated in several countries in Europe and North America.
• Diaspora networks can contribute to the creation of trade through a unique network effect.
• It is important to study the many aspects of the Central Asian Diaspora because it concerns not only overseas ethnic Central Asians, but also those at home as well.
• One area where more research is needed is in building a statistical database for many variables related to the Central Asian Diaspora, particularly trade and investment data.
• It is recommended that organizations, foundations, governments and researchers should pay more attention to building this database in the future.
## Migration to Russian Federation: Top ten sending countries, by country of nationality, by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Origin Country</th>
<th>1989 Number</th>
<th>1990 Number</th>
<th>1991 Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>854,590</td>
<td>913,223</td>
<td>692,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>381,192</td>
<td>278,953</td>
<td>210,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>158,679</td>
<td>157,401</td>
<td>128,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>84,104</td>
<td>103,951</td>
<td>69,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>75,922</td>
<td>91,436</td>
<td>47,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>55,981</td>
<td>72,218</td>
<td>45,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>36,358</td>
<td>50,812</td>
<td>42,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>31,650</td>
<td>39,019</td>
<td>33,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>33,061</td>
<td>29,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>22,463</td>
<td>32,320</td>
<td>27,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>19,009</td>
<td>14,994</td>
<td>13,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>45,439</td>
<td>46,558</td>
<td>43,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992 Total</td>
<td>926,020</td>
<td>923,284</td>
<td>1,146,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>195,672</td>
<td>346,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>183,891</td>
<td>189,409</td>
<td>247,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>112,442</td>
<td>96,814</td>
<td>146,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>72,556</td>
<td>91,164</td>
<td>68,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>69,943</td>
<td>69,934</td>
<td>66,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>62,897</td>
<td>68,761</td>
<td>49,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>54,247</td>
<td>54,684</td>
<td>46,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>36,212</td>
<td>34,670</td>
<td>45,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>32,340</td>
<td>29,895</td>
<td>43,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>27,271</td>
<td>25,891</td>
<td>26,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>74,066</td>
<td>66,475</td>
<td>61,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995 Total</td>
<td>1,146,735</td>
<td>1,199,669</td>
<td>1,597,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>241,027</td>
<td>172,886</td>
<td>325,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>188,443</td>
<td>170,928</td>
<td>138,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>112,312</td>
<td>49,977</td>
<td>39,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>51,412</td>
<td>40,312</td>
<td>29,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>43,442</td>
<td>38,551</td>
<td>24,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>41,799</td>
<td>32,508</td>
<td>23,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>35,337</td>
<td>25,419</td>
<td>19,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>34,112</td>
<td>23,903</td>
<td>17,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>46,836</td>
<td>35,417</td>
<td>39,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Protection in the Context of Broader Migration Movements in Central Asia

Ms. Geraldine Salducci,
Legal Advisor, UNHCR Geneva

Overview

Migration trends are part of the environment in which refugee protection has to be realized, and often a migration problem becomes a reason for states to redefine their responsibilities to all non-citizens indiscriminately. Globalization and increasing pressure on access to developed countries (threat of uncontrolled migration), including through resort to asylum, contributes to an increasing unwillingness of states to admit refugees.

It seems that asylum-seekers are less and less welcome in many countries, unless they are formally invited via resettlement programmes, visas or temporary admission from countries in crisis. If they enter by other routes, their motives will be seen as economic, and the fact of illegal entry will prejudice their case.

The migration debate - often with asylum issues at its heart - has taken on a dimension of its own. Refugees are increasingly part of movements including both forced and voluntary departures and may resort to migrant smugglers to leave. Refugees may also move on to other countries, either because they do not enjoy effective protection or for other reasons. At the same time, people not in need of international protection and lacking legal migration options may resort to asylum channels in the hope of gaining temporary or permanent stay abroad. As a result, the line between migrants and refugees blurs in the public mind, as does the distinction between migration control and refugee protection in the policies of many states.

Problems of illegal migration, smuggling, and trafficking of persons, and the security dimension of refugee problems have led to an increase politicization of the institution of asylum, tighter control measures and in some states, to a tendency to criminalize refugees and asylum seekers and stigmatize them as people trying to circumvent the law.

The lack of resolution of some longstanding refugee problems coupled with an imbalance in responsibility sharing have triggered a growing impatience in first asylum countries and have resulted in increasing the level of discrimination in the offering of asylum, denial of protection to those in need and non-acceptance of returning irregular movers as well as increased reliance on detention.

The 1951 Convention is no panacea for all the problems of displacement. Yet refugees do not lose their protection needs and entitlements just because they are part of a mixed flow, nor can durable solutions be truly realised without due attention to the root causes of displacement. Ironically, though the numbers of refugees and asylum seekers are on the decline, concerns about the institution of asylum appear to be multiplying.

Issues that reflect negatively on the asylum regime

The misuse of the asylum regime and the illegal means used to enter countries have a negative impact on states and public opinion's view of refugees and asylum-seekers. Many refugees, of necessity, not only come uninvited, but more and more, via smugglers. Being smuggled to sanctuary has become an increasingly important avenue to seeking asylum, but an asylum-seeker who resorts to a human smuggler seriously compromises his or her claim in the eyes of many states. As Harding has also commented, this leads to an imputation of double criminality: not only do refugees flout national boundaries, but they consort with criminal trafficking gangs to do so, so their claims are considered as bogus.

The widespread perception in many countries is that there are more costs than benefits in receiving refugees. Rising costs associated with running the system. States seeking to restrict asylum options frequently claim that these options have to be limited because of the economic burden of offering asylum, set against competing national priorities for limited resources. Security concerns, inter-state tensions, backdoor migration, social and political unrest, and
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environmental damage - are all cited as “negative” costs in the asylum ledger. in parallel with more and more asylum arrivals is a growing incidence of racism, xenophobia and intolerance directed against refugees, asylum-seekers and foreigners in general. there is also a cost to this at the political level and it is certainly, as a result, a disincentive to enlightened arrival policies.

- inability to return rejected asylum-seekers resulting from a variety of causes including weak cooperation between the states involved.
- mixed populations claiming assistance and having difficulties in applying refugee concepts to mixed groups of arrivals.
- emergence of a plethora of varying notions of protection or alternative protection regimes of more limited duration and guaranteeing lesser rights when compared to those of the 1951 convention, and also increasingly discretionary forms of protection, (temporary protection, “b” status, humanitarian status, exceptional leave to remain, stay of deportation and toleration permits are but a few) instead of legal, rights-based approaches, which make new accessions to the full application of the convention even more difficult to achieve.
- overly restrictive application of the 1951 convention and 1967 protocol, together with obstacles to prevent legal and physical access to countries. increased detention, reduced welfare benefits, severe curtailment of self-sufficiency possibilities and restricted family reunion rights.
- confusion in identifying states’ responsibilities for examining individual applications for asylum (problems related to the concept of safe third country). notions such as “effective protection elsewhere” are increasingly entering the asylum systems, in effect substituting for the internationally agreed refugee definition. similar concerns exist with the notion of “safe country of origin”, which also is coming to serve as an automatic bar to access asylum procedures.

refugee protection and migration:

two different frameworks that complement each other

two different systems

one of the trends we have seen is that asylum policies of many states are being developed as a “subset” of their migration policies, rather than as part of a refugee policy. as a result, many asylum policies are becoming more control-oriented and losing the humanitarian/protection character associated with refugee policies.

from unhcr’s perspective, refugees are not migrants in the ordinary sense of the word. we believe that this distinction needs to be preserved for two important reasons.

- the displacement of refugees is caused by persecution, serious human rights’ violations or conflict in their own countries: events, which are beyond their control. so refugee protection is concerned more with coercive “push” factors in the country of origin, rather than “pull” factors in countries of transit or final destination.
- refugees have the right to benefit from a specific international regime that places legal responsibilities on states to provide protection to those in need and deserving it. this regime of international protection is constructed around the 1951 csr and provides a legal framework of cooperation and responsibility sharing between states, with the support of unhcr.

it is important however that all actors are sensitive to the inter-linkages between migration and asylum flows, so that the management of migration respects the differences between the various groups and interests at stake and approaches are adopted that recognise these differences and respond accordingly to the needs of individuals and groups on the move. in this way, perceived contradictions between
asylum objectives and migration objectives can be resolved paving the way for concrete initiatives which underpin protection obligations with the broader context of migration.

Which complement each other?

How to deal effectively with the nexus between asylum and migration is a question that was one of the key issues addressed during UNHCR’s own Global Consultations process from 2000-2002. A tangible result of that process was the Agenda for Protection (AfP). In Goal 2 of the Agenda we can find 7 practical areas relating to the protection of refugees within broader migration movements:

• **Better identification of, and proper response to the needs** of asylum-seekers and refugees including access to protection within the broader context of migration management.

• **Strengthened efforts to combat smuggling and trafficking.** This includes not only better policing and law enforcement against the criminals, but also adequate protection for victims. Indeed some victims of trafficking may meet the requirements of the refugee definition and therefore be entitled to international protection under the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol.

  * **Agenda for protection Goal 2:** Obligation on states to ensure that their asylum system is sufficiently flexible to receive claims from victims of trafficking.

• **Better research/data collection on the nexus between asylum and migration.** We need more empirical information on the demographics of people “on the move”, including analysis of the reasons for migration. This is needed to debunk the many myths and false assumptions of why people migrate, including the victims of forced displacement.

• **Reduction of irregular or secondary movements.** Many states have highly developed asylum policies that require asylum-seekers to seek protection closer to their countries of origin. They have developed notions such as “safe third country” and “effective” protection to prevent the movement of asylum-seekers and refugees from a state where protection was, or might have been available. States sometimes refer to such people as “irregular” or “secondary” movers, who are seeking “migration outcomes” not refugee protection; any decision to return an asylum-seeker to a “safe third country” should be accompanied by assurances that the person will be readmitted to that country, will enjoy effective protection against refoulement there, will have the possibility to seek and enjoy asylum, and will be treated in accordance with accepted international standards. In addition, the adequacy of “protection elsewhere” has to be nurtured through carefully targeted assistance policies – albeit always understanding that this should not absolve states of their responsibility to offer protection to refugees on their territories. These are the basic standards UNHCR’s Executive Committee has attached to this notion and should, at a minimum, be formally adhered to. Unfortunately this is not always, or even often, the case.

• **Partnership with other UN agencies and international fora.**

• **Information campaigns to ensure potential migrants are aware of the prospects for legal migration and the dangers of smuggling and trafficking;** UNHCR to seek means to contribute constructively to such campaigns in conjunction with partners such as IOM, ODC, ILO and others.

• **Return of persons found not to be in need of international protection.** There is a general consensus that the credibility of the asylum regime depends, to some extent, on the return of persons who, after undergoing a full and fair procedure, are found not to be in need of international protection, to their countries of origin. This is a key part of both a refugee policy and an effective migration policy. In practice however, it poses difficult problems for states. The logistic and other obstacles to finding, and then removing migrants unlawfully in a state’s territory presents significant challenges. One of the biggest operational concerns that hinders the return of person found not to be in need of international protection is the lack of international cooperation notably by:
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- Assisting in establishing the identity of persons presumed to have a right to return, as well as determining the nationality when there is no evidence of nationality in the form of a genuine travel or identity document.

- Finding practical solutions for the issuance of proper documentation for persons who do not possess genuine travel documents.

The Agenda for Protection has also recognized the need to expedite the return of persons found not to be in need of international protection. However, the return should take place in a humane manner and in full respect of the human rights and of the dignity of the returnee. This question was the subject of an Excom conclusion in 2003.

One practical area where the link between refugee protection and migration is very interesting is in protracted refugee situations where the character of the refugee population and the environment in which they are living may have evolved over time. A good example is Afghanistan where UNHCR is working closely with IOM, ILO and the Governments of Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan to find sustainable solutions for the millions of people displaced by decades of conflict. Although it is clear that many Afghans have ongoing refugee protection needs, many others have evolved over time, into migrants of a different character. This calls for a different and multi-dimensional response from states and the international community that focuses more on socio-economic development, including for migrant workers in the region.

Whereas migration policy is essentially about finding practical areas of convergence between states’ sovereign interests on migration issues, refugee and asylum policy has a different paradigm altogether. It is built on the basis of binding international obligations to protect refugees. Unlike migration policy, it provides a framework for international burden-sharing between states and has an internal (asylum) and external (burden-sharing) dimension.

The challenge for all of us, therefore, is to find ways in which these different policy “spheres” can complement and mutually reinforce each other, so they do not duplicate or undermine one another.

Comprehensive approaches and Convention Plus

Comprehensive approaches

The search for durable solutions demands comprehensive and sustained efforts on the part of UNHCR and a range of other actors, notably of course, states. Against the backdrop of the asylum/migration nexus, the search for comprehensive and innovative solutions takes on additional dimensions. Comprehensive plans of action, addressing the complexity of needs in large-scale and protracted situations of displacement, have proven their success in the past. The CIS Conference and its related follow up is but one example of this, and one from which lessons can be learnt. The IMP (International Migration Policy Program) led “Issyk-Kul Dialogue” offered a platform within this region for states and concerned actors to come together and discuss shared concerns and perspectives on a number of interrelated challenges spanning the migration and asylum fields. UNHCR is an active participant in a number of regional and global fora addressing migration in the broadest sense. Our aim is to ensure that such discussions are appropriately informed of the protection dimensions and guided as appropriate by the relevant sections of the Agenda for Protection (as outlined above). We view such fora as valuable opportunities to address many aspects of the nexus debate, bringing together as they do, government officials from a range of different ministries, as well as representatives of the UN and other international organizations, each bringing to the table their own mandate perspective. At the international level, to mention but two important ongoing initiatives, UNHCR is following with interest developments linked to the Berne Initiative, and its International Agenda for Migration Management, as well as the Global Commission on International Migration, whose report will be delivered to the UN Secretary General in October. A number of states in this region have been active participants, influencing the evolution of both these global processes.

Convention Plus

The changing patterns of forced displacement, and more generally, global migration, are undoubtedly placing new challenges on states and UNHCR. Issues such as the trafficking of persons, restrictive and
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deterrent measures introduced by states in their asylum systems, and the return of persons found not to be in need of international protection, have been traditionally viewed as matters for a select number of developed states to address. Over the past years however, they have become issues of concern to almost all the countries that UNHCR is working with.

In response to these new challenges, a number of objectives of the Agenda for Protection focus on the development of tools and strategies for the better protection and efficient global management of refugees. During the fifty-third session of the Executive Committee in October 2002, the High Commissioner recommended that some tools take the form of “multilateral special agreements”, to complement the 1951 Convention. The agreements are intended to set in place joint arrangements in areas where multilateral commitments are called for, and where they are negotiable. The High Commissioner termed these tools “Convention Plus”.

Today, in the context of Convention Plus, UNHCR together with states is pursuing generic multilateral agreements to tackle three priority challenges. These include the strategic use of resettlement as a tool of protection, a durable solution and a tangible form of burden-sharing; the effective targeting of development assistance to support durable solutions for refugees; and clarification of the responsibilities of states in the event of secondary movements of refugees and asylum seekers.

Concluding Remarks

Quoting what Ms. Erika Feller (Director of the Division of International Protection) stated in Lisbon (June 2000) addressing a conference organized by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council with the support of the European Commission:

The problem of people on the move, be it to search for better protection or a better life, is global in character and beyond the control of any one state. As one government representative of a major refugee receiving country had cause recently to observe, “We seem destined to be continually in search of newer, more effective control measures. No sooner do we solve problems of abuse than new ones appear. We are caught up in a cycle of adding more and more restrictive measures. The advent of well-organized criminal trafficking organizations may make our controls effective for even shorter periods.... We devise our measures [...] without knowing what the effect is on the growing number of people in the world who need protection. We measure their effectiveness by the reduction of the number of refugee claimants in [the country concerned]. We do not know how many people genuinely in need are prevented from coming.... We do not know what the effect of [our] control measures, in combination with similar controls in other countries, is on people genuinely in need of protection.”

These are sobering words - and not UNHCR’s, although they could have been.

In conclusion, refugee law is not static but a dynamic body of principles. As with all branches of law, it has, and must retain, an inherent capacity for adjustment and development in the face of changed international scenarios. UNHCR’s approach to promoting this development rests on the understanding that refugee protection is first and foremost about meeting the needs of vulnerable and threatened individuals. These needs of course, have to be accommodated and addressed within a framework of sometimes competing interests of other parties directly affected by a refugee problem, which include states, host communities and the international community generally. The refugee protection regime has to balance appropriately all these rights, interests and expectations. UNHCR regards it as its moral, legal and mandate responsibility to foster this process of developing new approaches, not to lower the international protection paradigm, but to strengthen the available protection modalities.
Combating Trafficking in Persons in Central Asia: Experiences and Challenges

Ms. Caterina Badikova
Counter-Trafficking Programme Officer for Central Asia,
International Organization for Migration (IOM), Almaty

The Activities of IOM’s Counter Trafficking (CT) in Central Asia were featured in the following PowerPoint presentation on awareness measures:

Central Asia is a region that is observed as experiencing trafficking as:

- Origin - countries;
- Destination;
- Transit;
- In-country and also in-region trafficking.

Types of Exploitation:

- Sexual
- Labour
- Other
  - Information Campaigns (risk groups, specialists, population in general)
  - Legislation
  - CT trainings
  - Researches

Assistance to Victims:

- Voluntary Return
- Rehabilitation and Medical Assistance
- Reintegration
- Legal Assistance
- Awareness Raising

Hotline Calls facilities
Labour migration in Russia: recent research experience (with a focus on migration from Central Asian countries)

Elena Tjurjukanova
Expert, Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

At the end of the 20th century Russia became an immigration country. The flow of labour migration to Russia is the largest and most dynamic in the CIS region. Migration to Russia from CIS countries, particularly from Central Asia, is both inevitable (due to differences in development levels, wage differentials, unique historical background, etc.) and is indispensable, first and foremost, for Russia itself. The Russian economy is in need of an influx of labour resources from the outside.

The development of Russia as a migrant host country follows the track of practically all developed countries. During the last decade the Russian labour market has been structured taking immigration into account, and migrants occupied the same economic niches as those in the majority of host countries. The principal sectors of the economy demanding migrants’ hard labour efforts and activities are construction, industry, agriculture, trade, transport, and services (including leisure and entertainment, as well as sexual services). Although the official data shows the foreign labour force share as 0.5% of all those employed in the economy, this figure is really 5-7% if all illegally and unofficially employed immigrants are included, thus maintaining the same levels as in France, Sweden and Belgium.

Several factors determine Russia to be a migrant host country for years ahead:

- **Demographic.** According to demographic predictions, in 2006-2016 the decrease of the able-bodied population will be about one million people.
- **Economic.** Segregation of workers in the labour market and isolation of the migrant sectors of employment has developed a systematic character, and has been growing and turning into a sustainable distribution of labour. These sectors will reproduce the sustainable demand for migrant labour in the future. According to research, 30 to 50% of the workplaces occupied by migrants in Russia today have already been “fixed” as migrant labour positions, as the local population will not compete for these workplaces. The economic growth in such sectors directly depends on the migrant labour intake.
- **Humanitarian.** Migration for the majority of CIS migrants is a fairly effective strategy of survival. Before arriving in Russia 75% of the migrants viewed themselves as the poor or poorest; after they have started to provide for themselves in Russia, their share has reduced to 33%, while the group of “the poorest” (whose income does not even cover the cost of the necessities) is almost completely eliminated. The majority of the migrants send certain amounts of their money to their homeland, and one-quarter of the respondents stated that the remittance is the only income their families have to live on.

Migrants from Central Asia have, on average 4 dependants. About a half of them are the only “breadwinners” in the family. 29% of the migrants previously held no job, while the same number had only short-term or odd jobs in their home countries.

From the point of view of the Russian state, the humanitarian factor means social responsibility not only in terms of its own citizens, but in terms of widening the opportunities for the citizens of neighboring and other countries also.

**Maintaining social and political stability in the region.**

90% of migrants have improved their economic position as a result of migration, and one-quarter has solved all their financial problems by migrating to Russia. This shows that migration helps to withdraw social tension in the region and to maintain social stability by providing people with alternative ways of improving their economic situation. The recent “colored revolutions” in Georgia and Ukraine, however, demonstrate the relative character of such stability. The paradox of today’s political situation is that

---

the opponents of CIS integration have been very actively playing upon the “migration map” - they reinforce only the negative aspects of migration both for Russia and the countries of departure. As for integration supporters, they are not so active in exploiting the positive aspects of the idea of migration. This is why the integrating potential of migration has hardly been realized in the CIS region.

The main challenges of labour migration are caused by the fact that it occurs mainly through unofficial channels and represents so-called unregulated migration. The principal component of illegality for migrants from the CIS who follow the non-visa inter-state migration is the absence of work permits. All in all Russia issues about 400,000 labour permits for foreign citizens. The total number of illegally employed immigrants is estimated to be 4-5 million people.

Illegal migration occurs for many reasons, mainly the narrowness of legitimate channels of migration and tough demands for cheap and unprotected labour from Russia's shadow economy.

The majority of migrants are employed in the informal and shadow economy. In Russia this amounts to 22% of GDP, as a minimum. According to the survey results, about 90% of the migrants receive their pay in the form of so-called “black cash”, and 80% of migrants do not have written contracts with their employers. A high percentage of migrants are employed in the most informal and shadow segments of the economy where the most monstrous forms of a man’s exploitation are very widespread.

### Table 1: Expansion of various forms of criminal exploitation and control over migrants from CIS countries to Russia. (Research by ILO).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Exploitation</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsion to work overtime</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint to work to “wear and tear”</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous payment delays</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsion to do some work without any consent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint to work in inhumane conditions (mud, cold, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsion for free work</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual services constraint</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological violence (threats, cheating, others)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of freedom (control over movement, isolation)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal violence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt to the employer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID withdrawal</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % of females

The demand for illegal labour “aggravates competition”, when migrants play “consent to exploitation” as a trump card in competing for workplaces. This leads to the reduction of payment in the branch, slows down the modernization of an enterprise and undermines the basis for honest competition.

The fact that the labour migration regime is specified in the region by economic demand ensures that it is impossible to change the situation by means of migration policy measures alone. It is necessary to work out a wider programme on their removal from the shadow economy, and the programme should contain a special section dedicated to the role of migrants in the economy.

New trends in labour migration to Russia:
- A move in favor of small towns and villages (70% of migrants are from towns and rural areas);
- A decrease in the educational level of migrants (the end of “elite” migration) - 35% lack a complete higher education;
- The poor (53%) and “the poorest” (24%) are migrating for work;
- A growing number of migrants do not know or barely know the Russian language.
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Such migrants are barely informed, they are legally unaware, and as a rule, they agree to be exploited in the harshest ways. It is necessary to coordinate the activities of migration, social and other services with all these changes in mind.

The so-called “consent for exploitation” that migrants put forward as an ace in their competition for a workplace in the receiving country turns from an individual’s personal choice into an important social phenomenon. When large groups of people who have found themselves in extreme poverty conditions and who are hardly capable of changing this situation, and who agree to work like slaves, in sweatshop conditions that violate all the norms of democracy and human rights, this practically results in the legitimating of such servile conditions and their turning into some quasi-normal relations. The double standard ideology lies in the fact that both society and the authorities often justify the exploitation of “alien” migrants as if they are saying, “if it doesn’t suit them, they must leave.”

Regulation of migration in Russia today possesses features of anti-crisis management, whereby a strategic line is often sacrificed in favor of an immediate effect. Adequate awareness of the important role of migration for the Russian economy has been shaping recently, but it is still impossible to bring the rules and migration regulating mechanisms quickly into line with the new reality. Inefficiency of migration management is revealed particularly in the inability of states to coordinate migration policies and the economic demand for migrants. Large groups of migrants are treated as illegal because they cannot legally obtain jobs that actually exist in the receiving country.

Activities that could possibly lead to the introduction of legal labour migration in Russia, to reinforce its positive aspects and to minimize threats:

- Systematic and institutionally shaped interaction of economic policies, labour policies and migration policies is indispensable in order to fight the demand for servile labour. The shadow economy gives birth to servile labour; this is why it is necessary to develop a programme to fight the shadow economy and illegitimate labour practices. The topic of migration (bringing out of the shadows those sectors of economy where migrants are employed and legalizing their employment) should be a separate section of a more general economic programme of taking the economy out of the shadows, as far as the illegal employment of labour migrants is a permanent source of new manpower for the shadow economy.

- Development and institutionalizing of a policy of reception and integration of migrants in Russia. Russia is attracted not only to the reception of temporary migrants, but in the replenishment of the permanent population through immigration. Considering that up to 40% of labour migrants are oriented towards long-term stay and possibly further residence in Russia, an adequate legal and institutional infrastructure should be elaborated to enable the realization of these intentions.

- Broadening and simplifying legitimate short-term labour migration (simplification of registration procedures, work permits, etc.). Phased transition to the permissible order of the CIS citizen’s employment in Russia (starting at the branch, regional level, etc).

- Development of an official infrastructure of migration and migration services (informational, jurisdictional and others). A limited number or lack of such services has led to their replacement with illegal and criminal structures.

- The state is no longer the only “subject” of migration policy. A number of new players appear in this field; the role of business, the civil society and international organizations is growing. Today it is necessary to work out new models of cooperation among all the players.

- It is necessary to use the influence potential of international organizations on governments with the aim of broadening the legal migration channels; today this potential is not being used to its full extent.

- While opposing illegal migration, the stress should not only be on punitive methods (deportation, fines, etc.) but should be shifted to:
  - migration amnesty;
  - economic control over employers.
• A more active development of interstate cooperation in the sphere of migration (including regional cooperation - among Russia and CIS countries), signing of inter-governmental agreements.

• Crusade against corruption in the sphere of migration - a series of democratic processes, etc.

• Ensuring adequate statistics and accounting in the sphere of labour migration.

• Scientifically based research on labour migration. At the moment mostly generic research on the problems of labour migration has been conducted. New and thorough research on separate, more narrow and specific issues are necessary, directed at a science provision of actual decision taking.

Today a political struggle is under way over migration in the CIS. Supporters of a liberal approach are more and more active. Their arguments are based on objective reasons for the necessity for migration to Russia. At the same time the supporters of the conservative trend counterbalance them, underlining the risks and threats linked with the liberalization of the migration regime. While the rational middle has not been found, it is important to avoid turning migration into a "political horror toy", to not allow extremist and disintegrating forces to dominate, and to preserve the potential of migration as a factor for integration in the region. In this connection it is important to widen those integration sprouts that have been preserved - to maintain and strengthen the visa-free regime, to set up economic migration, to move gradually towards removing the barriers for movement of the workforce. It is important to understand that visas and other administrative and political barriers are a factor of disintegration. As far as the voices of supporters of non-visa regime in the region can still be heard, it is important to oppose actual steps towards them, which are targeted at integration - this is the demand of both the unique history of the countries of our region and of the logic of the current stage of global development.
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Oralmans in Kazakhstan: Socio-Economic Status and Paths Toward Integration into Kazakhstani Society

B.L. Tatibekov
Researcher on UNDP Oralmans Report, Almaty

Migration issues are pertinent in today's society. Some types of migration are more general, such as migration from less to more developed, or from less to more democratic countries. At the same time there are more specific types of migration such as that based on ethnic ties.

Germany, Israel and Kazakhstan are examples of this last process. In a global society capable of the borderless exchange of information and technology; in a world where a language can be virtually wiped out within a country's borders, in these cases migration policy takes on a special character and significance. It strives to preserve national identity on the one hand and restore a proper historical past on the other, while taking socio-economic and cultural factors into consideration.

The immigration of ethnic Kazakhs, “Oralmans” to Kazakhstan is especially significant. This migration process is taking place with the support of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan and happens for several reasons. Among them is a decrease in the population as a result of high levels of out-migration during the country's post-Soviet transitional period. For various historical, political, socio-economic and ethno-cultural reasons, after the fall of the USSR many who migrated to Kazakhstan during Soviet times began to return to their historic homelands or immigrated to other countries. The tearing down of the so-called Soviet “iron curtain” gave many Germans, Jews, Greeks, Chechens, Ingush, etc. the opportunity to return to their historic homelands.

During the period of intense out-migration the Kazakhstani Government began to adopt a policy directed at attracting ethnic Kazakhs to the country in an attempt to offset the negative effects of emigration. This policy tried not only to lessen the fall in population, but also to reverse the injustices of the country's past. It also had the goal of resurrecting the uniqueness of the Kazakh people, which was lost during the Soviet period.

The Kazakhstani Government adopted the laws “On immigration” in 1992 and “On migration of the population” in 1997. These acts and other presidential declarations contained not only organizational, economic and legal measures on the repatriation of ethnic Kazakhs, but also material incentives to attract them to Kazakhstan.

The realization of various measures to bring back ethnic Kazakhs and also the economic improvements in the country contribute to the fact that more Kazakhs entered the country officially through the quota system than unofficially outside of it. At the beginning of 2004 the number of oralmans who arrived in the country both within and outside of the quota exceeded 307,000 people. Of this number, 41.5% were children school-aged or younger, 52.1% were working-aged people, and 6.4% were pensioners.

The division of oralmans among the regions of Kazakhstan is rather specific. Most oralmans live in the South Kazakhstan oblast and, to a lesser extent in Mangistau and Almaty oblasts. 64.9% of resettled oralmans' families live in these areas. Various factors contributed to the distribution of families, including climate, regional, cultural, linguistic, as well as historical ties to their place of birth. It is important to understand that oralmans have ties to the regions from where they emigrated, and so they tend to settle in the regions most geographically close to their places of birth. For example, many oralmans from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan live in the South Kazakhstan oblast, while those from China and Mongolia live in the East Kazakhstan oblast, etc.

The social and economic integration of oralmans into the fabric of Kazakhstani society has not been smooth or without challenges. The full adaptation process for migrants in any country is tied to linguistic, cultural, legal and economic problems and takes a substantial amount of time. The integration of oralmans in this country is no exception. First of all, they come to this country with no knowledge of the law, economy, Russian language, etc. Their opportunities for earning income are smaller and different from those in their countries of origin; for example, half as many have steady employment as previously; half as many work in business. Twice as many are occasional workers and three times as many are unemployed. Almost twice as many rely on pensions or other types of welfare
assistance. According to an opinion poll of oralmans in Astana, the percentage of those living below the poverty line has risen from 10.2% to 24.6%.

Taking as a whole the sufficiently high level of education of oralmans, many of them cannot take up entrepreneurial and other types of activities due to their lack of knowledge of conditions, laws and regulations on how to do business and due to the absence of their inability to get credit.

The issue of housing is a big problem for oralmans, especially those who arrive outside of established government quotas. Of those who arrived at the beginning of 2004, 51.2% had housing. Only about one-quarter of these (26.1%) owned their own homes.

While oralmans arriving as part of the government quota receive money for housing, those who come to Kazakhstan outside the quota do not receive such funds. The housing allowance (a sum based on a varying computational index multiplied by 100) is sufficient to purchase a home in rural, but not in urban areas. It should be mentioned that the existence of a procedure for acquiring housing has created two categories of oralmans: those who are dependent on government assistance and wait for it, and those who do not. Those who aim to acquire the long-awaited housing do not have any incentive to obtain citizenship quickly or become an active member of society, while the others use every means to acquire citizenship rapidly, and with it they use all of their rights in the area of housing acquisition (for example obtaining credit for home construction or opening a business, mortgage credit, etc.).

According to the law, oralmans and all citizens of Kazakhstan are guaranteed free access to health services and medical treatment. This guarantee however does not include medicine dispensed on an outpatient basis, and frequently it does not cover in-patient or specialized medical services. Sociological research has shown that the majority (78.5%) of oralmans who arrive in Kazakhstan both within and outside the quota use the medical services of the local clinics. One in six oralmans cures him/herself at home in order to save money. 7% of oralmans, mostly those who live in cities use the services of a personal friend who is a doctor. The vast majority (80%) does not pay for medical services. Among those who paid, the price ranged from 50 to 50,000 tenge.

As with healthcare, the Kazakhstan Government also guarantees free elementary education. Above all, the government specifies a number of oralmans who arrive within the quota to receive access to higher and secondary-professional education. Here however, there is a problem due to the oralmans’ lack of knowledge of the Russian language and Cyrillic alphabet. There also are differences between the educational systems in Kazakhstan and those in their countries of previous residence. Then there is the problem of absenteeism, as 23% of oralmans’ children have skipped school. The primary reason for this is illness. 16.8% of children who missed school did so due to illness. 4.3% of schoolchildren in urban areas reported that they worked instead of attending school due to a lack of money in the family. 5.7% of children in rural areas reported missing school because of difficulties in actually getting to school.

The problem of successful integration of oralmans in Kazakhstani society depends strongly on their linguistic, cultural and psychological adaptation. In this regard it should be mentioned that Kazakh repatriates from the “far abroad” face a number of problems associated with the lack of a foundation in the Kazakh language among many locals, the widespread Kazakh-Russian bilingualism in Kazakhstani society and the practice of conducting business in Russian. This problem is especially acute in the northern part of the country.

A so-called “cultural distance” problem exists between oralmans and local ethnic Kazakhs, not to mention between oralmans and ethnic Slavs. The lack of knowledge of the Kazakh language among local Kazakhs, especially in urban areas, plays a crucial role in contributing to this problem. Having arrived from essentially mono-ethnic environments where their language and culture were well-preserved (oralmans in their former places of residence resided mostly in compact ethnic settlements), these oralmans have a difficult time adjusting to an unfamiliar environment, especially in the beginning. Adjustment takes place much more quickly in the southern and south-eastern regions of the country and in the mono-ethnic regions of the western, northern and central regions of Kazakhstan, where the locals have preserved their national traditions, including the Kazakh language.

An analysis of the habits and traditions of oralmans shows that despite their closeness to local Kazakhs, there are cultural differences. For example, oralmans women living in the southern and western areas of the country wear traditional national clothing consisting of a long, closed dress with a camisole worn over it. In addition the clothing has influences of the culture and country from where these women arrived. Many Kazakh women arriving from Turkmenistan, Iran and Afghanistan do not adopt the dress of local Kazakhs, considering it too frivolous. Among men the differences in dress are not as significant,
but the nonetheless we see that they preserve some local details. For example men who arrive from Uzbekistan wear Tyubeteiki (scull caps), while those arriving from Pakistan and Iraq (mostly elderly) wear chalma attire.

To a great extent the so-called “first wave” oralmans, repatriates from Mongolia have adjusted to the ways of local Kazakhs. In the first years after their arrival, these oralmans brought with them and used mostly handmade clothing, including winter wear. Now these oralmans have almost completely adopted modern, European-style clothing.

There are also differences in lifestyle. Many oralmans do not buy furniture; instead they have an abundance of korpe (handmade patchwork blankets), pillows and rugs. Some of them live in yurts. They have low tables made from wooden planks on which they eat. They decorate their living space with handmade furnishings, many of which were made before coming to Kazakhstan. With their subsequent change in occupations, surroundings, and the process of urbanization this production of household items has all but stopped, especially among Mongolian Kazakhs. This is because of a lack of materials and a rethinking of the practicality of such items. One can say that in a 10-year period the culture of these oralmans (the Mongolian Kazakhs, for example) has become considerably modernized.

However, it should be noted that for oralmans in the western and particularly southern regions the conservation of certain cultural elements might emerge. This adds to the predominance of ethnic Kazakhs in these regions and an orientation towards paternalism in social relations there. It is necessary to look at these kinds of cross-cultural influences when working with oralmans in order to prevent a regional social schism based on culture in the country.

A number of non-governmental organizations have sprung up to assist oralmans. Oralmans themselves are among the founders of such organizations, the creation of which allow deeper and more objective understanding of the adaptation problems these people face.

NGOs that work with oralmans provide the following services: legal assistance (consultation on legal matters, social defense, translation and formulation of registration and citizenship documents); organization of conferences, seminars and roundtable discussions; the elaboration of recommendations for improving the legal standing of oralmans and presenting them to the RK parliament, the RK government and local organs; the elaboration of joint projects with international organizations, cooperation creating small businesses, creating business plans, defending the rights of oralmans in local government bodies on legal and social issues; and the education of oralmans (history and culture of Kazakhstan, Russian language, etc.).

These organizations however do not use their full potential. There exist no good connections between these organizations and government structures or with other social organizations.

Most notable among organizations that have helped oralmans is the International Organization for Migration (IOM). IOM has played a large role in solving oralmans issues; the organization has participated in the 2000 RK Government Inter-ministerial Commission for migration issues, of which it is a permanent member. IOM assists oralmans to obtain citizenship, cooperates on practical matters associated with the integration and adaptation of oralmans in their new places of residence; it supports developing the potential of NGOs that work with oralmans and also supports the initiatives of NGOs and oralmans themselves on specific projects.

One project IOM is working on in Kazakhstan involves the construction of villages for oralmans in the village of Baibesek in Almaty. Project donors include the Embassy of the Netherlands and local power structures. The project started in December 2003 and was successfully completed in July of 2004. The following were provided as part of this project: a well to provide residents with clean, safe drinking water; improved roads leading into the village and ten micro-grants for the neediest families to obtain building materials for their own homes. IOM also subsidized the construction of a workshop that provided full-time employment for 13 qualified immigrants in its first year of existence.

This initiative is being replicated across the country. Similar projects currently are underway in Astana, Aktau, Pavlodar, Shymkent and Ust-Kamenogorsk.

In the latest stage of independent development, the Republic of Kazakhstan is starting to solve many of its social and economic problems by taking new positions on issues. Among these, a new migration policy is very important. This policy should be built on the principle of assuring national security. It must also take into account new social and economic possibilities formed on market economic
principles and the development of the processes of democratization and internationalism in the construction of social-oriented legal government.

It is necessary to transform governmental, economic and social policies on oralmans. Policy should be based not on providing them with free housing but on giving them zero-interest loans for building their own homes. We need to eliminate the differential treatment between those oralmans who arrive within the quota and those who arrive outside of it.

If the oralmans quota system is retained, a schism will arise not only between the two categories of oralmans, but in general between immigrants. The current general migration policy is neither objective nor transparent.

We do not recommend spending the budget on a specific and limited number of families, nor do we recommend the opposite, giving a miniscule sum out to everyone. Instead we recommend concentrating the money in a special immigration fund with regional offices that would distribute the money to oralmans in the form of zero-interest loans. The government could direct this fund through NGOs and other organizations that work with oralmans, for example to build housing complexes for them, create temporary adaptation centres, organize various professional, cultural courses, training, etc.

An important element of integration of oralmans into Kazakhstan society is the creation of an appropriate language environment. In particular I am referring to the further development, spread and creation of stimuli for use of the Kazakh language in the northern part of the country. This will enable the oralmans to feel as if they are arriving home to their motherland where knowledge of their native tongue is needed and is widely used among all nationalities. The creation of stimuli for using Kazakh in the northern part of the country was an important factor in resettling oralmans in the north and in this regard the Kazakh language is now needed there even more.

It is necessary to take a fresh approach to migration policy and in particular, the policy on oralmans. The improvement of the law "on migration of the population" is an important political (and legal) instrument in this regard.

A government program for the adaptation of oralmans in Kazakhstan needs to be developed. Such a program should be based on a redistributed financial mechanism and should equalize conditions both for those arriving within the quota as well as outside of it. The program must contain sections on economic adaptation, job placement, entrepreneurship, etc. The social adaptation part of the program should contain sections on housing acquisition, medical services, education, etc. Cultural-linguistic adaptation will include problems tied to a quicker mastery of culture and lifestyles in contemporary Kazakhstani society.
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| 13. Ms. Gulnara Mendykulova  
Researcher  
Academy of Science, Almaty | 14. Mr. Nurbolat Aiekeshev  
Researcher  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty |
| 15. Ms. Meruert Abuseitova  
Director, Institute for Oriental Studies  
Academy of Science, Almaty  
invostok@nursat.kz | 16. Mr. Kanat Kanafin  
Researcher  
Institute for Oriental Studies  
Academy of Science, Almaty  
invostok@nursat.kz |
| 17. Mr. K. Talipov  
Researcher  
Institute for Oriental Studies  
Academy of Science, Almaty  
invostok@nursat.kz | 18. Ms. R. Karimova  
Researcher  
Institute for Oriental Studies  
Academy of Science, Almaty  
invostok@nursat.kz |
| 19. Mr. Tatibekov  
Researcher  
Institute for Oriental Studies  
Academy of Science, Almaty  
invostok@nursat.kz | 20. Ms. Nazym Shedenova  
Deputy Director of Gender Department,  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty |
<p>| 21. | Ms. Aigul Esimova | Researcher | Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty |
| 22. | Ms. Mansia Sadyrova | Researcher | Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty |
| 23. | Mr. Sultankozha Amitov | Researcher | Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty |
| 24. | Mr. Marat Hadjimukhamedov | Researcher | Ijtimoiy Fikr Social Centre, Tashkent |
| 25. | Ms. Dina Mirzakarimova | Programme Officer | USAID Tashkent |
| 26. | Mr. Ozat Ata-Mirzaev | Researcher | Ijtimoiy Fikr Social Centre, Tashkent |
| 27. | Ms. Umida Khshimova | Independent Researcher | |
| 28. | Ms. Adash Toktosunova | Secretary General | UNESCO National Commission |
| 29. | Mr. Kubanychbek Isabekov | Chairperson | Parliamentary Commission on Migration |
| 30. | Ms. Natalya Hajimuratova | NGO, Researcher | |
| 31. | Mr. Bolat Sarygulov | Deputy Head of Department | |
| 32. | Mr. Ludmila Torgasheva | Head, Demographic Department | |
| 33. | Mr. Saltanat Sakembaeva | Human Dimension Assistant | OSCE Centre Bishkek |
| 34. | Mr. Zlatco Zigic | Chief of Mission | IOM Bishkek |
| 35. | Mr. Mamadsho Ilolov | President | Academy of Science |
| 36. | Ms. Bahtiya Mukhamadiyeva | 1st Deputy Chairperson | State Statistics Committee |
| 37. | Ms. Saodat Olimova | Researcher | Sharq Research Centre, Dushanbe |
| 38. | Mr. Naderi Makhmoud | Chief of Mission | IOM Dushanbe |
| 39. | Mr. Anvar Babaev | Head of State Migration Service | Ministry of Labour and Social Protection |
| 40. | Mr. Marc-Antoine Desy | Programme Manager | UNDP Dushanbe |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN AGENCIES</th>
<th>UN AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Ms. Yuriko Shoji UN Resident Coordinator UNDP-UNFPA Resident Representative Kazakhstan <a href="mailto:yuriko.shoji.kz@undp.org">yuriko.shoji.kz@undp.org</a></td>
<td>42. Ms. Aida Alzhanova Assistant Representative UNFPA Almaty <a href="mailto:unfpakz.arep@undp.org">unfpakz.arep@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Mr. Gordon Johnson Deputy Resident Representative UNDP Kazakhstan <a href="mailto:Gordon.Johnson@undp.org">Gordon.Johnson@undp.org</a></td>
<td>44. Ms. Lyazzat Rabbiosi Programme Associate UNFPA Almaty <a href="mailto:lyazzat.rabbiosi@undp.org">lyazzat.rabbiosi@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Mr. Patrick Taran Senior Migration Specialist ILO Geneva <a href="mailto:taran@ilo.org">taran@ilo.org</a></td>
<td>46. Mr. Narasimha Rao Programme Manager UNHCR Almaty <a href="mailto:rao@unhcr.ch">rao@unhcr.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Mr. Talgat Umirzhanov National Correspondent ILO Almaty <a href="mailto:umirzhanov@ilo.org">umirzhanov@ilo.org</a></td>
<td>48. Ms. Geraldine Salducci Legal Advisor UNHCR Geneva <a href="mailto:salducci@unhcr.ch">salducci@unhcr.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Ms. Damira Sartbaeva Regional Programme Director for CIS UNIFEM Almaty <a href="mailto:damira.sartbaeva@undp.org">damira.sartbaeva@undp.org</a></td>
<td>50. Mr. Massimiliano Riva Programme Associate UNDP Almaty <a href="mailto:Massimiliano.Riva@undp.org">Massimiliano.Riva@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Mr. Ivar Vikki Ambassador, Head of Mission OSCE Centre Almaty <a href="mailto:Ivar.vikki@osce.org">Ivar.vikki@osce.org</a></td>
<td>52. Ms. Donna Wright Acting Mission Director USAID Almaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Mr. Bjorn Halvarsson Human Dimension Officer OSCE Centre Almaty <a href="mailto:bjorn.halvarsson@osce.org">bjorn.halvarsson@osce.org</a></td>
<td>54. Ms. Inna Biriukova USAID Almaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Mr. Nilim Baruah Head of Labour Migration Service IOM Geneva <a href="mailto:nbaruah@iom.int">nbaruah@iom.int</a></td>
<td>56. Ms. Nataliya Kryuchkova Country Representative DFID Almaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Mr. Michael Tschanz Chief of Mission IOM Almaty <a href="mailto:mtschanz@iom.nursat.kz">mtschanz@iom.nursat.kz</a></td>
<td>58. Ms. Almut Brunkhorst Project Manager EC Delegation Almaty <a href="mailto:Almut.Brunckhorst@cec.eu.int">Almut.Brunckhorst@cec.eu.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Ms. Alexandra Formanek Consultant IOM Almaty <a href="mailto:aformanek@iom.nursat.kz">aformanek@iom.nursat.kz</a></td>
<td>60. Ms. Hema Kotecha Consultant OSCE Centre Almaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Ms. Ekaterina Badikova Regional Programme Coordinator IOM Almaty <a href="mailto:ebadikova@iom.nursat.kz">ebadikova@iom.nursat.kz</a></td>
<td>62. Mr. Claus Folden TCC Coordinator IOM Vienna <a href="mailto:tccmrfvienna@iom.int">tccmrfvienna@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBASSIES</td>
<td>EMBASSIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 63. Mr. Taner Seben  
Ambassador  
Embassy of Turkey, Almaty  
almatyturk@kaznet.kz | 64. Mr. Clifford Sorensen  
Regional INL Coordinator  
US Embassy, Almaty |
| 65. Mr. Matyavin Vladimir  
Head  
Russian Embassy Representation, Almaty  
rfe@nursat.kz | 66. Ms. Assel Roberts  
Regional INL Coordinator  
US Embassy, Almaty |
| 67. Mrs. Madhumita Hazarika  
2nd Secretary  
Embassy of India, Almaty  
aaadmtn@netel.kz | 68. Ms. Naiya Okda  
Programme Officer  
CIDA/Embassy of Canada  
Technical Assistance Section |
| 69. Mr. David Hinchon  
3rd Secretary  
Embassy of Great Britain, Almaty | 70. Ms. Alipa Aubakirova  
Team Leader,  
Support to Tajik Labour Migrants Project  
Embassy of Tajikistan, Almaty |
| 71. Mr. Azamsho Sharipov  
Counsellor  
Embassy of Tajikistan, Almaty | |
| INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS | INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS |
| 72. Dr. Sabiha Syed  
UNESCO International Consultant  
Director, Migration Research Centre,  
Islamabad  
NGO's | 73. Ms. Elena Tjurjukanova  
Expert,  
Institute of Socio-Economic Studies of the Population, Academy of Science, Moscow  
NGO's |
| 74. Mr. Antonio Stango  
Project Director  
Freedom House  
stango@freedomhouse.org | 75. Ms. Viktoria Tiuleneva  
Legal Specialist  
International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Kazakhstan  
vika@bureau.kz |
| 76. Ms. Tolkyn Muissova  
Media Officer  
Freedom House,  
Muissova@freedomhouse.org | |
| TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS |
| 77. Mr. Talaidbek Usualiev  
Deputy on Technical Issues  
BOMCA/CADAP Bishkek  
talaidev,USUALIEV@EU-BOMCA.ORG | 78. Mr. Rustam Muzafarov  
Project Manager  
ADB Project  
rmuzafoar@adb.org |
| 79. Ms. Anjum Haque  
Head of UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty  
ar.haque@unesco.org | 80. Ms. Laura Kennedy  
Consultant,  
UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty  
lmkcb@yahoo.com |
| UNESCO CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT | UNESCO CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT |
| 81. Ms. Paz Fernandez  
SHS Programme Assistant  
UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty  
p.fernandez@unesco.kz | 82. Mr. Bakhtiyar Ospanbaev  
Education Assistant  
UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty  
b.ospanbayev@unesco.org |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Ms. Indira Konelbaeva</td>
<td>SHS Programme Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:i.konelbaeva@unesco.kz">i.konelbaeva@unesco.kz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:i.konelbaeva@unesco.kz">i.konelbaeva@unesco.kz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Ms. Leila Seitova</td>
<td>SHS Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:l.seitova@yandex.ru">l.seitova@yandex.ru</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:l.seitova@yandex.ru">l.seitova@yandex.ru</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Ms. Aljan Sugurbekova</td>
<td>Culture Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.sugurbekova@unesco.kz">a.sugurbekova@unesco.kz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.sugurbekova@unesco.kz">a.sugurbekova@unesco.kz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONFEREE INTERPRETERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Mr. Valery Surikov</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:surikov@yahoo.com">surikov@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Ms. Eugenia Leschenko</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eleschenko@rambler.ru">eleschenko@rambler.ru</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Bolatbek Amanbekov
CI Assistant
UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty
b.amanbekov@unesco.kz

Ms. Irina Andreyeva
IT Assistant
UNESCO Cluster Office Almaty
i.andreyeva@unesco.kz
UNESCO resources

- Management of Social Transformations (MOST) - www.unesco.org/shs/most

Additional resources

- BOMCA - www.eu-bomca.org
- EurAsEc - www.mpa.eurasec.org
- European Union - http://europa.eu.int/
- Global Commission on International Migration - www.gcim.org
- ILO - www.ilo.org
- International Foundation for Election Systems - www.ifes.org
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development - www.oecd.org
- OSCE Kazakhstan - www.osce.org/almaty
- United Nations Kazakhstan - www.un.kz
- UNDP - www.undp.kz
- UNFPA - www.unfpa.kz
- UNHCR - www.unhcr.ch
- UNIFEM CIS - www.unifemcis.org

The UN host-agencies represent an international body designed to assist in maintaining peace and security throughout the world, whose priority is to promote and protect human rights, including those of migrants. As Mr. Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General, stated in his address to the World Economic and Social Survey 2004: "Migration brings with it many complex challenges: issues of human rights and economic opportunity, of labour shortages and unemployment, of brain drain and brain gain, of multiculturalism and integration, of refugee flows and asylum seekers, of law enforcement and human trafficking, of human security and national security".

Promoting respect for the human rights of migrants and respect for cultural diversity are the basic premises of UNESCO’s work in the field of migration, as migrants are both workers and also human beings; migratory flows therefore have social and cultural implications.

Problems, achievements, ways to improve national and international activities in the field of migration and the rights of migrants and their family members will be discussed during the conference. Apart from migrants’ rights, the following main themes will be stressed: labour migration, remittances, the role of diasporas, and migration and development. The concept of building partnerships between governments and social scientists on migration issues through research and analysis and national statistics in Central Asia will be highlighted. Future migration trends and directions will be projected.

This conference will pave the way for a future where migrants’ rights are upheld in a manner faithful to the original spirit of the UN Convention on the Rights of Migrants and their Family Members.

Representatives from a number of CIS and Western countries (e.g. France, Austria, the USA) will take part in this event. Approximately seventy conference participants will include the heads of migration services from Central Asian countries, social scientists, migration experts, representatives of statistical agencies and the civil society, along with human rights activists and diplomats, who will share information and experiences on migration in individual countries and the region as a whole.

The selection of Kazakhstan for the conference venue shows the high recognition that the international community pays to Kazakhstan for its achievements in the area of political and interethnic stability, and its progress in the areas of human rights and democracy. As a country of emigration, immigration and transit migration, Kazakhstan remains strong and continues to move towards prosperity.

The conference will conclude its work with recommendations that will focus on organizing activities for managing migration as well as mainstreaming this phenomenon into Development policies, encouraging networks to bring all interested stakeholders together to share best practices used by the different actors that deal with migration issues: government, the civil society and the international community. These recommendations will be supported and coordinated by UNESCO in partnership with other international bodies that deal with migration at country and regional levels.

The opening will be held in the Hotel Kazakhstan on 12 May 2005, starting at 9.30 a.m.
### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOMCA</td>
<td>Border Management Project in Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADAP</td>
<td>Central Asia Drug Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASWANAME</td>
<td>Central Asia, South West Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBP</td>
<td>Committee for Border Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States, (former Soviet Republics, excluding Baltic states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Check Point (At the border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Counter Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAEC or EurAsEC</td>
<td>Eurasian Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECA</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>The European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLF</td>
<td>Foreign Labour Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMA</td>
<td>Federal Migration Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRG</td>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBAO</td>
<td>Gorno-Baakhsan Autonomous Oblast (Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIM</td>
<td>Global Commission on International Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/Aids</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFES</td>
<td>International Foundation for Election Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>International Migration Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRSU</td>
<td>Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLSP</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOS</td>
<td>Ministry of Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST</td>
<td>Management of Social Transformations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWB</td>
<td>Migration Without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>Republic of Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Republic of Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUz</td>
<td>Republic of Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMR</td>
<td>Regional Centre for Migration and Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Social and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>State Migration Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>State Statistical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Technical Cooperation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td>United Nations Development Fund for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>United Nations Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US or USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (before 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>